

[Contact me](#)

Mirror's to this e-book on website

mirror 1: <http://attltb.hosting.bizfree.kr/tvf/eng/cont.htm>

mirror 2: <http://attltb.mireene.com/tvf/eng/cont.htm>

Index page mirror Link3: <http://attltb.hosting.bizfree.kr/tvf/eng/idx.htm>

Index page mirror Link4: <http://attltb.mireene.com/tvf/eng/idx.htm>

mirror 5: <http://st0rage.org/~graalreborn11/pet/The%20Venus%20Flytrap/eng/cont.htm>

Download entire website mirror 6: <http://attltb.mireene.com/tvf/tvfeng.zip>

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

By Attltb

Contents

[Chapter 1. Because The Venus Project is the most dogmatic ideology nowadays.](#)

[Chapter 2. Because The Venus Project is trying to renovate people.](#)

[Chapter 3. Because The Venus Project is based on guesses and bluffs.](#)

[Chapter 4. Because The Venus Project believes in autocracy.](#)

[Chapter 5. Because it removes our freedom of choice.](#)

[Chapter 6. Because it is simplifying too many things.](#)

[Chapter 7. Because if it fails, the cost would be massive.](#)

[Chapter 8. Because it is exactly a utopian engineering predicted by Karl Popper.](#)

[Chapter 9. Because it is not based on a scientific method, and not even based on a science.](#)

[Chapter 10. Because we have better alternatives already.](#)

[Appendix A. About Economics](#)

[Appendix B. About Current Crisis](#)

[Appendix C. About FED](#)

[Appendix D. About Impossibility of Self-purification](#)

[Appendix E. About Cities](#)

[Closing Remark. Correct alternative is born from correct knowledge.](#)

[Does automation create unemployment?](#)

[Index](#) (for debate)

[Download](#)

[Contact me](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 1.

Because The Venus Project is the most dogmatic ideology nowadays.

1-01 Summary) Jacque Fresco devotes more time and effort to criticizing accepted norms and beliefs than describing his alternative society. According to Fresco, an essential thing to do in order to make people accept his alternative is letting them to face the fact that their thoughts have been governed by ideologies, and helping them to escape from their ideological prejudices. The Venus Project is described as something they will accept as a matter of course at the moment they finally liberated from ideologies.

1-02 But this method which looks plausible at a glance only caused many side effects. Many supporters of The Venus Project behave like people who received some kind of intellectual revelation. They believe that they are special people who removed all prejudices from their mind and that anyone with contrasting opinions has been brainwashed by the system. Even Fresco himself identifies his subjective opinions with the law of nature impliedly.

1-03 The introspection which Fresco emphasizes is neither original nor advisable. The method through which Jacque Fresco attempts to bring revolution in our consciousness is similar to the method of a pseudo-scientist named Alfred Adler, not to the method of Albert Einstein. Fresco may pledge us liberation from ideologies, but his ideas are already becoming the most dogmatic ideology nowadays.

1-04 There has been a long dispute about whether the economy must be planned out or left to the market. This problem has been one of the greatest political issues ever since it was first raised. We now have a system of the economy that distributes most goods through the market, and this is referred to as the market economy. On the contrary, communist societies like the former Soviet Union controlled everything through the central government. This is referred to as the planned economy.

1-05 We never think that the entire economy should be left to the market or planned out. Keynesianism, corporatism, and social democracy have their own views about what is to be planned out and what to be left to the market. However, we can classify different ideas according to the degree at which a nation participates in production and distribution. Complete laissez-faire that leaves everything to the market would be placed at the rightmost, and planned economy would be placed at the leftmost.

1-06 Jacque Fresco's Resource-based economy does not exist outside the vertical line alone. The argument of Jacque Fresco that communism is identical to capitalism because it also uses money simply means that for many people, only the resource-based economy is placed to the left of communism. Communists who are at the leftmost side always argued for the complete abolition of money, but only few of them believe that they are essentially different from other communists.

1-07 It is not that there is no difference between resource-based economy and communism. There are many differences between them. My point is very simple. The reason why many people oppose resource-based economy is that it is a planned economy. They accurately understand what they are trying to refute. In any case, argument about the resource-based economy cannot be free from the long argument between the market economy and planned economy.

1-08 To those who reject planned economy, failure of communism does not simply mean failure of communism. It also suggests failure of planned economy. You may argue that failure of communism cannot prove the failure of all planned economies, but you should not say that your opponents fail to distinguish between resource-based economy and communism. They well understand the difference between communism and resource-based economy. [1] They simply regard this difference as unimportant.

1-09 Such simplification is always being used by supporters of The Venus Project. According to Jacque Fresco, all systems that use money are money-based economies and money-based economy is wrong. As such, supporters of The Venus Project equate all subjects of their criticism such as capitalism and communism. They simply regard such difference as unimportant.

1-10 All of those who criticize planned economy have an integrated rebuttal applied to all planned economies. Whether the plan is devised by scientists or politicians, it has absolutely no influence on their logic. If supporters of The Venus Project cannot refute this, they can never argue that The Venus Project is fundamentally different from other planned economies. They must not believe that they have exclusive right to identify something with another.

1-11 However, according to many supporters of The Venus Project, all other thoughts about social systems are mere *ideologies*. Only their classification is justifiable. If someone else uses a different classification, it shows that the person has fallen into some kind of ideology. They believe that scientific and engineering methods are only being correctly applied by themselves to designing of social systems. In short, only The Venus Project is science and common sense.

1-12 Did Fresco really say such thing? In this case, yes he did. One of Fresco's favorite things is to imagine how our descendants who will live in much "saner" world would think about our current civilization. According to Fresco, they will conclude that our current civilization is definitely wrong. They may not even understand why we didn't start what Fresco calls The Venus Project earlier.

1-13 We will later demonstrate that the so-called scientific methodology to which Jacque Fresco relies upon is not scientific at all. This though is not something that we want to talk about in this Chapter. We are going to get back to this in Chapter 9. This Chapter is about why Jacque Fresco and his supporters

came to assure that his resource-based economy is not an idea, why they had to be assured, and what inevitable conclusion is brought forth by such assurance.

1-14 According to Fresco, thoughts and personality of a person are determined by the social environment in which the person is placed. Most people cannot think past this limit because even the vocabularies and sentences they use are affected by their environment. Whether they are created by intentional propaganda or nature, thoughts infused into us by the environment serve to perpetuate our environment. [2] We refer to these thoughts as ideologies.

1-15 Jacque Fresco compares the astonishing accomplishment of natural sciences with various social systems that repeated failures. Based on his explanation, the reason why social systems failed until now is because they have their basis in ideology. By removing prejudice, we can apply truly natural scientific methods to our society. This is an objective method to which nobody can raise an objection. There cannot be an ideology about how to make an airplane.

1-16 Hence, what he demands from people is clear: We must perceive and remove things that are injecting incorrect thoughts into us. We can then begin truly objective social engineering. If we could get rid of prejudice, things that we need to do will become as obvious as natural science. Also, he suggests The Venus Project as such obvious alternative.

1-17 Of course, it is not easy to escape from ideology. It requires the process in which one realizes that he has fallen into the mainstream ideology and places efforts to overcome this ideology. We will call this process as *introspection* from now on. Most people are not willing to go through such trouble, including economists. Thus, there is no meaning in arguing economics as being a field of science because they have not removed their prejudice.

1-18 So this differentiates The Venus Project from all other alternatives. Other alternatives were made without introspection. Only The Venus Project went through the process of introspection. It is not surprising to see that supporters of The Venus Project fail to imagine that The Venus Project is an ideology. We can only start with The Venus Project by removing ideology.

1-19 We already seem to be able to give two criticisms against thoughts of supporters of The Venus Project: First, there is no guarantee that introspection would reveal *all* prejudices we have. Second, the fact that a previous belief was an ideology is completely unrelated to the fact that our new belief is not an ideology. We must consider the two separately. New beliefs adopted after removing prejudice are often found to contain a greater prejudice.

1-20 At this point, one may want to ask the following questions. Isn't it true that The Venus Project, after all, made a new attempt never tried by other alternatives? Therefore, isn't The Venus Project superior to other alternatives in some ways? The problem is that even this is a fallacy. Fresco's attempt is what Popper called *Sociology of knowledge*, and what Mises called *Polylogism*. It's far from something new. The proper criticisms were already made.

1-21 Let us first disclose the miserable performance left behind by people who applied such attempts to natural sciences. *In the history of science, there was no single true scientist who contributed to the development of science by finding specific prejudice or ideology in the mainstream science through introspection and trying to overcome such prejudice or ideology.* The only reason why we need to have a constraint of being true is because followers of theories that were later found to be pseudo-science have always made similar attempts.

1-22 Einstein did not tear down the prejudice at the time by contemplating the essence of time and space. In fact, he was able to reach the theory of relativity with major experimental results at the time, theoretical outcomes like Michelson-Morley experiment, and theoretical efforts to explain Lorentz transformation as a compatible system. Fathers of modern science also did not ask for introspection to overthrow prejudice of the medieval age.

1-23 Whether it is or not the same type of introspection demanded by Jacque Fresco from us, there is a serious doubt about the existence of methods that can cultivate objective thinking which encompasses all fields of study. The history of science shows that a person who removed a prejudice can become more vulnerable to another. Einstein never acknowledged the quantum theory, and Newton believed in alchemy.

1-24 There were times during which introspection was deemed important in science. Science in the medieval age dominated by the idea of Aristotle placed importance in such fostering. Therefore, we can see two groups that faithfully followed scientific methodology of Fresco: Pseudo-scientists today and medieval scientists. We might have to look at Jacque Fresco, who tried to differentiate his alternative from others, with eyes of concern rather than eyes of respect.

1-25 Fresco has a critical misunderstanding about scientific methodology. He believed that objectivity of natural science comes from an individual's efforts to have objective thinking or be objective. This definitely is not true. Even if it is true that scientists have relatively few prejudices compared to other people, this clearly is not a result of introspection or their efforts to remove their prejudices.

1-26 *Objectivity of science is not a personal attribute of scientists but an attribute of a community created by a group of scientists.* A philosopher of science Karl Popper wrote, 3) "Objectivity is closely bound up with the social aspect of scientific method, with the fact that science and scientific objectivity do not (and cannot) result from the attempts of an individual scientist to be 'objective', but from the friendly-hostile co-operation of many scientists. Scientific objectivity can be described as the inter-subjectivity of scientific method."

1-27 A scientist presents his theory, convinced that there is no place for refutation. However, this fails to move the heart of his colleague scientists or competitors and can actually arouse their objection. Scientists know that scientific attitude is an attitude of criticizing everything, and they cannot be held back by authorities. This results in ceaseless logical arguments by those who have opposing opinions.

1-28 What does it mean by the fact that scientific objectivity comes out of logical argument among scientists with different opinions instead of individual efforts by scientists to become objective? Sometimes, an entire group of scientists can have prejudice. However as shown by the actual history of science, possibility of this prejudice being refuted is open as long as science allows argument and doubt. We must not give up on this possibility.

1-29 The problem is that this is an arduous path for someone who wishes to tear down prejudices. He must confront many opponents. He must confute all objections by opponents. Even if his argument began from doubt about the fact taken for granted by most of scientists, he needs to accept that other scientists also have the right to doubt his argument. Unless he endures all these hardships, it is forever impossible to tear down their prejudices.

1-30 This may sound hopeless. He may think that most scientists are so ignorant and full of prejudice that he cannot communicate with them. Therefore in many cases, people who are trying to tear down prejudices take the opposite path. He seeks to settle disputes by making other scientists to have the

same doubt as he does. He looks for solution by appealing to introspection by scientists.

1-31 The problem is that such appeal can never see its effect. At any time, such appeal would be regarded as ridiculous by the world of science. The theory of relativity by Einstein completely changed our awareness about time and space. However, he did not accomplish this by appealing us to doubt the essence of time and space. There is a great implication in the fact that such revolution that overturned the basis of physics was solely based on *logical argument*.

1-32 Let us clarify what logical argument means. All people who try to remove other people's prejudice by encouraging introspection tend to misunderstand the term logical argument. They trust that pointing out someone else's prejudice is an act of logically refuting his opinion. This phenomenon cannot easily be understood by explanation. Consider the following example.

1-33 Fresco says in *Zeitgeist: Moving Forward*, "Whether you are dealing with the philosophies of Milton Friedman, F.A. Hayek, John Maynard Keynes, Ludwig von Mises, or any other major market economist the basis of rationale rarely leaves the money sequence. It is like a religion. Consumption analysis, stabilization policies, deficit spending, aggregate demand... it exists as a never ending, self-referring self-rationalizing circle of discourse." [4]

1-34 All of those who believe that this is a logically appropriate refutation of the market economy should read the following sentence: "Whether you are dealing with the sciences of Erwin Schrödinger, W.K. Heisenberg, Richard Phillips Feynman or any other major quantum physicist the basis of rationale rarely leaves the wave function. It is like a religion. Operators, perturbation theory, exchange forces, Schrödinger equations... it exists as a never ending, self-referring self-rationalizing circle of discourse."

1-35 Of course, this is nothing but the most ridiculous pick on the quantum theory. Nobody would think that this is a reasonable refutation. [5] But what we must be aware is why we do not consider such arguments as reasonable refutation of the quantum theory. It is related to the fact that such arguments simply reproach abstract concepts of the quantum theory instead of rebutting specific principles of the quantum theory.

1-36 The value of the quantum theory is in that it offers specific principles applied to explain the real world. If a principle of the quantum theory applied to the real world, the principle of uncertainty for example, is found to be only justified by internal circular logic, the impact would be significant. This finding will be published as the cover story of all science magazines, and the very first scientist who makes this finding can easily fix the prejudice of his colleagues.

1-37 Economics has as detailed principles as the quantum theory. In fact, economics exists to come up with principles. Thus, we can show without difficulty that one of economic principles is wrong. It is easy to point out the flaw in an economist who argues that the planned economy fails based on reasons only justifiable to monetary economy. Jacques Fresco should have criticized at least one of economic principles like this.

1-38 Perhaps Jacques Fresco wanted to deny the entire modern economics rather than a specific proposition of modern economics. However, in this case, he can only do so by refuting detailed principles that form the basis of modern economics - for example, economics would collapse if the principle of supply and demand were to be refuted. Fresco surely attempts hard to criticize the methodologies of economics, but he was never successful in refuting a single principle of economics.

1-39 It is absurd to think that one can refute a field of study by pointing out the concepts on which the field relies. *No field of study is free from such criticism*. The fact that specific scientific principles are true does not prove that premises of such principles are also true. Let us think that estimations of quantum mechanics are always correct. Can we argue that all premises in the basis of quantum mechanics are true? The answer is self-evident: No.

1-40 If we take the Newtonian mechanics as the truth, we must believe that objects exchange force and move according to a differential equation. However, this contradicts the Lagrange dynamics arguing that objects move according to an optimal route with a purpose. Amazing thing is that these two dynamics estimate exactly identical phenomenon despite the fact that they have different and contradicting premises.

1-41 Strictly speaking, maybe this is the reason why we must distinguish between principles of science and premises in the scientific background. The fact that specific estimations of a theory are true does not verify that the theory is true. The ridiculous criticism that quantum mechanics is self-referent perhaps may not be completely wrong. We cannot argue that interpretations about its nature are true based on the fact that estimations of quantum mechanics are often correct. [6]

1-42 In short, Jacque Fresco seems to be consistently applying the following definition to the term science: Science is an objective system of knowledge that we obtain by looking at the nature without ideology. The problem is that such thing does not exist anywhere. How Jacque Fresco handles this problem only demonstrates his ignorance about science. To say the truth, it is impossible to interpret the world without ideology.

1-43 If so, what distinguishes science from non-science? It is difficult to answer this question. It is no exaggeration to say that the entire philosophy of science was made to answer this question. I can introduce to you different schools of philosophy of science that answer this question in different ways. However in this text, such introduction would simply be a waste of time. (Anyway, it is not about existence of ideology.)

1-44 For instance according to Karl Popper, it is *falsifiability*. The biggest characteristic of scientific proposition is that it can be disproved. We cannot verify the principles of natural sciences. For example, we can never guarantee that the law of gravity is applied to all matters, since we have not tested all matters that existed before and will exist in the future. Nevertheless, it can still be disproved. The characteristic of natural sciences that presents specific estimation that may be correct or incorrect brings possibility of counterevidence.

1-45 If an ideology is an arbitrary assumption about something that has not been proved, we cannot completely get rid of it from science. It is impossible. What we must drive out through science are explanations that cannot be disproved by any experience. We can define them as an ideology in narrow terms. However, this must be fundamentally distinguished from the broader sense of ideology mentioned earlier.

1-46 Jacque Fresco could perhaps demonstrate that economics is not science by showing that economic principles cannot be disproved, based on the view of Popper. This may not be totally impossible. [7] Nonetheless, all of these are distant from what Fresco actually attempted. There is no meaning in listening to his criticisms about economics. It is natural to neglect wrongful criticisms.

1-47 One thing must be made clear before we continue with the discussion. Ideologies that can exist at the base of all fields of study including science are different from simplification of situations used by

the fields to come up with an actual estimation about something. Economics can assume that all human beings are selfish, but this is not an underlying ideology of economics. They are only using this to simplify complicated economic problems.

1-48 The assumption in economics that people behave selfishly is similar to negligence of air resistance in physics. They do not use such assumptions because they believe in them. They simply use them to simplify complex problems. Economists use the assumption that people are selfish in order to simplify difficult economic phenomena in the real world. This is quite different from underlying ideology of economics. [8]

1-49 Many critics consistently failed to differentiate between assumption and conclusion. They say that economics assumes invisible hand - the principle in which each individual enhance social benefit by pursuing personal benefit. However, this is not an assumption under any term and clearly is a conclusion drawn by economists based on a series of assumptions. Nobody believes in a conclusion without reason. It is absurd to refer to a conclusion as assumption or ideology.

1-50 Jacque Fresco's understanding of science is so epically wrong that it is unclear where we should start criticizing. We proved that it is an erroneous thought to believe that correct science is always free from ideology. However, such criticism is undeserved for Jacque Fresco if he fails to distinguish between what is an assumption and what is an ideology.

1-51 Someone may think like this: Alright, Fresco definitely misunderstood scientific method. However, whether or not he uses the method of scientists is not a big deal. No matter what method he used, wasn't his attempt to fix the errors of economics positive after all? But the difference between these two is not so small. It is about the difference in the method of approach to the truth.

1-52 There is no doubt about the fact that principles of study presented to resolve problems of reality can always be disproved. On the contrary, ideology cannot be disproved. This implies something simple. *Those who wish to refute a study through destruction of ideology can never use logical method.* Instead of arguing or persuading opponents by reasoning, they try to convert their opponents or refuse to communicate.

1-53 Jacque Fresco simply turned down on economics instead of refuting specific arguments by economists. According to him, economics is inevitably wrong because it uses concepts eaten up by ideology. In substance, its meaning is as follows: We should not accept an argument of economics, even if it seems perfectly logical. The only reason why it seems right is because it uses biased concepts.

1-54 So then, what can we argue about with economists? The answer of Fresco is firm. Nothing can be expected of people who are completely brainwashed by ideology. Accordingly, Jacque Fresco gave up on all constructive communications with economists. He isolated himself by building a bridge between him and economists that can only be crossed by conversion based on introspection. He did not just refuse to apply scientific method. He made it impossible.

1-55 Jacque Fresco's hatred for argument is noteworthy. Carefully listen to what he has to say: "We must learn to outgrow our egos in exchange for constructive dialogue rather than debate. In addition? We must be capable of stating problems and proposing solutions clearly and succinctlyâ€¦ even when these solutions are radically opposed to accepted norms." First sentence is the key, which was mainly quoted to stop the mouth of those who oppose The Venus Project.

1-56 If you think there is nothing wrong in what he says, suppose the same is being said by someone who supports market economy. He is demanding a 'constructive conversation' instead of 'argument' to

improve market economy. What kind of reaction would supporters of The Venus Project show? The reaction would not differ much from my reaction to the words of Jacque Fresco when a supporter of The Venus Project told me.

1-57 The advice of Fresco can only be accepted when we agree that his resource-based economy is fundamentally correct. In what sense is this constructive attitude? Science never developed when scientists failed to challenge the mainstream opinions and when they were satisfied with 'constructive conversations.' Most of scientific developments were made possible with active and aggressive challenge against the mainstream opinions.

1-58 Jacque Fresco's thinking is morbidly ambivalent. When speaking about market economy or money, he emphasizes doubting and challenge of the most fundamental part. When speaking about resource-based economy or The Venus Project, all doubts are not 'constructive' and we need to only discuss the details while accepting that the direction of The Venus Project is fundamentally correct. This is their scientific methodology. This is The Venus Project.

1-59 The doubt of Jacque Fresco about selfishness of human beings and scarcity may be important, but why should that be treated as special? All fields of study were developed based on doubt. Even economists were not completely uncritical about the mainstream opinions. Modern economics began from the doubt of Adam Smith about mercantilism. Jevons and Menger doubted one of the most fundamental assumptions of classical economics that goods have objective values, which resulted in marginal revolution.

1-60 The argument of Jacque Fresco that The Venus Project is special because it is free from ideology is a mere attempt to grant a privilege for a ridiculous reason that it is the outcome of introspection. The truth is exactly opposite from what supporters of The Venus Project believe. Jacque Fresco is not the only person who successfully doubted the mainstream opinions, but he is the only person who gave up on logical argument.

1-61 Peculiar emphasis on introspection by Jacque Fresco is not an evidence showing dominance of his view. It actually shows that his view is inferior, because he is trying to create a non-existent privilege in his doubt. Imagine how ludicrous Jevons would have appeared if he were to argue that the classical value theory is a prejudice generated by the society and emphasize introspection.

1-62 The method used by Jacque Fresco gave birth to pseudo-science when it was used in science. Popper presents Alfred Adler's psychology as an example. Adler saw all human actions as revelation of inferiority. According to Adler's theory, an act of helping others is an attempt to get out of this inferiority by proving one's ability. An act of not helping reflects inferiority, regarding oneself as incapable of helping others.

1-63 Such theory of course cannot be disproved, but Adler is indifferent about it. Adler demands from his opponents what we have been referring to as introspection - the process of removing one's psychological prejudices by objectively looking at oneself. He makes his theory seem more scientific by denouncing all people who do not accept his theory as people surrounded by prejudice.

1-64 All of these are typical characteristics of pseudo-science. Why exactly such pseudo-science prosper? Popper points out that these methods have profound psychological effects. We consider Adler's theory as ridiculous solely because we have no trust in it. Once you start to have trust in it, it cannot be rejected. In fact, the world is full of evidences that prove this theory.

1-65 This is what Adler is aiming for. Once an ideology is removed, there is no way we can stop a new

ideology from taking the place. Ideology does not disappear. It is substituted. More moderate ideology was substituted by a radical ideology arguing that it is the absolute scientific truth.

1-66 The method used by Jacque Fresco gave birth to bigger ideologies when it was used in reconstruction of society. Just like Fresco, Karl Marx asked people to overcome capitalist ideologies in order to achieve communism. The strange part was that the communism itself became an ideology which is even bigger than what he tried to eliminate as soon as the revolution he desired finally happen.

1-67 Marx emphasized science as Fresco did. He thought that we can reconstruct our society scientifically by overcoming capitalist ideologies. But now, few people doubts the fact that what he regarded as a science was not a science at all. Mises even insists that Marx's ideology theory is not only far from scient, actually a revolt against science and reason. He named it polylogism.

1-68 Mises describes Marx's polylogism as follows. "Human reason, he asserted, is constitutionally unfitted to find truth. The bourgeois mind of the economists is utterly incapable of producing more than an apology for capitalism. The teachings of bourgeois science, an offshoot of bourgeois logic, are of no avail for the proletarians, the rising class destined to abolish all classes and to convert the earth into a Garden of Eden."

1-69 Now we can find another polylogism in Fresco's book, named *The Best That Money Cant Buy*. "The word suggests a way of talking or stating problems in which the words used do not have a physical referent; that is to say, one cannot find agreement among people as to what, in the real world, the words are actually referring to. In this context, the author fears the idea of resolving conflict on the basis of mutual understanding is a myth as well."

1-70 Unfortunately his method already had a profound influence on his supporters. Not every supporters of The Venus Project gave up on logical argument by accepting Fresco's advice. They often argued passionately when somebody challenged to The Venus Project. But they never thought that they have to challenge to the mainstream economics if they are right. They just gave it up for the reason that economists are full of prejudice, or for the reason that the languages economists are using are contaminated by ideology.

1-71 The reason why such stances can't be supported would be clear if we look back on the past and see what the fathers of modern science did to overcome prejudices of medieval science. They were not satisfied merely with dismissing medieval science. They challenged to medieval science and rebutted it. Galileo's famous thought experiment was for breaking the mainstream science of that time.

1-72 Guardians of the medieval science were never had less prejudice than economists of today. Nevertheless they could not stand long against the power of logic which modern science has. If Fresco's ideas are obvious like science, why supporters of The Venus Project never believe that they can do same thing with the fathers of modern science? Of course, it would be because Fresco's belief that "there is no sharing of values and no communication at all if we don't have a common starting point."

1-73 After dismissing the idea of resolving conflict on the basis of conversation as a 'myth', Fresco asks. "How then, in a society that is culture-bound and has limited language and ideas, can we introduce listeners to new concepts which, even if they desire to learn them, have no connections in their experience and thinking?" And he answers. "We live in a perpetual 'show me' state. In like manner films, books, seminars, videos, will be necessary to demonstrate the validity of our proposals."

1-74 But the only way to 'show us' the feasibility of The Venus Project is actually doing it and carrying it to a successful conclusion. Not only rubbishes like films and books but also even his experimental cities seem not be able to show much as long as he doesn't rebut the mainstream. We will see the problems of Fresco's experimental cities in chapter 8. But anyway, what he's trying to say is obvious.

1-75 As Mises pointed out, polylogism or sociology of knowledge is no more than a refuge for people who failed to rebut their opponents' logic. Fresco explains why he didn't try to rebut mainstream economics through his theory about prejudices. Perhaps his theory about prejudices exists for it. If we notice this, it would not be very hard to understand why scholars like Popper and Mises regarded these kind of mythology as a revolt against science.

1-76 In addition, I seriously doubt effectiveness of introspection. I am not simply saying that it fails to achieve desired effects. It arouses reverse effects. It is not by coincidence that excellent scientists consistently refused to take part in such attempts. *Introspection leads us to a strange self-deception that we can be completely free from prejudices without exception, which as a result reinforces prejudices instead of removing them.* [9]

1-77 Jacque Fresco presented new terms that do not contain ideology, arguing that most of existing terms are contaminated by ideology. These new terms and classifications are commonly known to not contain any ideology. Is it really trustworthy? The new terms contain explicit value judgment. It's impossible to what exactly based means scientifically in phrases like resource-based economy and money-based economy.

1-78 Problems of these terms will be discussed in detail in Chapter 9. The fact is that the truth is exactly opposite from what supporters of The Venus Project believe in. If Jacque Fresco simply introduced these terms without making such a great fuss about prejudice, some supporters of The Venus Project might have been able to question these terms. Thus, we can find an astonishing effect of so-called introspection, but this effect has a negative value.

1-79 It would be impossible to finish the discussion of Chapter 1 without sneering at some of introspections demanded by Jacque Fresco because they are so absurd. One of them is about realizing that all people are connected to each other. He argues that all prejudices magically disappear by doing so. We can learn the meaning of unconditional love. I do not understand this, but they say you will understand once you feel it. This feeling is told to be astonishing.

1-80 I think that Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph are probably influenced by Buddhism or similar Eastern mysticism. However, there is no meaning in digging up their ideological background. Realization, or whatever this is called, is regarded as the most important means of enlightenment. (If not, you cannot explain the profound importance of this foolish sermon in *Zeitgeist Addendum*.) These things practically replace logical arguments.

1-81 One thing I can say is that most of great scientists were not engaged in such foolish thing in order to gain objectivity. Richard Feynman did not do it. Friedrich Gauss did not do it. Even Einstein did not do it. Small number of scientists may have done it, but it only reconfirms our previous conclusion that not all scientists need to be sane.

1-82 Just a moment ago, we saw people who worshipped science and objectivity as idols fall into the most pathetic mystics. Speaking in earnest, people being connected through quantum field means nothing. It cannot mean that we should love other people as we do our own body. It is as silly as the

argument that tigers and rabbits should love each other because they are connected by circulation of ecosystem.

1-83 Before laughing at Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph, remember why he had to use such method. He tried to remove other people's prejudice, but he did not believe in argument. He rejected the method used by science in the past to remove prejudices, which is called *mutual exchange and argument*. If we refused the only rational and scientific method, only the irrational methods remain.

1-84 Fresco's attempt is similar to Adler's attempt. He first removes the ideology we originally have. When we become blank, he naturally injects his new ideology into us. This new ideology contains absurd contents as we saw earlier. It is presented as something absolutely right, like science, instead of ideology without any ground.

1-85 Mysticism of *Zeitgeist Addendum* deserves to be ridiculed, but it is only one of new beliefs presented to us by Fresco. He forces his perspective about almost everything in us. Most supporters of The Venus Project would not doubted it. Considering how often this method was abused by pseudo-scientists in the past, they must be afraid and start questioning it. I will help them become suspicious through this text.

1-86 There is something much closer to The Venus Project than science: Christianity. They say that their religion is not a religion. It is the truth and process that conveys existence of God. They also say that conflicts will disappear once Arabs, East Asians, Africans and Europeans altogether accepted the fact that God exists. They hate conflicts at much as supporters of The Venus Project do. They try to get rid of conflicts by converting other people into Christians.

1-87 Supports of The Venus Project say that conflicts will disappear once children in Israel, Palestine and Bolivia come to have *the same wish*. Of course, this same wish would mean The Venus Project. They also say that their idea is not an ideology. It is an obvious truth. They are trying to remove conflicts by turning the entire mankind into supporters of The Venus Project.

1-88 Christians have their religious leaders. These leaders had special spiritual experiences that ordinary Christians never had. They were visited by the Holy Spirit. It must be an amazing feeling. Jacque Fresco and the economic sniper that appeared in *Zeitgeist Addendum* had a rare experience of feeling connection of all things through their body. This must be astonishing. All supporters of The Venus Project wish to have the same experience, as Christians do to feel existence of God.

1-89 So my question is simple. Excluding religions, what ideology is more dogmatic than this?

[1] It's true that many critics of The Venus Project are calling it socialism. But in this case, they are not saying something wrong. The socialism exactly means 'a planned economy in which there is no private ownership of the means of production.' According to Wikipedia, its exact definition is as follows. 'Socialism is an economic system characterized by social ownership of the means of production and cooperative management of the economy.' But it's true that the term socialism can make certain prejudices about The Venus Project. Anyway when we hear the term, most of us tend to imagine certain systems distributing scarce resources and goods. Also, if Fresco really reached his conclusion independently, he may not want his alternative to be labeled with existing alternatives. In these contexts, it's quite understandable that The Venus Project keeps saying it's not socialism. I do not want people have such prejudices about The Venus Project. That's why I never call The Venus Project socialism in this text.

But, I repeat, The Venus Project and resource-based economy which it pledges are socialism by definition. Critics have a right to call them socialism according to the definition.

[2] We can find the same argument in Sociology of Knowledge established by Max Scheler and Karl Mannheim. They referred to the collection of common ideas determined by social environment as ideology. In fact, the term ideology was first used with this meaning by Karl Marx. Read his German Ideology. Views of Jacque Fresco and Karl Marx are much more similar than often believed.

[3] Someone may refute this by saying that Popper's scientific philosophy is not the only way to understand science. However, none of these support Jacque Fresco's view on science. There are some scientific philosophers who believe that scientific research is conducted according to Fresco's method. The problem is that they deny objectivity of scientific knowledge without a single exception.

[4] This can be simply interpreted as a comment that modern economics is only interested in the problem of money and does not care to satisfy actual desires of people. If so, it is wrong. Economics always discuss about the method of improving the livelihood of the public or net income. This is exactly why their suggestions are popular. Modern economics is not useless in analyzing economy without money. Modern economics is not based on money but the concept of subjective marginal utility, which can be naturally translated into the term desire which Fresco likes. Furthermore in economics, money is an abstract concept that refers to an ideal medium of exchange created to analyze indirect exchange economy. Such ideality exists nowhere in the real world. Anyway, both of them are far away from the interpretation intended by Fresco. He simply claims that economics is wrong because it uses a thinking tool called money and is a circular argument. It is a fact that some economics use the thinking tool called money when analyzing non-exchange economy. However, this is not because they actually believe money to exist in non-exchange economy. Physicists actually do similar things using ideal gases. What is the problem?

[5] This is so ridiculous that someone might think I made up this argument impromptu to criticize Jacque Fresco's ideas. But I merely repeated actual arguments proposed in the past by many post-modernists and anti-scientists using Fresco's expression. Fresco would not even have imagined that his elaborate criticism can be applied to natural sciences. This is a representative example of prejudice.

[6] However if someone argues that physics is a faulty science based on this, he is having a serious misunderstanding about natural sciences. The only reason why physics becomes valuable is because it comes up with predictions that can be applied to the real world. Presumptions placed in the background of physics - we may be able to refer to it as ideology - are not something that we must accept in order to accept physics. The world view presented to us by Newtonian mechanics is completely different from the world view presented by Lagrangian mechanics. Nevertheless, we consider these two mechanics as being equivalent today because they predict the same phenomenon. Scientists in the Newtonian era did not know there can be a different interpretation on Newtonian mechanics. More objective interpretation on it became possible after Lagrangian mechanics was discovered. However, the field of physics was not innovatively changed.

[7] It's true that Jacque Fresco sometimes refers falsifiability which was defined by Popper when he compares science and religion. But he never uses it when he criticizes economics. Instead, as we saw, he always depends on loose and poor logic which was rebutted by Popper. He doesn't seem to have noticed that these two are contradictory to each other. At least there are many differences in opinions about whether economics is a field of science defined by Popper. But Fresco's alternative is not science.

[8] Assumptions used in physical calculations may or may not cause problems. Which assumption causes a problem and when it does are important subjects of study in physics. This is also the same in economics. Economists well understand the limitation of assumptions they use, and they also study when such assumptions create problems. Truly ideological problems in the basis of study cannot be

studied by these methods. To tell the truth, it is unclear as to whether modern economics based on the concept of subjective utility requires the assumption that human beings are selfish. Someone who does good deed does so because the act of doing so gives him utility called psychological satisfaction. He may be selfish in a way that he is trying to maximize his subjective utility. At any rate, he is not actually a selfish person. Refer to *Human Action* by Ludwig von Mises, especially Chapter 1 Acting Man.

[9] Precisely speaking, such attempt generally only removes what is exposed to the surface among our prejudices. In return, deeper prejudices are actually reinforced. The fact that we removed a prejudice does not mean we can remove another. In fact, we already learned a lesson from Einstein. He brought a revolutionary change in our thoughts about time and space through the theory of relativity, but we could not accept the quantum theory until the last moment. We cannot ascertain about what is prejudice and what not until we are completely freed from prejudice. We can only say that we might have prejudice. Fresco acts as if he knows what the prejudice in our society is. He believes he has already eliminated his prejudices. We will see how this belief is based on unscientific methodology and mysticism.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 2.

Because The Venus Project is trying to renovate people.

2-01 Summary) Individualism nowadays is suffering disgrace of being linked to egocentrism and egoism. However, individualism has no inevitable relationship with egocentrism or egoism. Individualism is the belief that individuals can have their own views and preferences without interference of others. It is no exaggeration to say that conviction to protect the rights of minorities and desire for freedom of expression were born from this individualism.

2-02 However, unprecedented diversity brought by individualism means corruption of civilization to those who always try to force their own values in others. They do not hesitate to define all values different from their own as evil or disease that requires treatment. These two are described as different things, but they are the same in reality. They share the same premise that their own value is correct and other people's values are incorrect.

2-03 The idea of Jacque Fresco to eliminate conflicts by integrating the wishes of people around the world is a typical example of collectivism. Such collectivism may start with the banner for protection of individuality, but it strictly destroys individuality by suppressing freedom of idea. It may start with the banner for protection of science and technology, but it strictly destroys science and technology by transforming fields of study into slaves of ideology.

2-04 In traditional economics, competition is mostly about competition of producers - corporations in the capitalistic economy. This is unrelated with companies creating competition among workers using incentives. If people become more efficient through cooperation than competition, corporations with cooperative systems will survive. Corporations will emphasize cooperative mind, and schools will teach students to become as cooperative as possible. This is right in many cases.

2-05 Within capitalism, people are engaged in many competitions, as well as cooperation. The same is applied to animals in the nature. All people being selfish is not beneficial to capitalistic economy, because it precludes cooperation among workers, which is required to increase productivity of corporations. The reason why many people believe that capitalism makes people become selfish is a mystery.

2-06 In any case, our thoughts and ideas are affected by the surrounding environment. Fresco is correct about his criticism that people today have prejudices, though details of these prejudices are extremely suspicious. The problem is in the program he presents to remove prejudices from our society. He boasts to permanently get rid of prejudices by changing our environment.

2-07 Changing environment does change people's thoughts and ideas to some degree. The problem is there is no guarantee that these new thoughts and ideas do not contain a new prejudice. Jacque Fresco does not acknowledge this. Such attitude results in the inability to cure a new prejudice when it occurs. His social prejudice treatment program is wrong for the exactly same reason as his personal prejudice treatment program. It is dogmatic.

2-08 Popper's insistence that prejudice can only be removed through argument and communication is not only applied to science. It is also applied to society. If we were to truly treat social prejudices, we must accept methods of argument and communication. We must throw away the arrogance that we can reach the truth through introspection. We must be actively engaged in exchange with others.

2-09 Scientific problems are guaranteed to be resolved by argument, but problems of ethics and values are not. However, this does not prove that nothing can be resolved through argument in ethics and values. Through argument with an opponent, we can arouse the outcomes of his idea. As a result, we can show the opponent that his idea cannot coexist with another idea he has.

2-10 Such argument can only solve a few problems. Argument cannot be made if two people have fundamentally different values. In this case, we have to acknowledge that our perspective can differ from the perspective of our opponents, as scientists do about the problem of ideology which cannot be resolved through scientific argument. Tolerance must be regarded as the most important virtue of our society.

2-11 Accordingly, Popper draws the following conclusion. We cannot expect all people to have the same value. *We should not try to eliminate conflicts by making everyone have the same thought.* This actually increases most of conflicts rather than removing them. We need to remember that numerous religious wars broke out because of this wish. No matter how much the religions emphasized love and

peace, it was unable to change the devastating consequence of wars.

2-12 We prohibit evil deeds through laws in order to maintain social order. Furthermore, we must punish people for violating laws. Nevertheless, there is a very important limitation to this. We do not punish someone just by the fact that he has an evil mind. We take for granted the fact that only actions, not minds, can be the grounds for punishment.

2-13 In fact, laws and punishments are the only means to make someone become obedient to the society without changing his mind. He probably cannot perform all actions he wants to do. However, at least he has the ultimate freedom. That is, he has the freedom to be evil. We do not believe that a community should interfere with individual's mind. As a result, *we use laws and punishments as alternatives of personality education instead of using personality education as an alternative of laws and punishments.*

2-14 Individualism is a belief that each human being can have his own preferences. [10] Collectivism is a belief that a community must pursue at least one common goal. We already recognized the former view. The latter view is sometimes compared to understanding of an entire community as a living organism. An organism cannot sustain if its hands and feet pursued different goals. According to collectivists, so is the society.

2-15 Here, I briefly described two ideas that have long been confronting: Individualism and its opposing concept, collectivism. These two represent two social programs for treatment of prejudice rather than representing two social prejudices. In this Chapter, we are going to review the outcomes of each idea when it is applied to the society and find the direction we need to follow.

2-16 First, we must ask the following question. *Is it even possible to accord the preferences and goals of all members of the society?* Look at how many people's personality supporters of The Venus Project think they need to educate. Those who are interested in stories about celebrities instead of the mankind rescue project by Jacque Fresco will be educated. People who do not acknowledge that we are connected and fight over sports are immature, so they will also be educated.

2-17 Someone might say that such education is unnecessary once resource-based economy is completed. This argument is disproved by scientific studies. Diverse tribal ceremonies in hunting and gathering societies existed to inspire a sense of community and create a fantasy that everyone is united. This was the most uproarious education method devised by mankind, and it was not completely successful in preventing deviations of tribesmen.

2-18 Even more horrible thing would happen if we were to apply this method in the modern world. We have already seen the same thing occur in Germany and Italy during 1930s. It can only become something like thousands of crowd marching with a flag or collective art performances in North Korea that arouse disgust in people living in liberalistic nations.

2-19 Therefore, the plan of Jacque Fresco is confronted with a difficulty at the beginning. There is no doubt that relatively small communities are advantageous over large scale communities in uniting the goal of their members. Despite this, tribes in hunting and gathering societies failed. Modern collectivistic nations saw greater failure by using more stupid methods. Much more, Jacque Fresco and his followers need to accord the goal and means of the entire mankind. How can that be possible?

2-20 It is uncertain as to when the resource-based economy will be completed. It is not easy to create a

rich environment in which everyone can naturally become altruistic. During this endless period, 'patients' who threaten the resource-based economy will be ceaselessly treated. The term patient does not only include people whom we refer to as villains. It includes all people who believe in values different from Jacque Fresco.

2-21 According to Fresco, his alternative is special because it doesn't punish people. But in a matter of fact, *there is no difference between calling something a subject of punishment and subject of treatment.* [11] In fact, the latter causes worse result. The former can coexist with the perspective that even though it is an act that must be punished, this punishment is a necessary evil required to maintain the society. The latter cannot coexist with this perspective. It is simply a disease, and it must be corrected by a good educator.

2-22 In an individualistic society, freedom of thought is often regarded as one of the most important principles of freedom. We punish lawbreakers according to law. But we don't obstinately try to change their conscience. We just acknowledge that they have a freedom to think as they want. Which gives more respect to offenders between Fresco's alternative and this? The answer would differ depending on your values.

2-23 But our concern is more practical. Fresco describes the process of educating criminals beautifully. Educators would find the environmental factors of criminal behavior with a series of scientific methods and remove it. Educators would change them not by punishing them, but understanding them. All of this sounds very appealing. But are they really feasible in the environment of his alternative system?

2-24 We do not believe that we can cure every villain without any exception through education. No scientist, no psychologist, no psychiatrist makes such a claim. But Fresco's plan of replacing every laws and punishments with education can't be justified without such an extreme assumption. How can we prevent crime of criminals to whom the education doesn't work?

2-25 If somebody were to receive an education for having raped a child, can this education on him be performed peacefully? It may be at first. However, can we still stick to peaceful method after he repeats the crime two or three times? Would the public approve of it? Won't the treatment inevitably become increasingly oppressive and authoritative?

2-26 Even on the assumption that a treatment will always succeed, problems still remain. An education takes time. We would have to protect majority of people from brutal criminals until their treatment is done. We would have to isolate them until the treatment is finished. However as prisons of today suggest, such isolation is itself a punishment. It inflicts the freedom of body to move anywhere they want to.

2-27 But *collectivistic society has no objective standard to determine who is to receive education and through which method.* Punishment is carried out based on action, but treatment is based on mind. How can we judge someone's mind? Perhaps methods of science and engineering can be used. This generally means the following: Method that cannot be understood by most people.

2-28 We have laws to clearly distinguish between what are subject to punishment and what not. If a policeman arrests us without reason, we have the right to protest. We cannot expect the same from resource-based economy. The fact that laws do not exist practically means that the planners can isolate and treat people *without any clear standards.*

2-29 Can this get worse? Yes. There are much more actions regarded as diseases that need treatment in resource-based economy than actions being punished by laws today. Violence and addiction as well as

selfish and non-cooperative behaviors will of course be considered as subjects of treatment and education. Moreover, all ideas other than the idea of Jacque Fresco will probably be considered as potential subjects of treatment and education. People who fell into ideologies are the ones who need treatment and education the most.

2-30 This is not a fiction. I am talking about actual events that happened in most of collectivistic nations. North Korea does not have prisons. It only has institutions called correctional centers. Everyone today knows that correctional centers of North Korea are spaces of oppression that violate human rights. The problem is that these centers were created with the same purpose as the behavioral correction program promised by The Venus Project: *Removal of psychological diseases through treatment*.

2-31 Perhaps one may protest that the method of education pursued by The Venus Project is different from North Korea's. But then, was Marx's ideology similar to current North Korea's? What we know is that Marx's ideas were spoiled in North Korea and every other communist country which tried to change people's mind. Even punishments which never meant to be in Marx ideology were justified so easily as a means of education.

2-32 We can't prevent our system from spoiling because of human imperfection without law. If we anyway have to isolate somebody and do something to them they don't want, we must have clear standards. And it must be based on action, not mind. The reason why we have to reject Fresco's suggestion is not that his view of education is wrong, but rather that his view of education is incompatible with the system he's proposing in the long term.

2-33 Supporters of The Venus Project would still not think things that happen in clearly erroneous totalitarianism of Hitler and Stalin can also happen in resource-based economy. However, they fail to realize that such clearly erroneous ideas did not start out as clear errors at the beginning. Communism began with an ideal as noble as The Venus Project.

2-34 This is what supporters of The Venus Project must explain to argue that The Venus Project is different from communism fundamentally: Psychological corruption of communism. Supporters of The Venus Project might say that it occurred because communism failed to completely remove the environment that corrupts people. Okay. What can you do if the process of creating a perfect resource-based economy, or the transitional process, is a process that corrupts people in the same way?

2-35 The Venus Project creates a fantasy that ideas are fixed by identifying their idea with the laws of nature. The truth is that *ideas change, even in the most stagnant societies*. How would they educate a villain for whom cure program does not work at all? If he has murdered dozens of people, would supporters of The Venus Project still be able to use moderate means? Won't the efforts to protect their idea become increasingly authoritative?

2-36 As soon as we give up on individualistic belief that everyone can have his own views and preferences, it becomes impossible to treat prejudices. Experience of becoming united with all things is as helpless as revelation of God in removing prejudices. Even if we start out by removing all prejudices, a new prejudice will grow. Therefore, the belief that the noble ideal of The Venus Project will be maintained forever is very uncertain.

2-37 The belief that the entire mankind is a single body may not appear bad, but this can be combined with any other thoughts. Think about the father-ship of North Korea. If all citizens of a nation were

members of a family, their leader can be compared to the father of family. It was not a surprise to see all North Korean citizens cry when Kim, Jong Il died. It is only natural for children to respect and love their father.

2-38 Plato saw citizens as cells that compose an organism called nation. The king must be like a king, citizens like citizens, and slaves like slaves. Struggle between social classes is not allowed. It is similar to how feet cannot become hands and heart cannot become head in an organism. Plato's comparison of social class to body organ was made over 2,000 years ago, but it is still very simple and attractive.

2-39 Meditation to realize that the entire mankind is connected is not at all helpful for breaking these arguments. [12] Vague realization can be used in any way. Therefore, we should not believe that we are essentially different from residents of North Korea. North Korea, like The Venus Project, promised its residents to provide a nation equal for everyone. When this noble ideal is being corrupted as the most vulgar religion, only a small minority of North Koreans recognized it.

2-40 Jacque Fresco is actually right when he points out that we cannot think outside the society to which we belong. The only reason why we think that totalitarianism of Hitler and Stalin is absolutely wrong is because we are not living in a totalitarian society. Supporters of The Venus Project tend to believe that when their idea becomes corrupt, some kind of human nature will rescue them from error. Unfortunately, such nature does not exist.

2-41 The truth is that it is not only possible for ideology maintaining collectivistic society to be spoiled but that it is inevitably spoiled. Ideology can only be copied from a person to another through education. However in this process, ideology is not perfectly copied. We all watched the same video, but everyone has slightly different idea about what the resource-based economy is. [13]

2-42 It is so naïve to think that conflicts will disappear when everyone accepts resource-based economy. Many factions will appear to argue that they are the only ones who succeed Jacque Fresco's idea. They will fight each other, as Stalinists and Trotskyists did in the past, saying that they can apply scientific method to the society. *What we need to learn from the history of religious division and conflict is not that conflict is bad. It is that the collectivistic attempt for unification cannot permanently unify ideas.*

2-43 Anyway, let us stop discussing about how the idea of Jacque Fresco will give birth to conflicts. I am more interested in evolution by individual variation than speciation. Ideologies change as they are duplicated. In this process, attributes that can be duplicated faster will prosper, and other attributes will disappear. As Richard Dawkins correctly pointed out, ideology evolves. We can refer to this as meme.

2-44 However in general, evolution of meme is not something that improves quality of our life. Genetic position of meme is identical to virus. Since virus genes cannot reproduce once their host is dead, they share at least a little bit of benefit with the host. But they do not consider survival as important as genes in our body do. If there is a trait to reproduce faster by putting the host into danger, this trait is chosen by natural selection.

2-45 Meme is selfish. Instead of evolving the trait that helps us to question everything with critical mind, it evolves the trait that makes us accept everything without criticism. For ideology, the trait that encourages blind belief to sacrifice one own and other people's lives will be naturally selected. The most self-deceptive trait that can be described as love and justice while most cruelly punishing competitors will evolve.

2-46 Natural selection is not the only one that can change ideology. Changing of ideology can be

intentionally performed by planners who have obligations and rights to educate such ideology to us. If they are careful enough, they will slowly but surely draw the wanted result. Exactly same thing happened during 1930s in Germany and Soviet Union.

2-47 Of course, meme is as selfish in individualist society, but it applies a brake on meme's deluge. The thought that we can only reach the truth through reason and logic makes it possible for us to question meme. We are still a bit dogmatic about the mainstream ideology of our society, but it is nothing compared to that of medieval Europe, North Korea or former Soviet Union. The lesson is clear. Idea to which nobody can raise objection tends to corrupts. And absolute idea corrupts absolutely.

2-48 There cannot be academic freedom without freedom of idea. Since in many cases ideas are based on academic knowledge, studies must be controlled in order to control ideas. Can evolutionary psychology survive in the system of The Venus Project? Isn't this field of study presenting interpretations on human beings that cannot coexist with Jacque Fresco's interpretations a subject of disposal like economics? [\[14\]](#)

2-49 Supporters of The Venus Project would say that evolutionary psychology must disappear because it is based on prejudice. It may be true, but the problem is they believe that there is absolutely no prejudice in the idea that led them to this conclusion. Supporters of The Venus Project measure validity of all fields of study through idea. To them, studies can always be incorrect while idea - which they never refer to as idea - is absolutely true.

2-50 Critical thinking disappears when studies only volunteer for ideas and society. If a lie is needed to strengthen an idea and maintain social harmony, it will be accepted. The phenomenon that Plato called *noble lie* will exist all around. Instead of truth changing idea, idea will determine the truth. This practically means death of studies.

2-51 Evolution of meme is not always bad, as long as it is properly controlled. Also as correctly pointed out by Hayek, successful ideology can drive out inappropriate ideology and be naturally selected by improving life quality of people who follow it. Scientific theories can be considered as a type of meme in that they develop based on mutual competition. However, evolution of scientific theories as memes actually improved life quality of their hosts or human beings.

2-52 What I would like to emphasize is that it was not easily obtained. The argument that evolution of scientific theories contributes to life quality of human beings was made possible after rise of new competition called liberal criticism and discussion. Selfish meme shares some benefits with its host, but it simultaneously tries to prosper itself by exploiting its host. Natural selection of positive meme requires a special environment in which the former tendency becomes advantageous and the latter becomes disadvantageous.

2-53 We may need to continuously control the evolutionary environment of meme so that it does not threaten peace of mankind. This is not a totally new story. Within the market economy, we hope corporations that supply better goods at lower prices to be naturally selected. On the contrary, we do not hope unjust corporations to be naturally selected. We must adjust the environment of competition by introducing fair trade laws. This is not different from adjustment of competitive environment between memes.

2-54 To some degree, we know how to make such adjustment today. Allowance of liberal criticism and discussion is one of the methods. However, the prescription suggested by Jacque Fresco is the opposite. He attempts to erect an idea unquestioned by anyone that grants the right to censor and distort natural

sciences. This is practically the same as returning to the medieval age when there was no progress.

2-55 Supporters of The Venus Project say that only technological development brings improvement in quality of life. As discussed in detail later on in Chapter 4, the possibility of this being true is low. Many things we currently enjoy that support quality of life, such as fair trade and labor standard laws, are political system. We generally accept that they contributed as much in improving quality of our life as water purifiers.

2-56 However if Jacque Fresco intended to say that technology mainly contributed to improvement in life quality, it is correct. Nonetheless, there is an unresolved mystery. *The reason why we believe that market economy or individualism contribute to improvement in our life quality is because it occurred around the same time as technological development, the actual thing that improved quality of our life. Why did this happen?*

2-57 When Western Europe quickly developed its technology through industrial revolution, did remaining countries stay still because they are inferior to Western people? Technology and also culture always developed fastest in places where individualism was most developed. Excluding modern civilization, the civilization that gave birth to the great philosophers like Socrates and Plato and great scientists such as Euclid, Eratosthenes and Pythagoras was Athens, one of the most individualistic civilizations.

2-58 Many people have excessively romantic thoughts about primitive collectivist societies. As verified in Chapter 9, such thoughts hardly helped us in removing social classes, wars and egoism. The great ancient civilizations to be respected by us are not the same. It was always individualistic generations that succeeded in boosting the rights of citizens, developing science and technology, and improving quality of life.

2-59 Individualism is deeply related with economic liberalism. It showed that order can be formed without controlling individual's efforts. Instead of a system, the market was a spontaneous structure created as a result of allowing personal freedom. Each individual freely produced and exchanged goods by ownership of oneself. As a result, those who produced goods most desperately wanted by others gained profit, and efforts to gain profit created abundance.

2-60 Hayek wrote, "From the commercial cities of Northern Italy the new view of life spread with commerce to the west and north, through France and the south-west of Germany to the Low Countries and the British Isles, taking firm root; the general direction of social development was one of freeing the individual from the ties which had bound him to the customary or prescribed ways in the pursuit of his ordinary activities."

2-61 And "Perhaps the greatest result of the unchaining of individual energies was the marvelous growth of science which followed the march of individual liberty from Italy to England and beyond. Only since everything could be tried - if somebody could be found to back it at his own risk - and, it should be added, as often as not from outside the authorities officially entrusted with the cultivation of learning, has science made the great strides which in the last one hundred and fifty years have changed the face of the world."

2-62 If science and technology are the only things that can improve quality of our life, what we need to do is obvious. We must accept the prejudice removal program that developed studies, arts and sciences in all places, not the prejudice removal program that suppressed liberal thoughts of human beings and destroyed studies in all places. It is individualism.

[10] In this sense, individualism is not necessarily proportional to economic laissez-faire. The two have deep correlation, but this correlation is only probabilistic. In fact, the United States right now with the greatest number of Christian fundamentalists and patriots - mainly those who try to teach their ideas to others - in the world is far away from an ideal individualistic nation. It is surprising to see Fresco criticize patriotism of the United States and even totalitarianism while regarding the United States as an individualistic nation. He is not interested in the original meaning of individualism. When he talks about individualism, he is only referring to economic laissez-faire. If he were to maintain minimal consistency, he should have included nations that selected planned economy in 'collectivistic' nations such as the former Soviet Union and China. He did not.

[11] Thinking that a gay became gay because of environmental influence and helping him is not helpful for him at all. If we try to fix his disease, it would actually harm him. It is not surprising to see gays hate people with this attitude more than people who oppose homosexuality. However, supporters of The Venus Project have the same view on different values. They are not subjects of punishment, but they are subjects of education. Setting forth generosity by emphasizing treatment over punishment seems to be a universal characteristic shared by religious ideologies. When Christians pity gays and say they pray for their souls, they are not telling the truth. Such thought can never be innovative. I doubt whether it ever occurred in the past.

[12] Mystical experience mostly fails to correct our prejudices and incorrect ideologies. The psychological state praised by Zeitgeist as the great experience of realizing connection of all things is nothing different from the psychological state of Mahomet when he created the Islam after receiving revelation of God. In fact, the conclusion we draw from such mystical experience is determined by the environment in which we grow up.

[13] We cannot believe that we can prevent such spoils by specifically recording Jacque Fresco's ideas through books and video clips. Remember religions that teach contents written in the scriptures as the only truths ended up with greatest number of denominations. Fresco's plan is more distant from concreteness than the Old Testament. Nobody knows about structure of the provisional government which will command resource-based economy during the transition period.

[14] Evolutionary psychology deduces human psychology today from instincts that were advantageous when people lived hunting life. Such instincts were beneficial when the mankind lived by hunting, but they collide with the complex society of today. The problem is that they also collide with the cooperative society of Fresco. Fresco's claim that human behavior is determined by interaction between environment and human nature cannot refute evolutionary psychology. Evolutionary psychology is actually involved with such interaction. I will expose in Chapter 9 that Jacque Fresco's thoughts on human behavior contradicts with thoughts of most modern natural scientists. His thoughts are closer to thoughts of those studying humanities which were refuted by Steven Pinker in Blank Slate. *In reality, most of studies he cites were conducted by humanities scholars. They rarely received proper verification by natural sciences.*

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 3.

Because The Venus Project is based on guesses and bluffs.

3-01 Summary) Jacque Fresco always talks about science and technology, but he never actually cites any specific data about technology and science. It is quite obvious that an engineer wishes to talk about the engineering means he possesses, but he did not provide for such engineering means. As a result, we still do not know whether buildings he wants to construct have steel structure or not.

3-02 In science, responsibility for proof is in people who come up with the new theory, not in those who oppose the theory. It is impossible to prove that there is no technology sufficient for constructing Jacque Fresco's city without knowing specific means he wishes to use. It is very easy to prove existence of a technology. Jacque Fresco is obligated to show this technology. If he cannot do it, there is no reason for us to trust him.

3-03 Jacque Fresco says that the earth has abundant resources and there will be no scarcity if we use them according to the plan. It is suspicious as to how much he investigated to make such statement. Despite the fact that success and failure of The Venus Project depends on this, he rarely supported this argument using reliable data.

3-04 If he really had a method of supplying all goods to us without scarcity, he would have introduced the method already. But he did not. Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph produced numerous films including *Zeitgeist Addendum* where The Venus Project was first introduced and *Paradise or Oblivion*. It is strange that the most important part of The Venus Project has never been introduced.

3-05 Fresco does have a method about the city. However, we should be aware that it is the only method presented with his resource-based economy. [15] It is not even the most important method. It may be able to slightly increase efficiency of the city. That is all. Fresco only talks about the city all the time.

3-06 Does he really have a method to distribute goods like fiber, merchandises, medicines and luxuries to us without the problem of scarcity? The problem is that he never explained such method. Is there a special reason why he could not explain it to us? Isn't it that such method does not exist after all? Was he unable to explain it to us because it is quite contrary to our expectation?

3-07 In *Paradise or Oblivion*, Fresco confesses that they practically did not study resources available

on earth: "Therefore, a global survey is first needed to assess exactly what we have. This would inventory our physical resources, personnel production centers and the needs of people." He continues, "If you try to do that today, they'd wonderâ€¦ They would be skeptical, hesitant to give that information so I would say it wouldn't work in today's culture." [\[16\]](#)

3-08 Therefore, *Jacque Fresco does not know how to use each resource to sufficiently supply goods in a way that the entire world population cannot feel scarcity*. As he said, we cannot devise a plan because we have not yet completed the planet-wise survey of resources and demands. Nevertheless, he is already assuring success of a plan that has not even been devised due to lack of data.

3-09 He does not say that resource is unlimited. He says that The Venus Project is special because resource is limited. We are going to suffer scarcity of resources if we do not adopt resource-based economy. If we do on the contrary, resources will become so abundant that scarcity will disappear. This is a scope so strange that I doubt whether it actually exists. It is quite surprising to see someone without accurate knowledge about resources making such claim.

3-10 Why Fresco came to believe that resources are so plentiful? We can find the reason from his following statement. "At the beginning of World War II the US had a mere 600 or so first-class fighting aircraft. We rapidly overcame this short supply by turning out more than 90,000 planes a year. The question at the start of World War II was: Do we have enough funds to produce the required implements of war? The answer was no, we did not have enough money, nor did we have enough gold. but we did have more than enough resources."

3-11 Of course, this statement only shows Fresco's remarkable ignorance about economics. 90,000 planes were not free. Scarce resources went into producing planes, and as a result, ordinary people's spending had to be reduced as much as the government spent on planes. Statistics show that total output going to the private sector drastically fell during the war years. Real GDP increased only slightly, and even it were not by increased production, but by the denominator which were distorted because of price controls.

3-12 But Fresco's fallacy is not a new thing. It was created by money-cranks a long time ago. One may curious to know why this fallacy is beneficial to money-cranks. The answer would be clear if he think about what the federal government did to overcome this "lack of money." It neither abolished money nor tried resource-based economy. It just borrowed more money which was created out of thin air from the Fed.

3-13 Fresco's alternative is different from money-cranks'. The problem is that he has same fallacy with them. He does not stop saying we "don't have enough money," but "have enough resources." This argument is not just look similar to money-cranks'. It means exactly same thing. Even Peter Joseph seems not free from this fallacy. See chapter 9, especially [9-136~139](#).

3-14 But the most fundamental part of Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph's understanding of free market is fallacies which were made by interventionists and more likely, mercantilists. They accepts without a second thought the silliest mercantilist theory which contends that endless consumption, however meaningless the nature of such consumption would be, is needed in order for the free market to survive, and even the most fruitless of behaviors like breaking windows and war can be beneficial to the market.

3-15 Of course, this is far from an established fact of economics in any sense. Traditionally what economists like Adam Smith and Say have done is exactly showing that such waste is unnecessary. Frederic Bastiat summarized this fallacy and debunked it more than 150 years ago in his essay named

What which is seen and what which is unseen. Readers would be able to refer to this.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=erJEaFpS9ls>

3-16 The fallacy of mercantilists is, though it focuses on a different problem, essentially similar to the fallacy of money-crankers. They may be two sides of the same coin. Bastiat's rebuttal can be applied to Fresco's explanation about America during the war years. 90,000 planes which were produced by the government are what which is seen. Consumption and investment which could be done if the government didn't rob people's wealth through inflation are what which is unseen.

3-17 I don't want to deny that opinions which are similar to these fallacies became one of the schools of economics recently. Keynesians really argue that we have to spend more in order to increase effective demand. They sometimes argue that we don't have enough money. All of these are, though they are not extremely stupid like the fallacies which Fresco accepts uncritically, based on similar understanding of free market.

3-18 Readers can refer Henry Hazlitt's book *The failure of the new economics*. This book is educative because it introduces not only Keynesian fallacies, but also opinions of real free market economists which Fresco never introduces. Most of the problems of economics which he and Peter Joseph criticized do not actually exist in free market economics. Obsession on consumption, obsession on meaningless figures like GDP, endless bailouts... list goes on.

3-19 Even if we accept the Keynesian theory or the mercantilist theory, the fact that there is no evidence of Fresco's assertion doesn't change. Let's assume that the federal government could supply 90,000 planes for free during the World War II. Obviously this is not true. But if it's true, is it means that we can supply everything we demand for free now? If a free market is wasteful, is it really true that we can construct a world without scarcity by eliminating such waste?

3-20 None of Fresco's descriptions of market economy are his original. Nevertheless few of their real creators could argue that there is no scarcity. It was simply because they were insufficient to show it. Some supporters of The Venus Project seem to believe that the fact there is no scarcity is so obvious that it doesn't need an evidence. But it has not ever been obvious to anyone except them.

3-21 Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph's assertions about resources were, though they are mixed up with a bunch of bluffing, at least based on widespread fallacies. Though they always pretend that they're technical expert, their assertions about technology are worse. Usually they don't provide evidence when they argue something is technologically possible. And when they provide evidence, the evidence turns out to be distorted or misunderstood.

3-22 Peter Joseph says in *Zeitgeist Addendum*, "In 2006 an MIT report on geothermal energy found that 13,000 zettajoule of power are currently available in the earth with the possibility of 2,000 ZJ being easily tapable with improved technology. The total energy consumption of all the countries on the planet is about half of a zettajoule a Year."

3-23 Here, he seems to be citing a paper titled *Future of Geothermal Energy: Impact of Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS) on the United States in the 21st Century*. You can easily find this paper on Google. It is a very long paper with more than 370 pages. Only by reading the synopsis of this document, what Jacque Fresco promises us becomes clearly untrustworthy.

3-24 "With a modest R&D investment of \$1 billion over 15 years... the report estimated that 100 GWe or more could be installed by 2050 in the United States." 100 GWe means we can obtain 100 GJ of electric energy per second. If this is true, we can obtain 3,153,600 TJ of energy per year, which

corresponds to about 0.003 zettajoules. This is smaller than 1/20 of annual energy consumption in the United States.

3-25 In its synopsis, this report states the following: "It is likely that 50 GWe or more of coal-fired capacity will need to be retired in the next 15 to 25 years because of environmental concerns. In addition, during that period, 40 GWe or more of nuclear capacity will be beyond even the most generous relicensing procedures and will have to be decommissioned."

3-26 Therefore, the point is simple: Geothermal energy can replace the portion reduced from fossil energy and nuclear energy. There is no statement that geothermal energy can completely replace fossil and nuclear energies. Nowhere is the sentence that 2,000 zettajoules of energy can be 'easily' generated. If anything, this report says the following: *With continued investment, we have to wait until 2050 to replace 0.1 percent of fossil energy by geothermal energy.*

3-27 It is foolish to argue over the reserve of renewable energy. [\[17\]](#) Think about the reserve of solar energy. What is really important is the installed capacity, but *Zeitgeist Addendum* does not say a word about this. They have intentionally created an illusion that we can maintain current lifestyle solely by renewable energy if we were to stop the use of fossil fuels.

3-28 The report on excellence of geothermal energy is one of few academic data on resource and technology cited by Jacque Fresco or the *Zeitgeist* series. This report may be the only one cited. The fact that such report is completely distorted from its original intent is not something to be laughed away. Supporters of The Venus Project must seriously ask themselves. How many words of Peter Joseph do they believe *without proof*?

3-29 In *Zeitgeist Addendum*, Peter Joseph says introducing resource-based economy. "In a high-technology resource-based economy, it is conservative to say that about 90% of all current occupations could be phased out by machines." In *Zeitgeist: Moving Forward*, He says again. "75% of the global workforce could be replaced by mechanization tomorrow." Figures and percentages are introduced like these without any evidence.

3-30 Really, there are no studies or researches which support these figures. This becomes clear when we see the context of second quotation. "In fact, if you take a moment to reflect on the jobs which are in existence today which automation could take over right now, if applied, 75% of the global workforce could be replaced by mechanization tomorrow."

3-31 Now, if you really take a moment, you will soon notice that jobs are too various today, and if he doesn't know exactly what skills are needed for each job, even if he has perfect knowledge about mechanization and automation technology, he is never able to figure out something like "how much of the global workforce can be replaced by mechanization tomorrow." Peter Joseph is just saying about his imagination.

3-32 Some experts would know well about various ways to automate remaining labors in the field of tableware production and technological limitations of each. Programmers who are trying hard to make automatic translator would be more conversant about difficulties in automatic translation and their possible solutions than anyone. To say something about automation in these areas, you must either know well about these every subject, or at least search for their studies. What can we do by taking a moment right now!

3-33 Peter Joseph's groundless assertions greatly influenced to supporters of The Venus Project. Many supporters of The Venus Project think that we already have the technology needed to automate most of labor but are not doing so due to interference by the money system. But it seems that even Fresco would not agree with them. In fact, he understands reality at least better than Peter Joseph. Fresco says. "This system will keep installing more and more automation cutting down on the purchasing power of the majority of people."

3-34 As we shall see in chapter 10, the later half of this sentence is wrong. But let's focus on the first half. Fresco really says something right here. If we have a technology to automate something, it would be adopted. Really, there is no reason for enterprisers who pursue profit to not adopt it. This is one of the things that even Jacque Fresco acknowledges.

3-35 The reason why supporters of The Venus Project overestimate current technology is mainly because of Peter Joseph's mention about electric vehicles. However in this case, there existed an industry that was directly damaged by electric vehicles. No industry can be harmed by automation. An entrepreneur who wishes to carry out automation has no reason to worry about unemployment and reduced purchasing power caused by automation. All damages are burdened equally by all entrepreneurs. The first industry to implement automation enjoys its benefits. [18]

3-36 In fact, even Peter Joseph's mention about electric vehicles is far from the truth. Refer to the Wikipedia document at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electric_vehicle_battery. The document states, "Rechargeable batteries are usually the most expensive component of BEVs, being about half the retail cost of the car. Costs remain too high and, along with limited range, provide a key barrier to the use of rechargeable batteries in electric vehicles."

3-37 In the important section on battery cost and parity, we can find the following sentence: "The cost of the battery when distributed over the life cycle of the vehicle easily be more than the cost of the electricity." Especially, this document predicts that plug-in electric vehicles (PEVs) will become more economically feasible than current vehicles that use oil if price of battery is reduced to \$500/kWh, but this is clearly not true right now.

3-38 Therefore, resource or labor to be purchased to produce and maintain electric vehicles is greater than resource or labor to be purchased to produce and maintain vehicles with the same utility based on existing method. Even if same amount of resource and labor is necessary, the former requires more scarce resource and labor. Expensive cost of something in market economy really means nothing but one of these.

3-39 I can attach thousands of academic papers that show limitations of battery capacity and recharge technology, but it would be boring. *Electric vehicles are not being commercialized, simply because production of electric vehicles is not profitable.* What does it mean by not profitable? This problem can be discussed later on. Let us make one thing clear. *At least, non-commercialization of electric vehicles is not due to some kind of oil cartel.*

3-40 One might notice that as far as technology is concerned, I only dealt with Peter Joseph's claims. I rarely dealt with Fresco's claims. But this is really not my fault. Peter Joseph tries to give evidence at least sometimes when he argues that something is possible, though they are always turns out to be poor and incomplete. Fresco never does same thing.

3-41 For example, Peter Joseph introduced a technology called Contour Crafting about automation of construction, and introduced a technique called hydroponics about agriculture. This allows us to search

the technologies he introduced and criticize him. [19] Fresco never allows same thing. He might introduce some technologies like nanotechnology which everyone knows and blueprints which are based one these technologies. But there is always a lack of discussions about feasibility in his explanations.

3-42 From the train which can travel at the speed of 6400 km/h to the hydroponics and Contour Crafting, it's not too much to say that almost every specific technical solution we know about The Venus Project or resource-based economy are not introduced by Jacque Fresco himself. He introduces most of them through Peter Joseph in Zeitgeist series. So how can we discuss technical solutions of The Venus Project without deal with Peter Joseph?

3-43 Peter Joseph's confidence becomes weaker when medical treatments are concerned. "Through time, with nano-technology and other highly advanced forms of science it is not far-fetched to see how even complex medical procedures could be performed by machines as well." One might notice that practically this doesn't mean anything. 'Through time' really means nothing but the fact that it will eventually happen one day.

3-44 But it has to be pointed out that the article titled "Robot reinvents bypass surgery" which Peter Joseph showed us is actually irrelevant to the topic of automation. It's true that bypass surgeries which use expensive robots are becoming increasingly popular. But the robots do not operate automatically. It controlled by the doctor. Doctors use it just to do precise operations more precisely.

3-45 In any event, it is easy to prove that current technology is unable to substitute medical practices by machines. Think about the anti-spam code technology of YouTube. There is no computer program that can effectively crack this code yet. A doctor should be careful not to touch irrelevant nerves or cut blood vessels during treatment of patients. You cannot feel secure letting computer, which can't even break the anti-spam code of YouTube, to perform such medical operations.

3-46 I examined every technical solution which Fresco's resource-based economy based on except the train traveling at the speed of 6400 km/h. This is not a joke. These are really everything we know about resource-based economy in terms of technology. Even the most enthusiastic supporters of The Venus Project would not be able to defend Fresco after they see this overwhelming groundlessness.

3-47 Fresco had to provide technical materials until assert that something is possible with current technology. If something is really possible, it is very easy to show evidence that it's possible. The purpose of all research papers in the fields of science and technology is to demonstrate that a specific technology exists. Although academic data and papers can also be used to show limitations of current technology, this is certainly a secondary use.

3-48 Jacque Fresco could cite an academic data directly related to the technology, or he can simply use data provided by the Patent Office. Nevertheless, Jacque Fresco does not attempt any of these. Now instead of Jacque Fresco, people who oppose his claim became responsible for proving his lie. Fresco doesn't even let them know exactly what technical methods will be used to make his cities.

3-49 Jacque Fresco's secrecy becomes remarkable in FAQ page of The Venus Project website. He offers the following short answer to question #36 "From technological point - is the Venus project real?": "Technically The Venus Project is feasible today." He really doesn't think that more detailed explanation is needed as to this important subject.

3-50 Even Fresco himself seems to know that he is too secretive. See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OTEq1joaTWA>. In this noteworthy video, he asked a question as follows. "Why don't you give your technology away today?" And, not very modestly, he answers. "I'm giving you everything I think they need to make this jump."

3-51 According to this video, the reason why he doesn't "give his ideas away and make them available" is that if he gives it away, it will be "commercial." But why he is concerned about it? Maybe people would have to pay to live in the city. But as long as contracts are made by mutual consent between enterprisers and individuals, it would never harm anyone. Fresco's city is not either a type which harms the outside by environmental pollution or something.

3-52 Fresco's ignorance about scientific method is sometimes amazing. You may not even have to reread chapter 1 for this. Hear what Fresco says carefully. It does not even make sense. When Pasteur, Edison and Tesla hid their technology? They "gave their ideas away" and let everyone who studied their ideas can "answer questions." There is only one thing we can learn from this video. It's that Fresco's assertions about technology fell into a technical mythology which is on the same plane as "Philadelphia Experiment."

3-53 Exactly what does Jacque Fresco use to make people believe in his claim? He uses authority. If he did not have a plausible title of engineer, nobody would have seriously accepted his statements about science and technology. However, claim of Fresco becomes even more suspicious once we understand the methods of science and engineering. Mutual verification is the most important virtue within the academic circle of science and engineering. Which engineering in the world speaks like Jacque Fresco?

3-54 We should also ask whether he really is an expert about all areas of engineering. An engineer does not know all about engineering. Engineers who study automation of vehicle assembly know well about vehicles, but they do not know much about automation of tableware production. They do not recognize the technological difficulties involved, as well as which parts are already automated and which are not.

3-55 Jacque Fresco may be well-versed in some areas of engineering, but he probably knows nothing about other areas of engineering. He cannot boast that he can automatize all labors based on his experience. At the very least, he must have invited engineers in other areas to investigate what can be automated and what not. Surprisingly, there is no trace of such effort in his films and writings.

3-56 In his film, there is a scene where buildings are assembled like Lego pieces. However, architecture is completely different from Lego assembly. [20] Does he truly understand this difference? Of course, this is a basic question. We can just assume that he can do well since he is an engineer, but why would he not introduce the groundbreaking assembly construction method if there is one?

3-57 Supporters of The Venus Project may demand evidences proving that his claim is wrong in order to criticize him. They do not realize the fact that *Fresco is the one who needs to prove, not me*. If someone invented a perpetual mobile and does not provide any evidence, nobody will take his claim seriously. Jacque Fresco is not special.

3-58 His claims are not natural. Scholars have different opinions about when machines will be able to replace most of labor. Much less, the claim that we can produce so many goods that we would not feel scarcity using current technology is clearly contrary to most opinions. He is making these claims without providing any evidence.

3-59 Supporters of The Venus Project seem to tend to exaggerate information that supports their thoughts, instead of uncritically believing in it. They need to throw away the habit to believe something

as true just because we want to believe. If resources around the world are sufficient enough to produce as many goods as to remove scarcity, it would definitely be great. But what we want does not mean it is true.

3-60 It is important to understand that Jacque Fresco's bluff about resource and technology is nothing new. In 1940, Friedrich Hayek wrote in *Road to Serfdom*, "That people should wish to be relieved of the bitter choice which hard facts often impose upon them is not surprising. And they are only too ready to believe that the choice is not really necessary, that it is imposed upon them merely by the particular economic system under which we live."

3-61 He continues, "What they resent is, in truth, that there is an economic problem. In is their wishful belief that there is really no longer an economic problem people have been confirmed by irresponsible talk about potential plenty - which, if it were a fact, would indeed mean that there is no economic problem which makes the choice inevitable."

3-62 However, "Although this snare has served socialism propaganda under various names as long as socialism has existed, it is still as palpably untrue as it was when it was first used over a hundred years ago." Also, "The reader may take it that whoever talks about potential plenty is either dishonest or does not know what he is talking about. Yet it is this false hope as much as anything which drives us along the road to planning."

3-63 Even people who most sincerely believe in Jacque Fresco's argument that we can produce as many goods to remove scarcity without labor using current technology simply by abolishing capitalism would not think that we had such capability in 1940s or 1840s. They will be surprised to know that such argument promising perfect abundance has been used for over 150 years.

3-64 However, we should recognize that such lie did not always come out of ill will but actually came out of good will in many cases. The purpose of people who support planned economy is mostly noble, so it is not surprising to see them use some lies to realize their revolution quicker. None of them would consider that frankly acknowledging their limits is more important than rescuing children drying from famine and war in Africa and Middle East as soon as possible.

3-65 As a result, bluffs and lies are ordinary acts to those who insist on planned economy even before they start the revolution. They might deceive themselves by saying that bluffs and lies are necessary to quickly realize their utopia. They can think that 'temporary' lies are inevitable for acceleration of the revolution, even though they will reveal the truth on their own when the time comes.

3-66 Therefore, the reason why we must seriously question Jacque Fresco's words is not because he is evil. He may really believe that his resource-based economy is the only way to rescue the mankind. However, this does not deny the possibility that he is making up lies to realize his great ideal. Supporters of Fresco are responsible for correcting his errors, but this becomes impossible if they accept his bluffs without filter.

3-67 I saw a supporter of The Venus Project say, "Why operate in division? When unity, honesty could fulfill your dreams and wish in an instant." In an instant! Supporters of The Venus Project surely have some kind of fantasy. It is the belief that we can gain material richness and happiness incomparable to the past, immediately after we start with The Venus Project.

3-68 The truth is as follows. Whether we can obtain as many goods to remove scarcity is absolutely

uncertain. *Even if we assume it is true, it's nonsense to think that we can enjoy such richness as soon as we start the revolution.* Solar heat or geothermal power plant believed to make it possible has not yet been constructed, and automated production machines are yet to be made. If anything, we would have to be engaged in heavier labor than before for some time to prepare for these.

3-69 Even if Jacque Fresco's bluffs were true, we will be forced for some time to endure lower quality of life. If we were to start a worldwide revolution, it is clear that we need to yield significant portion of our share to people in underdeveloped regions in order to create equal society. Productivity of the society cannot grow by a factor of two in an instant. To citizens of developed nations, this means that we have to endure half the current living standard for a while.

3-70 These are what we have to experience when Jacque Fresco's claims are true. If he added any exaggeration, the situation becomes even worse. But in my view, there is little possibility that Jacque Fresco's claims do not include any bluff. Are supporters of The Venus Project really determined to withstand hardships they will inevitably experience in the future? Do they even recognize such hardships?

3-71 Jacque Fresco is responsible for such dreamlike attitude by supporters of The Venus Project. He must frankly acknowledge his own limitations and limitations of The Venus Project. If he really wants to communicate, he should not deceive his supporters. Jacque Fresco must be brave enough to say that at least for 5 years after the revolution, quality of our life can be degenerated and that we must withstand it to create a better society.

3-72 We cannot dramatically change our lives at once. We must endure pain in order to make a change, whether the change is good or bad. Jacque Fresco will eventually have to make a choice when the revolution he has long been waiting for actually happens. He is going to acknowledge the fact that many things promised by The Venus Project were bluffs and lies. I doubt whether he has that much courage.

3-73 In this case, the opposite can happen easily. He would probably try to remove people's complaints by exaggerating even more about the perfect abundance coming in the future. The more his promises are revealed to be lies, more absurd promises he needs to make. His bluffs will be inflated so much that they cannot be distinguished from religion. It is well known that exactly same things happened in communism, which promised to provide perfect abundance. [21]

[15] Jacque Fresco of course has an alternative about the problem of education and food. This becomes clear by looking at The Venus Project website (<http://www.thevenusproject.com/>). However, his alternative about education problem is only consisted of obvious declarations that it is impossible to think that it has any meaning. It is more of a pledge than alternative. Jacque Fresco's alternative about food problem will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

[16] Most nations are already investigating the amount and distribution of resources and population. It is not difficult to find statistics about them. We can obtain more detailed data investigated by individuals using paper search function on Google. The claim that nations will prohibit private survey of resources and disclosure of relevant data because of invasion threats is absurd. They have already been disclosed.

[17] In fact, "13,000 ZJ" is not the amount of geothermal energy available on earth. This report says

that the amount of geothermal energy in the United States is 13,000 ZJ. This information of course is advantageous to Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph. They could put this story in the clip they made. Nonetheless, they clearly referred to this as the amount of geothermal energy on earth. There is no room for doubt about the fact that they did not even read this report.

[18] However, it would be a lie to say that the current money system will never prevent automation. Such thing can actually occur for a more complex reason. For example, some legal measures for protecting laborers from layoff can prevent automation by blocking corporate restructuring. But the effect of such factors is not as large as you think. For instance, they are not applied to corporations making a fresh start.

[19] Of course these techniques have many possibilities. The problem is that Peter Joseph described their every future possibility as if they are attainable in the condition of current technology level. He makes an illusion that these techniques were not adopted; not because of their own limitation, but because of the system. His explanation is hard to be justified. The technology for Contour Crafting is still in the stage of development. As of 2013, 6 ft concrete walls seem the most complex structures which could be made through this technology. Saying about hydroponics, it's already widely being used in many farms. Even its automatic control systems are not new things. But, at least in the condition of current technology level, it's not that considerably greater than soil cultivation.

[20] The law of physics is not symmetrical with size. While maximum load physically withstood by a construction machine is proportional to square of size, load of a structure is proportional to cube of size. There is no reason to think that something shown as possible in a small model experiment will also be possible in large building. Similar error is the thought that small insects that can lift objects much heavier than their body weight will have enormous strength when their size is increased to the size of human beings.

[21] I didn't deal with one important subject about which we must contemplate in this chapter: if something is technologically possible, and if we have enough resources to do it, can we say that it's feasible? Although this subject is difficult, it has enough value to be analyzed in a separated chapter. See Appendix A.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 4.

Because The Venus Project believes in autocracy.

4-01 Summary) Totally planned economy is characterized by the fact that it practically precludes democratic control by demanding excessive expertise from planners. Even the communism system that started out as most democratic did not survive long because of the limitation that democratic decision making is sometimes too slow and more inefficient compared to decision making by an individual with outstanding technological capability. Communism inevitably required dictatorship by technological bureaucrats.

4-02 However, corruption of this dictatorial politics was the actual cause that made the communism system to become a hell. The feature of planned economy that all plans must be integrated for a single purpose was forcibly spoiled to the Stalin system in which the final discretion about all things is given to an individual or group. Although Jacque Fresco's resource-based economy starts out by demanding dictatorship of science and technology bureaucrats, this can only shorten the time taken for resource-based economy to be corrupted into oppressive dictatorship.

4-03 (Classical) Liberalism taught us that 'complicated order of economic activities' can be formed without spontaneous and controlled efforts by individuals. In the society run by market mechanism instead of plan, role of the government is limited to monitoring of economic subjects to abide by given rules. Since this does not require technological ability, we do not have to leave this role to small number of experts who have solution to the problem.

4-04 In such society, role of the government is similar to that of a soccer referee. It must always take predictable measures in accordance to laws in place. This principle is referred to as the rule of law. Jacque Fresco's claim that an automated program should replace role of the government is quite similar to the rule of law. However, he is destroying current program in order to install this new program, and he does not recognize the fact that such destruction indicates destruction of all freedoms that we must protect.

4-05 Jacque Fresco does not believe in democracy. This is so obvious that if someone denies this, we can say that he does not understand what The Venus Project is. We can easily find the following sentence on the FAQ page of official website of The Venus Project: "It is not democracy that elevated our standard of living, it is our resources, water, arable land, and new technology."

4-06 He says that only engineers and scientists can make good decisions. Elected people can do nothing. They may be trying to do something, but they do not have technological capability. Scientists and engineers are those who can truly resolve problems, unlike us without technological capability. Accordingly, we must let them make all decisions. This is the belief of Fresco about decision making in the better society.

4-07 Of course, this indicates *dictatorship by scientists and technological bureaucrats*. Some may say

this is not a dictatorship since roles of scientists are decentralized into areas. Some may say this is not a dictatorship because scientists will make their decisions democratically. We are going to refute these arguments later on. However, only few will not acknowledge that this will take away from most people the right to make decisions about problems directly related to their lives.

4-08 Supporters of The Venus Project may argue that a computer can replace role of central planner, but this is only possible within the completed system of The Venus Project. Fresco acknowledges this: "As to the need for government, only during the transition from a monetary based society to a cybernated high-technological resource based economy of common heritage would it be necessary." What is this provisional government if it is not a dictatorship? [\[22\]](#)

4-09 Supporters of The Venus Project have a tendency to neglect the problem of process for constructing resource-based economy. They always desire to discuss about completed resource-based economy, and they believe that methods used to accomplish it is not a big deal as long as there is no significant contradiction. But *this intermediate process contains biggest elements that not only lead resource-based economy to failure but turn it into hell.*

4-10 People who think that resource-based economy is special because it has no money should know that considerable number of socialists in the past and now have been dreaming of a world without money. Lenin believed that money will disappear one day in Soviet Union. Marx believed that the government can be removed with coming of perfectly communitarian society. Numerous communists further believed they can eliminate laws.

4-11 Needless to say, perfect communitarian society never arrived. Communistic experiment failed because of problem in its means, not because of its final objective. Socialists nowadays well understand this fact, and they are trying not to repeat the mistake made by Soviet Union. I see these efforts as always insufficient, but their efforts deserve to be praised.

4-12 However, Jacque Fresco merely rambles on about his ambition for the completed resource-based economy without thinking at all about the process. He has never thought about what would happen if money, democracy and rule of law were to be removed right now. He does not even get the hang about what kind of *engineering problems* will be faced by those who are to rule the government during the transition period. His words actually demonstrate that he has never given any thoughts on this problem.

4-13 In *Zeitgeist: Moving Forward*, Jacque Fresco says, "Society is a technical invention. And the most efficient methods of optimized human health, physical production, distribution, city infrastructure and the like reside in the field of science and technology - not politics or monetary economics. It operates in the same systematic way as, say an airplane and there is no Republican or Liberal way to build an airplane... It has no regard for what you subjectively think or believe to be true."

4-14 Let us first make clear that the reason why nobody raises objection to how to make an airplane is not because it is about science and technology. The biggest reason why people today do not question the method of manufacturing airplanes is related to the fact that the method has been verified through experience. If we are living in 1920s and someone designs an airplane identical to airplanes of today, only some technicians will agree that it is much more stable than existing airplanes.

4-15 Technicians never tried to make plans for social infrastructures. It is impossible for them to easily reach a consensus. Since we tend to divide duties of planners in planned economy into areas, we do not realize how complicated they are. However, the reason why duties of planners in planned economy become unbelievably complex is because all plans in each area must be organically integrated.

4-16 In most cases, there are a fixed number of things we can do simultaneously. We need to decide what to do first and what to do later. This decision is hard to make. Imagine that we only have one construction machine. Some scientists may say that safety flaws of some buildings in the city should be fixed. Some scientists may say that we need to increase the number of wheat farms to accommodate for demand. At the same time, some scientists may demand expansion of basic science research facilities.

4-17 What should we do first and what should we do later? *Where should we place our priority?* It is easy to calculate demand for wheat. Thus, this is not a problem when we can cover demand and supply. However, it is not possible to calculate the aftermath caused by insufficiency of wheat. It is incomparable to safety problem. The size of benefits that basic science research can bring is unpredictable. [23]

4-18 The problems to be actually encountered by economic planners are more complicated. The assertion that he can easily bring agreement by scientists about these problems only demonstrates that Jacque Fresco has never seriously considered them. We have to choose whether to first build power plants, residential facilities, farms or transportations. Each has its own merits, but it is impossible to compare them using a single criterion.

4-19 The claim that substantiation and experimentation can improve this situation is correct in principle. However, social conditions that determine optimal plan are so complicated and never repeated. We will be able to obtain practical knowledge after irrevocably ruining everything through many trials and errors. We cannot leave our future to such uncertain hope.

4-20 The bigger problem is that *choosing the optimal plan always requires value system*. Even if we can perfectly predict the outcome of each plan, the optimal plan is never decided single-handedly. If we can improve life quality of 10,000 people in return for risking 10 people's lives, should we do it? Is there a way we can make a choice without applying the value system?

4-21 Therefore, the claim that choosing the optimal economic plan does not require ideology because it belongs to the field of science and technology is not just wrong but completely insane. Even when we can perfectly predict the outcome of each plan, choosing the optimal economic plan is reverted to choosing the optimal outcome. We all will have somewhat different views about it. What decision can we make after abolishing all political means?

4-22 The argument that economic plan is unrelated to our subjective belief because it belongs to the field of science and technology only shows arrogance of Jacque Fresco. There is no thought more arrogant than the thought that one's argument is the only truth in nature and other people's arguments are mere opinions. The truth is that all views are subjective opinions until they are proven. There is no reason for Fresco's subjective opinion to be treated differently from subjective opinions of liberalists and conservatives.

4-23 Therefore we, once again, verified that his view is not superior but inferior. He does not even grasp characteristics of the problems he handles. Each of efficient methods about people's health and physical production certainly belongs to the field of science and technology. However, we need to decide how to distribute time and resource to each method. We cannot make this decision solely based on science and technology. At least liberalists and conservatives were not so foolish as to forget about this.

4-24 In planned economy, scientists who work in each department can never make decisions about their

areas alone. This prevents resources from being used according to the plan. Thus in practical meaning, there is no decentralization. It only exists in laboratories where scientists conduct their own researches. Planned economy cannot be sustained unless all plans are integrated for a single purpose.

4-25 However, it is only a fantasy to expect that decisions about all complicated issues can be made through discussion by scientists. Such discussions are only possible because we do not have to reach a conclusion within fixed time period. Most of scientists have different opinions for their lifetime about whether the Higgs particle exists or not. There is almost no possibility that they will quickly reach an agreement on problems more complicated than problems of natural sciences. [24]

4-26 Discussions that cannot lead to any agreement will gradually become formal and be regarded as a waste of time. We will ultimately rely on coercive decisions made by an individual or group. Completely planned economy is nothing but a bureaucratic dictatorship in which experts of each field manage their respective fields while following integrated command. This is the only form of government that can efficiently manage resources by planning everything according to the given purpose.

4-27 Anyone can notice the fact that computers are not helpful in settling such things. As Fresco himself acknowledged, *computers can perform the role of planners only in the completed resource-based society*. If we had completed cities, completed power plants, completed transportation means, and enough number of construction machines to accommodate for sudden demand, necessity of choice would be reduced.

4-28 But as we have seen, the centralized government is most desperately needed when the new society has not yet been constructed, because we have to choose what to focus on and give up due to lack of productivity. Jacques Fresco's foolish delusion that scientists will always be able to easily reach a consensus prevents him from installing any systematic tool to stop his resource-based economy from becoming a dictatorship.

4-29 Furthermore even in the completed resource-based society, power of those who have the authority to improve and modify the system is so strong. We cannot uncritically apply ideas of scientists and engineers into the society. Someone must choose which of those ideas can improve the society. In this sense, the government can never disappear. Even if it can disappear, we cannot think that people with the power to plan out priority of everything will acquiescently give up on it.

4-30 People who believe that planners who are going to manage the transition process to resource-based economy cannot become oppressive dictators since they have no privilege must remember the fact that communism started out in the same way. It is so easy for people with the power to plan everything from social infrastructures and production of goods to hide their privileges or openly demand privileges through threats using power. [25]

4-31 There is no doubt that most of those who led the communist revolution promised democracy. [26] However, this promise was not realized. Even in a democratic nation where transition to planned economy occurred relatively slow, plans expanded to certain size often resulted in destruction of democracy. Hayek gives the following description about Germany in 1920s. [27]

4-32 "Parliaments come to be regarded as ineffective talking shops, unable or incompetent to carry out the tasks for which they have been chosen. The conviction grows that if efficient planning is to be done, the direction must be 'taken out of politics' and placed in the hands of experts - permanent officials or independent autonomous bodies."

4-33 Therefore, "In Germany, even before Hitler came into power, the movement had already progressed much further. It is important to remember that, for some time before 1933, Germany had reached a stage in which it had, in effect, had to be governed dictatorially. Nobody could then doubt that for the time being democracy had broken down and that sincere democrats like Brüning were no more able to govern democratically than Schleicher or von Papen. Hitler did not have to destroy democracy."

4-34 Therefore, the claim that planned economies in the past including communism failed because they were ruled by politicians instead of scientists is far away from the truth. *Whether gained through revolution or gradually accomplished, perfect planned economy always required dictatorship by technocrats.* Incompetent democratic decision making body had to give up its power to the dictatorship of technocrats for efficiency until such power was completely gone.

4-35 But what we know is that such yield actually destroyed the ideal of planned economy instead of accomplishing it. Inevitability of integrated plan turned ruling by uncontrolled scientists and technocrats into vertical and centralized ruling. People had to endure the most oppressive dictatorship in the history of mankind in return for slight advancement in productivity and efficiency of the society.

4-36 We should not think that The Venus Project won't walk the same path as planned economic systems of the past because Jacque Fresco started out by promising governance by scientists and technocrats. In the end, ruling by technocrats was what destroyed the planned economy. Contempt of Jacque Fresco about democracy only shortens time taken for The Venus Project to fall into oppressive dictatorship.

4-37 Supporters of The Venus Project cannot distinguish between a promise and the method to realize that promise. The statement that resource-based economy will offer wide freedom of residential choice is not a method but promise. The statement that resource-based economy will provide education to nurture cooperative spirit and problem solving ability is not a method but promise. However, when we demand an alternative for something, we are demanding the method instead of promise.

4-38 How can resource-based economy guarantee freedom of residential choice? In the large cities of resource-based economy, space for individual houses is limited. What should we do if more people want to live in individual houses rather than apartments than expected? This is only one of promises Jacque Fresco made without providing specific methods. Many supporters of The Venus Project believe that Jacque Fresco's promises will come true, just because he said so.

4-39 For instance, supporters of The Venus Project trust that resource-based economy will resolve problems based on substantiation and experimentation. This is so because Jacque Fresco said so. We must ask. How can we ascertain that planners of resource-based economy will apply the method of substantiation and experimentation in improving quality of our life? [\[28\]](#) How can we trust them?

4-40 If a particular problem that occurs in resource-based economy is helpful for planners of the resource-based economy, there is no guarantee that they will resolve the problem through substantiation and experimentation. There is no device in resource-based economy that can force this. In this sense, Fresco's comment about substantiation and experimentation is a promise as empty as the pledge of Obama. *It is not valuable enough to be considered as a part of resource-based economy.* Only things that are structurally included in the system can be regarded as parts of it.

4-41 If Jacque Fresco talked about specific means to guarantee wide freedom of residential choice

within resource-based economy, we can discuss about efficiency of the method. In fact, this is what we always do about new policies in the current system. We can criticize Jacque Fresco when the method is found to be unrealistic or inefficient, but this is impossible if the method doesn't even exist.

4-42 Instead, anyone who wishes to criticize resource-based economy based on residential problem must verify that there is no means for resource-based economy to guarantee wide freedom of residential choice. If he cannot prove it, supporters of The Venus Project would argue that planners will offer freedom of residential choice using the method available in resource-based economy that can guarantee wide freedom of residential choice.

4-43 About what do we discuss in this way? If Obama promises improved quality of life and there is a method of improving quality of life, does it mean that Obama will actually improve quality of life? Such argument does not make sense. It is surprising to see almost all supporters of The Venus Project unconsciously accept this proposition when the subject is changed from Obama to Jacque Fresco.

4-44 Disclosure of the method is not demanded to simply show that an objective is achievable. *If we know specifically about each method, we can monitor whether or not the planners are doing their job correctly. It is impossible if we don't know about the method.* What can we do if they promise to give us freedom of residential choice but are thinking otherwise?

4-45 Jacque Fresco claims to get rid of laws by making the mankind good through education or environmental change. However, few people understand the fact that this "mankind" includes those planners who decide what to educate us and how to change our environment. The belief that we need to have in order to accept resource-based economy is the belief in these people, rather than in ourselves.

4-46 *Function of laws is not only to prevent individual crimes.* It also prevents crimes by the government. Personal liberty and freedom of expression included in the Constitution protect us from voluntary power exercise of the government. This does not mean that personal liberty and freedom of expression are always kept. It means that our government has to violate or modify laws if it wants to infringe personal liberty or freedom of expression.

4-47 Many people worry about NDAA and CISPA, but they do not ask about why we need to worry about them. NDAA allows the U.S government to imprison U.S citizens without trial, but why did they cause a controversy by particularly making it into a law? Why did they have to devise a bill like NDAA to do so? What forced the government to imprison citizens without trial until now?

4-48 If we were to give up the rule of law, we should give up the principles that gave us the minimal degree of freedom. The claim that this can be removed by turning people good is same as arguing that the planners will apply methods used for educating us to themselves, becoming united with all things, realizing the meaning of unconditional love, and behaving as good. How can we believe in this? [\[29\]](#) Why do we have to leave everything up to mercy of good planners?

4-49 In terms of constitutionalism, there have not been many things created by the mankind that brought about as much improvement in quality of life. The function of this in preventing voluntary power exercise of the government is so strong that it, even when it exists perfunctorily, has the power to restrict authority of the government. It would not be an exaggeration to say that people like Jacque Fresco can be active because constitutionalism still remains in the United States.

4-50 In the footnote of Chapter 3, I pointed out that data about amount and distribution of resources and population have already been disposed and anybody can study details on them. Jacque Fresco's claim that nations will not permit people to survey the amount of resources they have due to threats of

invasion is absurd. However, we must understand the reason why it is absurd. It definitely is not good news to nations for the amount of resources to be known. Why don't they prohibit disclosure?

4-51 They cannot. There is no law to prevent individuals from freely surveying the amount and demand for resources. We need to realize that this is only true for nations in which the rule of law exists. Jacque Fresco's assumption is actually correct in nations like North Korea. The North Korean government controls all data about its domestic conditions, and it decides what to disclose and what not.

4-52 Even if sufficient science and technology do exist in such oppressive dictatorship, they would not be used to improve quality of people's life. They are used as means to solidify the authorities of those in power. According to the claim of Jacque Fresco that political system is unrelated to quality of life, transition of the United States into a police state should not have any influence on life quality of U.S citizens. Technology is there, so why do we need to worry about fascism? Does this make sense?

4-53 There are many hypotheses about the reason for failure of communism. Some people say that communism failed because it did not give people the motivation to work. Some say that it failed because it neglected human nature. These two are what Jacque Fresco always refutes. However, they are not and have never been the most important proofs in opposing planned economy.

4-54 The tragedy of complete planned economy is that it requires excessive expertise from planners that democratic control becomes practically impossible. As a result, whether or not it started out claiming elitism, planned economy requires elites and has to leave all social plans up to them. As shown earlier, this inevitably leads to dictatorship.

4-55 This dictatorial government has *arbitrary discretion* about all things. They think about what would be the best method to accomplish a given objective, and they enforce it. Arbitrary means that ordinary people cannot predict how they will behave. The best method to accomplish something is so complicated that it is hard to determine except for people with professional knowledge in all areas

4-56 This can be described in other words. *There is no way for citizens of planned economy to check whether the government is doing the right thing or not.* Even if everything goes wrong, they cannot verify whether things are happening because of an external cause or mistake of the government. Everything will be justified by the explanation that it is a rough course we need to endure for future paradise. Education for ideological unification will turn into an effort to protect the system.

4-57 This is probably the most important argument opposing planned economy. This becomes clear once we read books written by modern opponents of planned economy such as Karl Popper and Hayek, and 18th century liberalists like Adam Smith. The principle of the invisible hand by Smith means that the society can run smoothly under few rules without having an overall plan that is inevitably accompanied by dictatorship.

4-58 What Adam Smith wants to say is not that human beings are selfish. He does not mean that human beings must be selfish to create such society. It means that selfishness is irrelevant. Jacque Fresco and collectivists always demand ideological unification of all mankind. However, such ideological unification is absolutely unnecessary, as long as we live in liberal society.

4-59 In the society run by market mechanism instead of plan, role of the government is limited to monitoring economic bodies in abiding by given rules. We must prevent them from fraud and keep them from driving their competitors out in abnormal methods other than normal price and service competitions. In such society, role of the government can be compared to role of a referee in a soccer game.

4-60 Accordingly, role demanded by such society upon the government is exactly same as role demanded by us on referees of soccer games. Discretion of the government should be minimized. The government needs to take actions like machines according to given rules, namely laws, and such measures must be predictable. This principle is referred to as the rule of law today. Since this does not require special technology, we can leave this to elected people instead of few experts.

4-61 The principle of the rule of law was not made to prevent individuals from performing evil deeds. It was made to prevent administrators from voluntary power exercise. [30] More importantly, it was actually effective. It accomplished an unprecedented improvement in human rights by reducing role of the government to simply performing duties according to given rules.

4-62 Nations with the rule of law cannot have a law saying "The US Central Intelligence Agency has the authority to determine and imprison terrorist elements." Since the judgment of who is a terrorist element is completely arbitrary, we can never predict how the authorities will act. Political organization cannot exercise discretion, and must be allowed only to act according to the rules. Acts of a nation must only be decided by fixed rules.

4-63 Few people will say that the United States is a nation run by the rule of law currently. American laws are allowing discretion of the central government in too many areas. (This allows for various lobbying acts of politicians criticized in Zeitgeist.) However, even if such discretion is gradually increasing, the scope of works that can be arbitrarily done by the government is still limited. We have the constitution. If the government were to infringe a right described in the constitution, we can easily recognize it.

4-64 The rule of law prevents arbitrary power exercise of administrators by turning the government into a machine run by rules. One probably noticed that this is similar to role of the computer predicted by Jacque Fresco to exist in the completed resource-based economy. Jacque Fresco's claim that an automated program should replace role of the government is similar in many ways to the rule of law. [31] [32]

4-65 The problem is that Fresco is trying to destroy other existing programs with similar functions in order to apply this automated program to our society. But as Fresco says himself and as we verified already, this new program cannot be used until resource-based economy is completed. During the transition period, we cannot have any program to protect us from arbitrary power exercise of the government.

4-66 Supporters of Zeitgeist do not believe in the government. Also, they believe that Jacque Fresco will create a society without government. However, only few of them recognize that they are trying to make a more arbitrary and larger government by removing the one and only program that currently exists for the same purpose.

4-67 Someone may say that this is a step backward that comes before taking two steps forward, but they do not understand that we have a cliff behind us and one step backward means death. We must leave the important task of dismantling the government to a completely arbitrary and gigantic authoritarian government. The expectation that it will dismantle its own power is nothing different from the expectation that Jong-un Kim of North Korea will voluntarily retire for his people.

4-68 What produced this situation? It is simple. Jacque Fresco saw people as clockmakers designing clockwork called society. However in reality, we are closer to dwarfs living inside clockwork called

society that must improve our environment. A clockmaker can discard non-regenerative clockwork into the furnace and remake one, but we cannot do that. We cannot throw ourselves into the furnace.

4-69 What Jacque Fresco and his supporters are attempting can be compared to uninstalling Windows XP to newly install Windows Vista. However, we have no such thing as installation CD. We do not possess a parallel world where we can install our society from outside. They download Vista at a random location and delete existing operating system, without recognizing what they are going.

4-70 This may be because of Fresco's prejudice as an engineer. Engineers are familiar with designing their inventions from outside, but they do not understand what it is to design the system when they are a part of the system. They probably have never done such work before. Fresco believes that we can design it without any problem, as long as we have the blueprint of the outcome.

4-71 Perfect communism has never failed, because perfect communism has never happened. Communists believed that their path was to the path to make perfect communism. However, this path was a path to dictatorship of Stalin and North Korean dynasty, which is not even communism now. Ideology of Marx and ideology of Jacque Fresco are alike in the fact that they do not have specific measures prepared after the revolution.

4-72 In this text, I presumed that the provisional government to be used by Jacque Fresco for implementation of resource-based economy is the government of scientists and engineers. But to tell the truth, he has never mentioned about specific form of the government. The sad part is that this government, no matter what form it takes, will be welcomed by most supporters of The Venus Project as long as it promises realization of resource-based economy.

4-73 Perfect resource-based economy is an objective as far off as perfect communism. Nobody knows how long it will take to construct cities on land and ocean, and to connect all of them through a railroad that extends over scores of thousands of kilometers. However, *according to Fresco's plan, we must give the so-called provisional government with dictatorship an authority to decide everything in order to accomplish this.* It is similar to how farmers in the medieval period trusted and followed new dynasties, believing they will bring prosperity.

4-74 Even if the first planner has good will, there is no guarantee that the next planner is not a person like Stalin or Hitler. How can you trust that he is a person who learned the meaning of unconditional love by feeling connection of all things with his body? Is such revelation really effective? Isn't it a delusion or lie, just like the revelations received by religious people?

4-75 Supporters of The Venus Project may want to get rid of the government. They do not realize that they are handing over our most precious rights to the so-called provisional government, which may be the largest government in history, to accomplish this purpose. The rights we take as granted today and even complain as insufficient were not matters of course in the past. They can disappear like smoke at any time, once the device we use to protect them is removed.

[22] Fresco continues, "They will not dictate the policies or have any more advantage than other people. Their job will be to carry out the restoration of the environment to near natural conditions as possible on land and in the sea." But he adds before we can be relieved that "They will also economically layout the most efficient way to manage transportation, agriculture, city planning, and production." The story of finding the most effective method of transportation, agriculture, urban

planning and production, if we assume this effective method to be applied - there is no reason to not make such assumption -, is the same as saying that the so-called provisional government will decide everything about transportation, agriculture, urban planning and production. They will probably determine what to teach to children and what kind of books to publish. Such a gigantic dictatorship is unprecedented in the history.

[23] However if the three are equally important, most scientists are likely to choose expansion of basic science research facilities. I am not arguing that scientists are selfish. It can actually occur by more diverse reasons. For example, it is easily overestimated because it is related to scientists who make the decision. Also, it can occur by collective egoism - which is not intentional - of scientists. We all regard helping people around us to be more precious than helping people far away from us. This is a natural feeling that is never unfortunate, but it becomes problematic when a specific group has exclusive power to devise a plan that would affect the entire society. It is not easy to pursue perfectly utilitarian virtue.

[24] It is ridiculous to leave the final decision to voting by scientists. Scholars studying the same field do not have equivalent expertise about the field. For a matter that requires agreement by scientists working in different fields, importance of the matter can significantly vary according to the field. In this case, it is easy to realize that the decision made by the majority vote of scientists will not be the best decision.

[25] For example, there are many high-rise buildings planned by The Venus Project with indefinite uses. Is there a guarantee that one of these buildings will not be a building for the planners? They can even construct a new building by making an excuse. If they say the building is necessary for scientific research, nobody would question legitimacy of the building.

[26] I am talking about communism in reality. Marx himself did not believe in government. He said that the government will wither away once perfectly communistic society is formed. However, he did not deny the fact that a government may be necessary in the process of transition from capitalistic society to perfectly communistic society. He did not speak details about the form of this government. Promise about democracy was made by later communists like Lenin.

[27] However, it is dangerous to identify planned economy with all types of welfare system. Welfare does not necessarily bring demand for dictatorship if it does not require arbitrary judgment by the government or economic planner. Arbitrary intervention on economy by the government is what actually demands dictatorship. Refer to description on the rule of law at the end of this Chapter. This topic is discussed in greater detail with the basic income system in Chapter 10.

[28] It is a fact that planned economy is a good system to apply the method of substantiation and experimentation. The problem is that this method is generally not used to improve productivity of the society and increase quality of life. The method of substantiation and experimentation can be used to effectively suppress resistance. It can be used to turn us into slaves. In reality we have seen the same thing happen in many communistic societies.

[29] This claim is actually made by many supporters of Zeitgeist I have met. Their ground is that since everyone will live abundantly once resource-based economy is achieved, the planners in the government of transition period do not need to be selfish. Of course, such argument does not consider the possibility of administrators not believing in this prediction or possibility of acting selfish in order to live abundant life faster than others.

[30] Fresco doesn't seem to know this. He wrote in his writing *Designing the Future*, "Many people feel that we need the rule of law to eliminate our problems... For instance, there are thousands of laws against stealing." This is completely off the course. The idea of rule of law is unrelated with eradicating crimes of individuals. If he wants to deny the rule of law, he needs to say that the rule of law cannot

restrain the government.

[31] Because of such similarity, supporters of The Venus Project sometimes quote writings of libertarians who have completely different ideas. However, when libertarians say 'the government is evil,' it means that we should reduce arbitrary power of the government and reinforce the program, or rule of law. They will be astonished by Jacque Fresco's plan. They know for a fact that Fresco's plan will result in a bigger government, at least in its transition period.

[32] However, it is still questionable as to whether planned economy can be completely programmed out using computer. This is only possible in stagnant society. Technological development will modify enormous number of programs every time, even if it occurs at today's rate. The authority of the group that can arbitrarily decide which technologies to accept and modify the program is larger than any existing government. Also, no innovator or inventor wishes his thoughts to be censored by someone else. They prefer to establish a business by collecting funds from partners. The reason why an engineer sometimes argues for planned economy is probably because his innovations and inventions can be fully applied in his planned economy. However, other engineers with ideas that must be censored by him would not feel very good. I didn't point out that planners also have to decide what would be televised and what would be taught to us and our children yet. If there aren't any government in completed resource-based economy as Fresco asserts, it's quite uncertain which group or decision making structure would make TV programs and content of the curriculum which would be taught to our children. Obviously computers can't supply these kinds of goods.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 5.

Because it removes our freedom of choice.

5-01 Summary) The secret of resource-based economy is that its ability to richly supply some goods as to remove scarcity is obtained by completely giving up on other goods. This is not different from market economy in which we give up on another good by purchasing a good with limited money. Important difference is that we can no longer make this choice about what goods to buy.

5-02 The argument that engineers must plan production and distribution because the government cannot resolve the problem is a result of disappointment and hatred towards the government. However,

we actually need to hate ourselves in order to accept resource-based economy. We are going to hand over the right of choice to planners. They will decide what's best for us, since they think that we are not capable of settling our own problems.

5-03 What we must surely understand about Fresco's alternative is that *the ability of resource-based economy to provide unlimited supply of a good is obtained by completely giving up another good*. This is the same as giving up on a product by purchasing another when we have limited money. The only difference is that this choice is made by someone else.

5-04 Jacque Fresco probably does not have to prohibit people from drinking alcohol. This is because he can simply prevent this by not producing alcohol. He can also eradicate drugs using the same method. If alcohols and drugs are not produced at all, or alcohols and drugs do not exist in Jacque Fresco's store where we can take everything freely, there is no way we can obtain them. [\[33\]](#) The same logic applies to everything which Fresco regards as harmful.

5-05 Among goods we can currently purchase in the market, there are so many unnecessary goods. He will be able to offer unlimited supply of necessary goods by eradicating such unnecessary goods. But this choice is not made by us. It is made by those who plan the economy and decide what to produce. So, here comes an important question *Why we have to leave the judgment of what is beneficial and what is harmful to somebody else?*

5-06 I am concerned that the goods which Fresco regards as harmful are larger in number than we generally think. For example, we would not eat meats at least in completed resource-based economy. [\[34\]](#) This has long been my personal supposition, but The Venus Project website now clarifies this fact in its FAQ. See question #96, "What about food? Would people eat meat?"

5-7 I cannot imagine we can keep a pet in resource-based economy. To speak about electronic devices, some goods need to be turned into common goods, as acknowledged by Jacque Fresco. It is still uncertain as to what are to become common goods and what not. It may differ every time according to conditions. Hayek's point that "control on production is control on consumption" is correct.

5-8 But let us stop discussing about completed resource-based economy. We should rather focus on resource-based economy in transition period because most of elements that not only turn resource-based economy into failure but hell exist in this transition period. Discussion about completed resource-based economy is a fiction and unnecessary. We do not need to discuss problems to face at least 30 years later before discussing important and critical problems that we are going to face immediately.

5-9 Fresco's plan about transition period is vague. Despite its importance, he never says about it in detail. Fortunately one paragraph which I already quoted in chapter 4 seem to give enough clue. Fresco certainly said. "As to the need for government, only during the transition from a monetary based society to a cybernated high-technological resource based economy of common heritage would it be necessary."

5-10 He continued, "They will not dictate the policies or have any more advantage than other people. Their job will be to carry out the restoration of the environment to near natural conditions as possible on land and in the sea. They will also economically layout the most efficient way to manage

transportation, agriculture, city planning, and production."

5-11 Obviously there is no reason for current corrupted governments to be a provisional government which pursues resource-based economy. So despite Fresco's so much gibberish which emphasize that The Venus Project is a process of evolution rather than revolution, at least one political revolution seem to necessary. [35] And because one of the purposes of the government is city planning, it seems that this revolution would happen before new cities are fully constructed.

5-12 Is there exist something like current free enterprise system at the transition period? Of course not. If current governments are vulnerable to lobbyists, so does the government of the transition period. As long as enterprise system exists, Fresco's every criticism about governments would apply to the government which would administer resource-based economy in transition period itself. So they would have to be eliminated.

5-13 How about Scarcity? Does it exist at the transition period? Fresco said that funds for his experimental city would be raised through various business The Venus Project is doing and contributions. But we do not think that every city can be constructed in the same way. We can't make every city before the revolution. It's impossible unless most of current big enterprises support The Venus Project.

5-14 So even if Fresco's assertion that we can be free from scarcity is true, we would not be able to get such abundance right after the revolution. We have to start our experiment without geothermal plants and completely automated factories. In fact, the ability to produce everyday goods may be reduced because we will have to invest much of our capability in the future.

5-15 How about money? He said that money is only important when scarcity does exist. Is this means that money is necessary as long as scarcity does exist? I will not make a conclusion about whether resource-based economy in transition period uses money or not. But one thing must be pointed out. He doesn't criticize only capitalism or free enterprise system. He criticizes every money economy. It was the reason why he could argue that his alternative is different from communism. If he wants consistency he has to insist immediate abolition of money. [36]

5-16 Our concern is what would happen in resource-based economy when scarcity is still a reality, and we have to choose what to produce and what to give up. Without a doubt, resource-based economy has to pass through this stage. Communist societies - though they also often pledged perfect abundance - couldn't overcome this stage to the end. Would resource-based economy be able to get a different result?

5-17 Some supporters of The Venus Project argue that communists are the same as capitalists, just because they both use money. They do not understand what made communism to use money. As mentioned earlier, many communists actually wished to eliminate money. Laborers demanded money. This was not because they were psychologically corrupted by capitalism.

5-18 Many people have different tastes about different areas of life. Someone wishes to increase quality of food by reducing quality of clothes. Someone wants to live in a better house by reducing quality of food. We gain the freedom to choose where to spend our money when money exists. We can purchase books or latest computer by spending less on food and living.

5-19 We can also choose what we eat in resource-based economy, but we can never choose quality of what we eat. We can only decide whether to eat banana or apple. It may permit choices among substitutes with identical quality. *However, it does not permit the freedom to improve quality of vehicles*

we ride by giving up quality of what we eat. The freedom of choice promised by planned economy is incomplete.

5-20 Such problem may not be a problem when we can get everything at its best quality. Communists who argue that money will become unnecessary once perfect communist society is formed are making the argument under the exactly same context as supporters of The Venus Project. However, the problem occurs when we cannot accomplish such degree of productivity, when we are forced to make choices.

5-21 We cannot have all we want. We need to give up on something to gain something. It is important that we can at least choose what to give up. We minimize our loss by giving up what is least important to us. If there is no money, we must rely on distribution. Whether to give up on something will be decided by someone else.

5-22 Jacque Fresco's promise to supply goods without scarcity cannot settle this situation. We have to completely give up production of another good in order to supply a specific good without scarcity, even in perfect resource-based economy. The number of goods we give up will increase in resource-based economy during the transition period. It cannot come true, and even if it did, it will become a masked rationing system that is no different from rationing system.

5-23 Jacque Fresco says in *Zeitgeist: Moving Forward*, "As harsh as it may sound, nature is a dictatorship." Also, as we have already seen, "It has no regard for what you subjectively think or believe to be true." These words are used to argue that there cannot be any difference in opinions about how to create an optimal society, or more accurately to deny necessity of democratic government. It is true, at least on the surface.

5-24 However, only few people understand the fact that Jacque Fresco's ideology is actually being applied to us. Whether we personally want to eat meat is not important to Jacque Fresco at all. Only science can tell us what is more and less important to us. If someone loves meat or alcohol, he have to be educated about this science. This is the key of Jacque Fresco's ideology.

5-25 However, what is more and less important to us is not solely determined by scientific knowledge about each good. *Our individual preference is the most important element.* There may be a person who loves meat so much that he cannot live without meat. His demand may not be satisfied by food produced similarly to meat. Can we ascertain that it is good for him to stop eating meat based on the scientific reason that meat is bad for health? [\[37\]](#)

5-26 Resource-based economy does not simply take away the right to choose food. It takes away the right of choice on everything. We can no longer buy better computer or television by sacrificing our food. The ratio of quality for housing, daily necessities, food and electronic appliances is given. Individual preferences hardly exist except when we choose among substitutes with identical quality.

5-27 Hayek wrote, "The question raised by economic planning is, therefore, not merely whether we shall be able to satisfy what we regard as our more or less important needs in the way we prefer. It is whether it shall be we who decide what is more, and what is less, important for us, or whether this is to be decided by the planner." It would, in effect, mean that we as individuals should no longer be allowed to decide what we regard as marginal."

5-28 You may not agree with this argument, but unfortunately, Jacque Fresco does not seem to have such right. What he says he is going to use in order to prevent people from drinking alcohol, or more

accurately to make people accept the measure taken to prevent it, is education. He wrote, "They can be educated out of the need for requiring artificial stimulants."

5-29 We can use education and campaign for specific purposes in market economy. However, there is an important difference. We can try reducing demand for alcohol through campaign, but we do not prohibit production of alcohol. In planned economy, things are carried out in opposite order. The planners first prohibit production of alcohol and then educate people to accept this prohibition.

5-30 In market economy, we have freedom to agree or disagree with an education program or campaign with specific purpose. Excluding few goods like drugs, the scope of what we prohibit is narrow. Final decision on what goods to buy is always on individuals. Resource-based economy takes away such right of decision. Hayek's comment about planned economy is accurate for resource-based economy.

5-31 Furthermore, even the so-called technological solutions that Jacque Fresco claims to apply in resource-based economy actually take away our freedom of choice. Most of what he explains as technological solutions can also be made in market economy, but there is an important difference. *In market economy, individuals decide whether to apply specific technological solution. In resource-based economy, planners make the decision.*

5-32 For example, if a corporation develops safer vehicles by introducing a new technology, we may or may not buy that model. The new vehicle may be more expensive. However, we will have to pay the price to enjoy the technology. Nobody willingly takes the risk of accident. However if someone can use his money on something more important, he can do so.

5-33 Such freedom of choice does not exist in resource-based economy. The new technology to increase safety of vehicles will probably be applied to all vehicles. Of course, we may not have to spend money in order to enjoy this new technology, but the cost of applying the new technology does not disappear. This cost can be resolved only by giving up something that can otherwise improve quality of life. In conclusion, this cost secretly comes back to us.

5-34 Jacque Fresco said that old cars will not exist in resource-based economy. Since old cars accompany danger, they should be replaced by good cars. There is no reason for this to be bad at all. Is it really so? Maintaining all vehicles in their best conditions always requires expense. Also, this expense can only be paid by sacrificing something else we regard as precious. If we cannot choose what to sacrifice, nobody would want it.

5-35 In fact, most of technologies that we readily do not apply in market economy have reasons. If we had a vehicle that automatically changes its maximum velocity according to speed limit on roads, we do not need to worry about violation of speed limits. The reason why we do not want to buy such vehicle is because we wish to enjoy the freedom of violating such limit.

5-36 There are moments when people are willing to violate speed limit and pay a fine. If one of family members is in a life-or-death situation, we would have to take the risk and violate speed limit on roads. This choice becomes impossible once technological solution is applied to force all vehicles to drive below the speed limit. In market economy, most people of course do not want to implement such technology.

5-37 We cannot expect people in resource-based economy to want what most of people in market economy do not. On the contrary, application of this technology to limit maximum velocity of vehicles in resource-based economy will actually bring complaints. It is more so when the technology accompanies an expense that can only be paid through sacrifice of another.

5-38 If this type of technology really must be enforced, we can always apply it in market economy. We can create a law to force automobile manufacturing companies to apply specific technology that changes maximum velocity of vehicles according to speed limit on roads. We do not do so because it is not effective. It is probably not going to be effective in resource-based economy. Jacque Fresco's romantic expectation about technological solutions is mostly based on this fraud.

5-39 However, there is something that more seriously threatens our freedom. *In resource-based economy, we cannot choose people to provide goods and services.* Since the planners have exclusive charge on production of all goods - production of goods by other people must be prohibited or extremely limited in order to make use of resources according to the plan -, they can be regarded as a monopoly. They decide what to give us under what conditions.

5-40 For example, what should we do if all houses they provide us have listening devices and surveillance cameras installed? If an architect builds such house in market economy, it would degrade his credit. The first people to buy the house will become victims. However, remaining people can effectively drive the architect out of the market by not purchasing houses built by the criminal. What architects are actually afraid of is such judgment by the market.

5-41 However, it is impossible to anticipate such market judgment in planned economy, where all goods are supplied by a single group of planners. Of course, we can fight against the planners who infringe our private freedom, but we would have to be determined. It is much more than determination of those who litigate legal action against architects. Our enemy is gigantic.

5-42 The planners may infringe our rights and freedom in much smaller things. In principle, we must fight against them when they demand privilege. However, if this privilege starts from something small, such resistance will not bring large sympathy. If infringement of rights by the monopolist is carried out slowly enough, we may not be able to resist at all until we lose all freedom. Remember that our thoughts are generated from the environment.

5-43 Perhaps there is no area that can show such monopolist's tyranny as prominently as areas of academics and arts. If what books were to be published and what not were determined by good will of the planner, *we will be unable to find any other books than those justifying the system.* Books of Popper and Hayek that offer dangerous thoughts threatening resource-based economy won't even be produced.

5-44 If the planners decide what is to be broadcasted on TV, they will be able to control and brainstorm people more effectively than any propaganda that exist today. Everything will be justified as education to teach proper ideology or truth to people. All collectivistic planned economies including communism and fascism prioritized education. This also is prioritized by Jacque Fresco in resource-based economy.

5-45 Jacque Fresco's view on arts is summarized by words of Ernst Fischer he cites in *Zeitgeist: Moving Forward*: "In a decaying society, Art, if it is truthful, must also reflect decay. And unless it wants to break faith with its social function, Art must show the world as changeable." This passage is well known today, but people do not know the fact that Ernst Fischer was a socialist.

5-46 Which among works of great artists like Shakespeare and Dostoyevsky volunteer for this purpose today? Also, think about the consequence of arts always volunteering for social purposes in a place where only one ideology is acknowledged. In a liberal society, art only exists for the sake of art, as science exists only for the sake of science. [38] The truth is that art may contain ideology but cannot and should not be enslaved by ideology.

5-47 Especially, *control on culture and leisure contents is more dangerous than any other controls*. The purpose of planners in providing culture and leisure contents to us cannot simply be to balance supply and demand. They must control our environment so we become good and cooperative. There would be no problem if we become good enough to only want things that encourage such attributes, but this is not an explanation that corresponds to resource-based economy in transition period.

5-48 There is no doubt that the planners in transition period must directly betray our demand for culture and leisure contents in order to turn us into good and cooperative people. Pornography, violent action movies and all games related to killing things will disappear regardless of how many people want them. Competitive team sports, non-productive TV entertainments, and lyrics with abusive language will either disappear or be reduced.

5-49 However, if we only talk about what should disappear and do not mention what will replace them, we do not have sufficient understanding about what collectivistic control of culture and leisure contents means. It is not an exaggeration to say that everything broadcasted on TV in resource-based economy must serve for social purposes. It must give us a lecture and cultivate the team spirit.

5-50 Nothing among them can help us raise fundamental question about the system. Actually, they will use all possible means to prevent us from becoming suspicious about the system. We are going to watch films praising the struggle of great ancestors who overcame the money system on a daily basis. I have not mentioned anything about specific 'tyranny' of those who will monopolize supply of culture and leisure contents. However, these explanations sufficiently remind us of TV media in North Korea and former Soviet Union.

5-51 It is naïve to expect that such control will only be applied to culture and leisure contents directly created and distributed by the planners. The internet is one of places where suggestive and provocative contents are most likely to flourish. There is no way the planners can control our environment without handling obscene and provocative contents on the internet, and aggressive review activities by AVGN or Nostalgia Critic that can always turn instructive TV programs into jokes.

5-52 Of course, many supporters of The Venus Project place importance in freedom on the internet because it is advantageous for starting a revolution. However, it cannot be more naïve than to believe that the so-called resource-based economy will guarantee greater freedom on the internet for such reason. The explanation that resource-based economy will almost eliminate freedom on the internet is closer to the truth.

5-53 It is not a good idea to compare complete control of the internet in resource-based economy to SOPA or CISPA. They are bad too, but I am talking about something that is incomparably bad. It is a specific environment that will completely remove anonymity and forbid any contents threatening the system from being posted on the internet through prior censorship. Supporters of The Venus Project have no right to mention freedom on the internet.

5-54 In Chapter 4, I asked how resource-based economy can guarantee freedom of residential choice. This question can be answered easily. As mentioned earlier, the essence of the problem is that there are limited spaces for individual houses in large cities of resource-based economy. In order to balance supply and demand, economic planners would have to adjust quality of two goods so that many people will prefer apartments over individual houses.

5-55 Whatever the specific method may be, this can only be accomplished by slightly increasing life quality in apartments compared to life quality in individual houses. In *Paradise or Oblivion*, Jacques

Fresco declares he will make many people want to live in apartments through such means. According to Jacque Fresco, apartments are superior individual houses because they have social infrastructures such as theatre groups, gyms, and hospitals.

5-56 This can be reduced to the economic problem of how to adjust conditions when the price is same in order to achieve specific ratio of demand for apartments and individual houses. I am convinced that economists who had been studying trend of demand about different conditions are best suited to solve such problems. However, this is an unbelievably difficult problem, even to them.

5-57 The planners can prevent lack of residential facilities by constructing sufficient number of residential facilities. But if the number of people who want to live in individual houses increases too much, they will end up balancing supply and demand by reducing quality of individual houses. It is easy to predict that individual houses will be laid aside compared to apartments when implementing various improvements. Accordingly, it is foolish to anticipate that complete efficiency and freedom of choice promised by planned economy will be simultaneously satisfied.

[33] Really? Fresco explains why he thinks so. "Not using money would eliminate the sale of drugs, prostitution, etc." But is this dismisses the possibility that black market would be formed? No. When money became useless pieces of paper because of the hyperinflation, Germans used cigarettes as currency. The same thing will happen in a resource-based economy, too. The truth is that as long as resource-based economy doesn't produce every goods which are in demand, there always would be a black market for them. Not only alcohols and cigarettes but also porn cartoons, luxury items, and even some ordinary goods which the system don't supply enough would be traded in this black market. If we can get raw materials of these goods from Fresco's free-distribution-store without paying anything, perhaps the black market would be an enormous threat to the system.

[34] 96th question still does not say anything about whether meat will be available in free-distribution-store. Obviously this is the only meaningful information. Jacque Fresco seems to have forgotten the fact that the planners are to decide this. Seriously, statements like this don't mean much: "We can not outlaw what people eat but we can outgrow the need for eating animal protein."

[35] This interpretation is supported by many other parts of FAQ. For example, see question #16. It foresees a "social and economic breakdown" as to "the turning point" of the future. The Venus Project would be accepted after confidence in existing system disappears completely. In every practical sense, what does this mean except that there would be a revolution? Perhaps there is no reason to believe Fresco's supposition that automation leads to a social and economic breakdown. (See chapter 10.) But a social and economic breakdown which is accompanied with widespread unemployment can happen anytime for different reasons. It happened during the Great Depression of the 1930s. Anyway, no matter what is the true reason, practically what would supporters of The Venus Project try to do when same thing happens? Don't forget that Marx said that capitalism would destroy itself, too. His supposition was realized only through revolution.

[36] If a resource-based economy in transition period still uses money, it would not be free from criticism that there are practically no difference between it and a communist system. The phrase "transition period" can't be an excuse for this similarity. As we already saw, communist societies in reality were also often understood as a transition period to reach a perfect communitarian society which clearly doesn't have a government or money. As we shall see in chapter 6, Fresco's plan is at least as vague as Marx's. And as we shall see in chapter 9, the most fundamental parts of Fresco's idea are not

based on science or scientific method. If a resource-based economy in transition period also needs a government and money, it's quite suspicious what can distinguish an experiment of a resource-based economy from previous failed experiments of communism structurally. We can't expect different results from two identical systems even though they pursue different goals.

[37] We are uncertain about whether perfect vegetarian diet is better for health than diet composed of meats and vegetables. Actually, opinion by many scholars who studied this topic is that perfect vegetarian diet is not as good for health as you think. We probably won't be educated about these in resource-based economy. This is only one of many cases in which planned economy distorts science for its general plan. Fresco says, "eating living animals are detrimental to health."

[38] Scientists can have ideological motivation, but it cannot and should not be compulsory. Of course, Fresco seems to know this. What he didn't notice is that the same principle applies to art, too. Science for the sake of science and art for the sake of art have been excluded from all collectivistic planned economies. It is needless to say that it resulted in death of science and art. About science and resource-based economy, see also Note [14] and its main text.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 6.

Because it is simplifying too many things.

6-01 Summary) Jacque Fresco doesn't seem to mind about trivial matters. Most of arguments he uses to back up his logic lack scientific preciseness and strictness. He sometimes treats problems that cannot be treated as identical to be identical. He draws excessively bold conclusions from few simple facts.

6-02 The Venus Project is an outcome of such hasty thinking. He has never given any thought about detailed problems that may arise during the transition period, despite the fact that they are most important. His tendency to make hasty plan and have optimistic view about everything is rather bureaucratic than scientific. He claims to devise a rational plan through science, but he is actually following the past mistakes of Kim Il Sung and Mao Zedong.

6-03 In 1958, Mao Zedong the leader of China directs extermination of sparrows. The reason was because sparrows disrupted agricultural production by feeding on grains. Various scientific institutions began to concentrate their research on harmful effects of sparrows on agricultural products, and adults and children in farms endeavored to catch sparrows. Sparrows almost became extinct in China within one year, and the 'Sparrow War' seemed to bear its fruit.

6-04 However, farmers did not become as plentiful as the amount of grain eaten by sparrows. As sparrows disappeared, its natural enemies like pests showed explosive reproduction. This resulted in a historic lean year. In the end, the leadership of China had to airlift 200,000 sparrows from the maritime province ruled by Soviet Union. The policy that neglected complicated circulation of the ecosystem turned out to be a complete failure.

6-05 Jacque Fresco and his supporters as environmentalists won't do this, but it does not mean there is no lesson to be learnt from this incident. The assumption that agricultural production will increase by eliminating sparrows since sparrows eat grains is plausible in a way. However, the planners in planned economy must be aware of such fragmentary thinking.

6-06 He claims to use scientific methodology, but we're uncertain as to how liberal he is from such fragmentary thinking. He argues to blindly remove laws without considering another function of laws to limit power of the national government, and he argues that democracy must be abolished since elected people are incompetent. If something has side effects, it should disappear. He has never seriously reviewed the consequence of his measures.

6-07 We are going to find out how rash and fragmentary his scientific methodology is. But before that, I would like to emphasize that this is not just an individual problem of Jacque Fresco. If we were to say there is a problem in Jacque Fresco, it is same as saying that planned economy can be successful if the plan is devised by a much wiser planner. I am trying to say something slightly different. *There is no planner wise enough to make planned economy successful.*

6-08 Mutual dependency of modern industries is so complex that someone may compare it to the ecosystem. However, leaving out extreme cases like 'Sparrow War', most of human attempts to interfere in the ecosystem failed. Today, few people think it possible to take a measure on the ecosystem while accurately predicting its consequence. 39)

6-09 Today, we intervene in the ecosystem for specific purposes. However, complete planned economy of Jacque Fresco is essentially different. It is like locking up all animals in zoos and separately breeding them to protect species, determining how many deer are to be eaten by lions and how many by leopards. There is no supply of food from outside except for grasses collected in meadows to feed herbivores.

6-10 There are several undeniable advantages of such measure. It can prevent accidental death of animals and inefficient energy use. It may be able to evolve species in the ways we want. (Please do not call me a eugenicist because I said this!) Nevertheless, we do not expect such project to become successful. The reasons are more complicated than direct and clear advantages obtained from such measures.

6-11 Those who support the theory of ecological zoo argue that it is a scientific method to protect species and accelerate their evolution. They will offer its direct advantages as the basis of this argument. Evidences that its opponents need to present are more complex and indirect. People supporting the theory of ecological zoo can simply regard them as non-sense.

6-12 Or they might argue that the problem can be resolved through substantiation and experimentation. Trivial problems can sometimes occur from ignorance about the ecosystem, but such trivial problems will be considered as resolvable using the trial and error method. They never think that so many trivial problems can occur at once that the exact cause of failure is unknown.

6-13 There is no doubt that the structure of mutual dependency among modern industries is extremely complex, though it may not be as complex as the ecosystem. What made this complexity possible was decentralization and automatic adjustment of decision making in the market, not the central command. Division of labor was intensified to flower the modern civilization because division of labor did not have to be created consciously. The modern civilization was possible since people accidentally found the method of extending division of labor far past the scope of conscious plan.

6-14 Modern industries have a much more complex structure compared to 1960s. This difference in complexity may be much greater than difference in the ability to process information using computers. Besides as shown in Chapter 4, computers are not helpful in resolving the most important problems of the transition period. Stalin and Mao Zedong also emphasized science and technology. How good of a planner is Jacque Fresco compared to them?

6-15 The knowledge required by planned economy is enormous. The planners must decide what technological method is to be used for individual production projects, while at the same time deciding how much of resource is allocated to each. They must have complete knowledge about everything in order to apply science and technology in this. They must completely understand quantum mechanics, mechanical engineering, architectural engineering, statistical physics, economics and genetic engineering.

6-16 They also have to know about people's demand. At least resource-based economy in transition period is unable to supply every goods in their best quality to the bliss point. Then planners must figure out what the best way to satisfy people is in a given condition. They must know, for example, which is more preferable for people between two more mandarin oranges and a little improvement of the quality of an electron lens.

6-17 Ultimately the planners would have to know what each individual prefer among every alternative combination of goods the system can afford to give to him. If they don't, they would not be able to optimize production in consideration of people's demand no matter what computer they use. Unfortunately even if the planners use the wisest method, it's impossible for them to get this knowledge. Everyone has different preference and the preference is always changing.

6-18 Of course, market economy does not demand people with such knowledge. *In market economy, price delivers information.* Entrepreneurs look at prices of goods and production materials to obtain information about what is the most expensive good among things that can be produced at the same cost, or in other words, on what people consider as most valuable. As a result, resources are naturally reallocated to the most urgent places.

6-19 When a scientist or engineer invents a new process to more quickly produce a certain good, an entrepreneur would decide whether applying the process immediately is beneficial or not by looking at the price. It is not always best to choose the new process. For instance, it would be more beneficial for entrepreneurs and consumers to not use the process until technology is developed further if the process requires use of very expensive rare earth metals.

6-20 Therefore, entrepreneurs will compete to use the process only if the process is actually beneficial.

This not only changes the environment of the industry producing the good but all industries. Unnecessary resources which were used in existing production process will become cheaper. But at the same time, special rare earth metals demanded by the new production process will become more expensive.

6-21 However, the overall industrial structure will quickly adapt to this new environment. A different industry that has been using metals which became expensive due to the technology newly introduced in an industry must either increase the prices of goods or look for a different production method not using the given resource. As a result of these readjustments, despite the fact that each entrepreneur does not clearly understand what the optimal resource arrangement is in terms of new technological environment and productivity, optimal resource arrangement is accomplished by the market.

6-22 The governments in many countries today devise long-term projects and plans with specific purpose. This is sometimes successful, but it is only possible because they can use information provided by price determined in free market. The tragedy of complete planned economy is in that it is impossible for the planners to receive such information through prices. This is why they easily carry out unrealistic projects and fall their nations into difficulty.

6-23 Planned production method of goods provided by those who support planned economy today is merely stopping production when there is inventory and manufacturing products when there is demand. Since this is just an imitation of corporations reducing production or price when inventory is large and increasing production when inventory is low, it would be funny if someone were to argue that planned economy can adapt to changing environment and accomplish optimal resource arrangement more quickly and efficiently than the modern market economy.

6-24 It still fails to explain what is the most appropriate among various resource arrangement methods that are competing. It does not explain the exact ratios at which resources allocated to each industry are changed when there is a need to rearrange resources as a result of technological advancement. Market prices are not perfect. The problem is that we have no alternatives to consider when we need to resolve these problems.

6-25 *No theory of planned economy created by supporters of planned economy - except for the theory of labor value by Marx which is too theoretical and arbitrary for actual use - came up with an efficient method to calculate desirable ratio at which goods must be exchanged or what must be sacrificed at which ratio for another.* Under such environment, who can lead to a better outcome than China under Mao Zedong or Soviet Union?

6-26 Neglecting the problem of economic calculation, Fresco was not different from collectivistic ideologists in the past that showed terrible failure. He has no specific plan. Only the objective is more specific than necessary. The ultimate form of cities is not important. It is as meaningless as a theorist in ecological zoo having a goal about future species to evolve. Specificity of the plan is important.

6-27 Did he ever think about what standards to use in distributing resources to goods with values that cannot be directly compared, such as food, entertainment, safety and transportation? Does he foresee and prepare for various problems that can arise during the transition period? What about simpler questions? Do the laws have to be abolished immediately after the revolution, or after some time? Should actual properties of individuals be confiscated immediately after the revolution or be left intact?

6-28 In fact, since the duty of the planners is so important and difficult, it would be hard to trust Jacque Fresco even if he had a plan so specific as to answer all of these questions. However, Jacque Fresco not

only fails to meet this level but did not even try. Far from reviewing the consequence of each measure, he seems not to understand what measures are necessary. He leaves all the complicated decisions during the transition period to the rulers of future provisional government.

6-29 Jacque Fresco's hopelessly optimistic personality and insincere thinking cannot be compared to Stalin, let alone Marx. As a result, I can even see supporters of The Venus Project discussing about specific measures to be implemented in his stead. How would the rulers of future provisional government to replace him be? It is mysterious as to why supporters of The Venus Project expect their future planners to be wiser than Mao Zedong.

6-30 I have already pointed out that most supporters of The Venus Project have surprisingly dreamy thoughts about conditions after the revolution. It is so obvious that we have more to lose than gain for at least 10 years even if the claims of Jacque Fresco about technology and resource are all true, yet only few are prepared to endure such sacrifice. The expectation of most people about the provisional government is ridiculously high.

6-31 The problem is that it is impossible to satisfy such expectation, even if the planners miraculously come up with an optimal plan. Moreover, most of things to be faced by the planners in planned economy are unbelievably difficult. The method of substantiation and experimentation requires numerous trials and errors at the beginning. It is doubtful as to how long the public with absurdly unrealistic demands is willing to wait for such trials and errors.

6-32 All mistakes that occur during the transition period will be blamed as incompetence of the planners instead of Jacque Fresco. In the worst case, good planners at the beginning can be driven out with criticism and mockery, only to be replaced by the evil group trying to abuse the power. Such possibilities are enough to bring an end to resource-based economy as soon as it starts unless safety measures are prepared in advance, but it was so important for Jacque Fresco to make the cities look round that he emphasized it three or four times.

6-33 About labor, the argument that people will enjoy their work is only correct in completed resource-based economy. During the transition period, we would have to produce food and daily necessities to be used by all members of the society. Time is required until mechanization is completed, even if we invest all our capacities into mechanization and lay aside construction of cities and power plants. Somebody needs to do labor during this time. However, it is simple and tedious labor that we do not enjoy.

6-34 Many labors require skilled technology. People who are engaged in such labors cannot expect to be freed from labor at the start of The Venus Project. *Why do they have to sacrifice for us regardless of their intent?* According to Jacque Fresco, those engaged in the most unproductive works will be freed first. This will arouse conflicts if privileges are not given to laborers.

6-35 More importantly *if all labors, except for essential labors that can only be performed by specific people, are carried out by volunteers without any reward, it would be a society most beneficial for the most selfish individuals.* Enjoying the fruits of other people's efforts without placing any effort is a privilege that cannot be enjoyed by any selfish individual in market economy, except for small number of capitalists.

6-36 What in market economy can make human beings more selfish than this, unless you believe in the outrageous logic that economics turns people selfish because it presumes human beings as selfish beings? How severe should personality education be to make people so altruistic in such environment?

(If we were to give privileges to laborers in order to avoid this outcome, what difference is there from market economy in which laborers are paid to work?)

6-37 It is interesting to see Jacque Fresco's poor thinking reflected in his science. He points out that people's personality is determined by interaction between inheritance and environment. This is true, though I wonder whether there is anyone who doesn't know this. 40) What's funny is the conclusion he draws from this scientific fact. He believes we can create an environment in which wickedness can be completely removed from all individuals.

6-38 However, determination of human personality by interaction between inheritance and environmental factors does not mean wickedness can be completely removed by adjusting environmental factors. We cannot make the function $x^2 + y^2 - 36$ equal to 0 only by adjusting the x value. If the y value is 8, there is no value of x that can yield 0. Unless we understand exactly how inherited factors and environmental factors interact, he cannot claim that we can completely get rid of wickedness.

6-39 In addition, there may be diverse environments that can completely remove evilness from people since individuals have different genetic markers. Even if it is possible to completely remove evilness from each individual, it does not mean we can create an environment that removes evilness from all individuals. For the function $x^2 + y^2 - 36$, there is a value of x that yields 0 when the value of y is between 6 and -6, and the x value differs according to the y value.

6-40 Even if there is one and only environment that removes wickedness from all individuals, how can we assure that it is the resource-based economy spoken by Jacque Fresco? Collectivism enclosed within resource-based economy may be able to remove a few evils from the mankind, but it may actually bring greater evil in return. 41) Did Jacque Fresco ever provide an answer to such natural questions?

6-41 What about Jacque Fresco's claim that there will be no motivation to commit crimes when all goods are abundant? Conflicts can be created when two men fall in love with a woman. It is impossible to settle this conflict using technological method unless we make this woman abundant by cloning her. Fighting for the opposite sex is frequently found in the nature. What if such conflict develops into crime?

6-42 When we do not have enough goods yet during the transition period, can we eradicate all crimes without laws? 42) Violence and sexual assaults can happen without private properties. I cannot believe that such crimes will be driven out immediately after the start of resource-based economy. *We may be able to create specific environment that removes all evils as Jacque Fresco says, but we did not grow up in such environment.* Resource-based economy in the transition period is far from the environment that completely removes evilness.

6-43 Someone might say that I am too inquisitive. However, we must ask these questions to Jacque Fresco if we were to accept Jacque Fresco's theory as science. If these questions are inappropriate, it is because his theory is closer to humanities than science. It is true. If he claims this to be scientific methodology, it would be proper to raise scientific questions.

6-44 There is a scene in *Zeitgeist: Moving Forward* where Jacque Fresco presumes we found another earth and discusses things we need to do. It is quite touching, but this scene best shows the fragmentary thinking of Jacque Fresco. He says, "Let's imagine for a moment we had the option to redesign human

civilization from the ground upâ€¦ The only difference between this new planet and our current one is that human evolution had not occurred."

6-45 He continues, "So what would we do? Well, first we need a goal right? And it's safe to say that goal would be to surviveâ€¦ Most people, indeed, desire to live and they would prefer to do so without suffering. Therefore, the basis of this civilization needs to be as supportive and hence sustainable for human life as possible - taking into account the material needs of all the world's people."

6-46 Also, "Next question regards our method. What kind of approach do we take? last I checked, politics was the method of social operation on Earth... so what do the doctrines of the republicans, liberals, conservatives or socialists have to say about societal design? Hmmm... not a damn thing. Okay then - what about religion? Surely the great creator had to have left some blueprints somewhere... Nope...nothing I can find."

6-47 And finally, "Okay then - so what's left? It appears something called science. Science is unique in that its methods demand not only that ideas proposed be tested and replicatedâ€¦ but everything science comes up with is also inherently falsifiableâ€¦ we take all of this inventory and tracking data and create a system to manage it. A global Resource Management System - in fact to account for every relevant resource on the planet. There is simply no logical alternative if our goal as a species is survival in the long run."

6-48 Fresco's argument seems truly logical, but it is only as logical as answering that all water particles should move in the direction of needle to the question of how to pull water out of a syringe. If we were to answer a question asking about the method of accomplishing a specific purpose, we must first decide what variables can be controlled. Behavior of individual water particles is not a controllable variable.

6-49 We are discussing about what kind of social system should be selected to redesign our civilization on the new planet. We only have a single chance to make the choice, unless we go through revolution to start over with a new system. Therefore, *we must only talk about things that can be decided at the moment of choice and should not speak about the future*. We have to accept the fact that the future is merely the outcome of system we chose.

6-50 Why is there such limitation? Can't we as individuals make choices in the future as we do now? Can't we come up with specific plans about what we are going to choose in the future and apply them? These are very good questions. However, it is only possible because we are a single body that makes sequential decisions.

6-51 Specific plans are only meaningful when we can continue to make decisions in the future instead of once at the beginning. *We can either hand over the right to decide everything to some dictators claiming they can resolve the problems or not*. If we have to hand it over, it is pointless to discuss about the plan thereafter. Whether or not they would test their ideas by repetition and reproduction is none of our business

6-52 Thus, "What would we do?" is not a proper question. 'We' as a community of billions of individuals is not an entity that can continuously make decisions like you. 43) *You should ask the following question: You found a new planet with billions of other people. You have the right to decide the social system in which we are going to live here. After making this choice, you go back to an ordinary citizen and live within the social system you make. What kind of social system should you make?*

6-53 In my thought, we need a system to appoint and manage a representative to make decisions since

we cannot make decisions about the society at all times. We probably need to implement democracy. Also, we probably have to create a republic nation governed by the rule of law so that the elected representative cannot abuse his power. While leaving economic activities of individuals to their own, we should probably set regulations to prevent them from wasting resources.

6-54 You may or may not agree with this conclusion. For instance, you may believe that there is a need for the mankind to perform global management resources and consciously control distribution. If so, you would have to agonize about what systematic device can allow such goal to be met. It's okay as long as you have that much of critical mind.

6-55 Go back by two paragraphs and see what Jacque Fresco is saying. You will realize that he has not mentioned anything important while rambling on and that none of his words is related to the answer we are trying to seek. If you still did not get any gooseflesh, you may think that you have not understood the meaning of this yet.

6-56 It is simple to pull water out of a syringe. You push the piston. However, this is merely a method of drawing water out of a syringe and not a method to make all water particles to move in the direction of needle. At the moment when we are pushing onto the piston, many water particles are moving in the direction opposite to needle. Operation of the piston can only increase the number of water particles moving in the direction of needle.

6-57 Therefore, we fall into an error if we answer this question while regarding movement of all water particles as a controllable variable. If we can control behavior of all water particles, the best method to pull water out of a syringe is clearly to make all water particles move in the direction of needle. However, you can realize that there is no such method if you think back on how to make all water particles to move in the direction of needle.

6-58 The argument that we should let many water particles to move in the direction of piston and many other particles to move in the direction of needle with more particles moving in the direction of needle seems ridiculous and inefficient under the assumption that we can control behavior of all water particles. But in fact, this is the only way to resolve the problem. We can make this possible by pushing the piston.

6-59 Therefore, Jacque Fresco is oversimplifying the problem. 44) Human society is a complex system created by many individuals, and the optimal measure applied to the complex system is different from the optimal measure for individual particles. We will learn how to correctly apply scientific methodology to human society in Chapter 9. Compared to this, Jacque Fresco's so-called scientific methodology is incredibly immature and fragmentary.

6-60 We can easily laugh at the planners of the past by looking at unrealistic and foolish projects like the poor 5-year economic development plans of former Soviet Union and China. Those who support planned economy hastily believe that we will never repeat such foolish mistakes and conclude we can come up with a much better plan using scientific methods differentiated from methods used in the past.

6-61 However, while the extremely high level of knowledge is required by completely planned economy, intelligence of the planners can never satisfy this level. Plans presented by the planners with knowledge on limited areas are reckless plans created under rash assumptions. If Jacque Fresco claims he can completely automate the fiber process in 5 years, it's not because he knows well about the fiber process. He is nothing different from the planners in the past in that he makes most of his claims based on assumptions.

6-62 Just like we mock unrealistic economic planners of North Korea and former Soviet Union today, our future descendants may laugh at unrealistic urban development plans to be devised by Jacque Fresco or planners of the provisional government. Despite the fact that he claims to use scientific methodology, Jacque Fresco and the past planners share more things in common than differences. They talk about their plans, but they neglect difficulty of the plans.

[39] The case of hairstreak in England is famous. Hairstreaks have symbiotic relationship with red ants. They cannot build ant's nest if grasses are too tall. As the number of rabbits increased, the English government spread a myxoma virus to reduce the number of rabbits. However, this resulted in extinction of red ants because they could not build their nests, and hairstreaks also became extinct. It is meaningless to blame foolishness of the English government about this case. It is easier to find the cause of a problem after it occurs than to forecast it in advance. Nobody foresaw that rabbits could have such a great impact on hairstreaks. Also, the English government - borrowing Fresco's expression - used the method of substantiation and experimentation, obtaining a precious knowledge as a result. However, the sacrifice it had to endure in acquiring this knowledge was larger than imagination.

[40] There is no doubt that Jacque Fresco is ignoring the level of audiences watching his clips. He teaches us that war is bad. The logic he uses in doing so is even more elementary. For instance, he says that war does not bring development or improvement in quality of life. Since nobody seriously believes that war brings development, his eloquence is totally useless. Of course, some of extreme social evolutionists in the 19th century actually argued that war brings development - through the mechanism of survival of the fittest. Unfortunately, Jacque Fresco's elementary eloquence is not helpful for tearing down their argument. The best objection would be that the society winning from war is not always the better society. At the time when religious wars were common, religions that can most violently and cruelly judge heathens often won.

[41] This is not a simple quarrel. In my opinion, collectivism destroys tolerance and respect for other people's opinions, spirit of independence, upright personality and decisiveness of protecting one's belief against superiors, healthy criticism to question things accepted by everyone as truth, and basic ability to empathize with individuals by loving and concerning. Look at Chapters 7 and 9.

[42] Jacque Fresco's position about this is ambiguous. He never said he would eliminate laws as soon as he starts resource-based economy. Maybe he plans to make the planners of provisional government to decide this problem. If this is true, there is one less characteristic that can differentiate resource-based economy from communism. Communists argued that laws are unnecessary in perfectly communistic society. Laws are only required in communism during early stage.

[43] Collectivists sometimes argue that this only holds true in individualistic society and not in collectivistic society where everyone has the same goal. In other words, they believe that who makes decisions is not importance because he would have the same goal as they do. This belief is what makes collectivists to easily give their authorities to dictators. It is unnecessary to say that their beliefs were always betrayed without a single exception.

[44] Of course, scientists sometimes simplify difficult problems. But in this case, they clearly know what they simplified and what limits they have, and more importantly, they try to share such limitations with other scientists. Jacque Fresco obstinately simplifies the problem and believes that the problem was simple ever since the beginning. Such immature thought is quite humanistic.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
Go to [prior chapter](#)
Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
Go to [prior chapter](#)
Go to [next chapter](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 7.

Because if it fails, the cost would be massive.

7-01 Summary) Why do so many supporters of The Venus Project accept it while knowing its logical flaw? They think they have nothing to lose by believing in it. If The Venus Project were to become successful, we can gain a lot of things. The mankind will be forever freed from labor, crime and evilness. However, the penalty caused by failure The Venus Project is uncertain. They actually believe that the penalty of leaving the market economy intact will bring greater penalty.

7-02 Therefore, it is not surprising to see many people regard The Venus Project as a kind of gamble in which a success would be nice, but failure isn't going to make things any worse. They will probably argue we need to attempt The Venus Project even if probability of it being successful were only 1%. Nothing worse can happen than their worst-case scenario.

7-03 Yet in fact, the cost we need to take when The Venus Project turns out to be a failure is enormous. Supporters of The Venus Project do not recognize the fact that technology is a double-sided being. The very reason why Hitler and Stalin could be engaged in the most awful deeds than any other dictators in the history is not because they were more wicked compared to the tyrants of Roman Empire. If the technology we are trying to hand over to future dictators is used as a tool for suppression, their evil deeds are going to be incomparable to those of Hitler and Stalin.

7-04 When we chose collectivism in order to escape from the pain of reality, it always brought us a greater pain than what we were trying to eliminate. Tyranny of Stalin was more dreadful than Czar's state, and Hitler's seizure of power resulted in death of more people than the Great Depression. Even if the mankind chooses collectivism to overcome economic crisis, the effect can only get worse than its cause. In this case, it's permanent enslavement of the entire mankind.

7-05 Jacque Fresco and supporters of The Venus Project do not talk about what the most ideal society is. They say resource-based economy is merely better than the current system and it is not the most

ideal society. Though such claim solely exists for the purpose of refuting the criticism that The Venus Project is utopianism, it is still a relief to have them think in this way.

7-06 The problem lies in the fact that they are too quick to judge what is worst, while not being hasty about what is best. Such thought is supported by the argument that all malicious traits of our society today came from characteristics of market economy and all good traits were obtained through technological development. According to supporters of The Venus Project, market economy is the worse system of economy that human beings can adopt and there is nothing we can lose by radically destroying market economy.

7-07 Is this true? *Are the freedom to criticize the system we enjoy today and freedom to be protected from violence of the government gifts of technological development?* These are the most important questions that Jacque Fresco had to answer in order to claim law and democracy as being useless. However, he has never given an answer to these questions. [\[45\]](#)

7-08 People living in places with abundant water do not realize value of water. They take water as granted. [\[46\]](#) As such, we cannot realize how precious freedom of idea and personal freedom are because we are living in a place where they already exist. We regard them as being a matter of course. It's not a surprise that many people fail to even consider how we can maintain the rights guaranteed by the Constitution while arguing we should abolish laws.

7-09 Whether or not most people are brainwashed by the ideology of market economy, all supporters of The Venus Project must acknowledge that *we can never make hasty conclusion about the worst if we cannot do so about the best.* We need to understand that our choice may increase agony of the mankind to an intolerable level. We should be as careful as possible before making judgments and are obligated to use reason before emotion and passion.

7-10 We are probably not standing on top of the tower symbolizing advancement of the mankind. Perhaps we have not reached the first floor yet. But we must be aware that we have not seen the bottom of this tower. The tower continues forever underground. We should be looking underneath our feet instead of looking at the sky. Then we can realize our current position that we take as granted is not a safety zone but something very dangerous.

7-11 Supporters of The Venus Project constantly blame lack of imagination in opponents, but there is *nothing easier than to imagine the best scenario. The worst scenario is difficult to imagine.* Imagining something we do not want to believe requires painful intellectual effort. The majority of supporters of The Venus Project are not willing to endure such intellectual effort.

7-12 The scenario I am going to introduce from now on is about things that may occur, and probably will in my opinion, in the so-called resource-based economy during the transition period. The reason why this scenario should make us shudder is because it is consisted of consequences that can be inevitably inferred from vulnerabilities of resource-based economy we examined until now. It is far from heaven or much better future.

7-13 Revolutionary process requires a strong conviction that the alternative proposed by the revolution will be successful. Many early revolutionists will realize the need to use some exaggerations in order to lead the revolution to a success. Parts of early resource-based economy that demand our sacrifice are buried under the surface. Instead, the fantasy of bright future - which in my view is already exaggerated - that resource-based economy will bring forth is endlessly overstated.

7-14 The moment the revolution is accomplished, everyone is returned back to reality. They will learn

that resource-based economy cannot immediately bring improvement in quality of life and that it requires our sacrifice, at least during its transition period. Construction of ideal city which once seemed so close suddenly becomes far off. Even worse, they have to witness with their own eyes many promises made by early revolutionists be turned down.

7-15 It is unclear as to whether early resource-based economy can stop the use of all fossil fuels. The planners probably know that it is better to rely on fossil fuel readily available for some time than to deteriorate lives of people by focusing too much on alternative energy. They probably cannot get rid of prisons. They know that at least during the transition period it is possible to eliminate crime in resource based economy by turning people good.

7-16 Despite the fact that such measures are the best means in terms of engineering perspective, they would not be seen as the best means to many supporters of The Venus Project who dreamed about bright future without the government, fossil fuel, prison and labor. They might think the planners are betraying the ideals of Jacque Fresco. They might belatedly realize that they have given too much power to the planners.

7-17 The planners will encounter problems that they have never handled in their lifetime. Determining priorities among things while harmonizing long-term goal and short-term demand is so difficult that the answer cannot be found using knowledge of the entire mankind. Too many decisions must be made within short period of time. Premature experience and knowledge will inevitably yield many mistakes. Some of these mistakes may turn out to be unbelievably pathetic.

7-18 The argument that we need to trust the provisional government composed of engineers who know how to resolve the problems would not last long, since engineers who are alienated in the economic planning process will denounce incompetence of the provisional government saying they are the only engineers who can actually find solutions to the problems. They can consider people's complaints as an opportunity to embody their technological ideal. Political instability is unavoidable.

7-19 Doubt about politicians today is very sound and regarded as being desirable. However, such sound doubt is only possible because we can easily grasp what is right and wrong. Since task of the planners is so difficult, we just can't determine whether it is best or not. We can merely choose one of many people claiming they can resolve the problem.

7-20 In general, great plans do not permit drop-outs. Long-term plans cannot be devised if a plan made today can be completely changed by other planners after 5 years. However, transition to resource-based economy requires such long-term plans. People will gradually realize that meaningless political quarrels are disrupting achievement of their ideal. What they want is a charismatic leader who can give them confidence that all of his decisions are correct.

7-21 From Lenin or Iosif Stalin of Soviet Union to Mao Zedong of China, Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania, and Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il of North Korea, it is a surprise that idolization of individuals occurred in communistic nations. Egalitarian ideal set forth by communism is unrelated to idolization of individuals, but we have to understand that this was an unavoidable choice for them to avoid political confusion.

7-22 It is always the person using the sneakiest method to eliminate political opponents by blaming one's own mistakes to opponents who finally seize power in the midst of struggle to take the position as planners. He is probably a person who acts according to desire for power instead of one's ideals and uses all possible means to accomplish his purpose. As Hayek forecasted, the wickedest people end up

reaching the top.

7-23 Even the most virtuous planner will one day find out that opponents threatening his position must be removed in order to accomplish his noble ideal. He might realize that power must be maintained as long as possible to achieve his ideal, which requires settlement of people's discontent through ceaseless lies.

7-24 *In other words, the virtuous planner operating planned economy will soon have to choose between utilizing every possible means to strengthen his power and giving up on economic planning.* He needs to accept the fact that the end justifies the means. If not, he will end up allowing immoral people who can openly do the same thing to take his place.

7-25 However, social instability brought forth by the revolution is more dangerous than political instability. As mentioned earlier, those who work for non-productive occupations will be freed from labor, but it is difficult to expect the same for people who have jobs demanding high level knowledge. If high quality laborers were given a privilege to resolve this problem, it would be criticized as being discriminatory.

7-26 What about properties? It seems natural to confiscate properties of capitalists and use them for laborers. The problem is our society also has significant size of middle class. Their social statuses were mostly gained through harsh labor, and their properties were built up by controlling waste. Even if the revolution does not confiscate their properties, all of their savings in the form of money or equity will disappear.

7-27 It is naïve to hope that ideologies will disappear or at least diminish with the revolution. Once the initial expectation about The Venus Project is betrayed, people giving up on the experiment of resource-based economy and arguing for return to market economy will grow around libertarians and free-marketeters. More than anything, their argument is going to be most compelling to the entire middle class and high quality laborers who become neglected during the revolutionary process.

7-28 But they can only be seen as turncoats and internal enemies trying to turn all hardships of the mankind into nothing to those who firmly believe that resource-based economy is the only way to rescue the mankind. People who spread libertarian idea will be condemned as government-patronized intellectuals cooperating with former capitalists or counter-revolutionists - despite the fact that libertarians are concerned as much about future of the mankind as supporters of The Venus Project - by supporters of The Venus Project.

7-29 Ideological unification is not only important to start with resource-based economy but also to maintain resource-based economy. It is easy to predict that some kind of ideology education will take place as soon as resource-based economy is implemented. The entire mankind will always hear Jacque Fresco's idea that we can learn the meaning of unconditional love by feeling interconnection between all things.

7-30 *As conflict and disruption that impose threat on the system become serious, such ideological education will be expanded to an unprecedented scale.* The most faithful supporters of The Venus Project, not the planners, are the first people to agree with this. They will believe that such education is the most ideal path without side effects to protect resource-based economy from the threat of counter-revolutionists and 'people still brainwashed by market economy.' As Jacque Fresco acknowledged, the purpose of ideological education is to remove disruption.

7-31 However, it is uncertain as to how effective it will be in persuading libertarians and free-

marketeers. They would consider it as a symptom that we are becoming a nation dominated by system-protective ideology like North Korea. To them, unprecedented expansion of ideological education will be seen as forecast on the most dreadful outcome of The Venus Project instead of showing the most hopeful image.

7-32 Ideological education works most effectively to faithful supporters of The Venus Project themselves who want such ideological education. Critical thinking is completely gone. Some of them might say that people who long for market economy should be isolated for treatment. Some of them might sincerely believe that such measure is the best for the mankind and for those brainwashed by market economy.

7-33 We can easily think that collectivism will cultivate the noblest values since the desire for collectivist system was born from high moral motivation. However, a system has no reason to uplift behaviors serving its intended purpose. The question we need to throw out is about what kinds of moral opinions are formed by collectivistic organization of the society or which opinion will dominate the society. *Our interest is in moral outcome, not in moral foundation.*

7-34 People's natural ability to empathize is extremely inefficient. We sometimes grieve for death of a fiction character instead of thousands of children starving to death in Africa. This is probably because we feel more attached to the character we know well than anonymous children of Africa. Virtuous attribute of human beings originates from this inefficient and sometimes even irrational ability to empathize.

7-35 Today, we have wide range of empathy from trivial story of mountain climbers to the story of Laika sent to outer space on Sputnik 2. Such emotional weakness being moved by trivial matters is a privilege granted to modern people. However, there are many proofs demonstrating that this is not simply a modern characteristic but characteristic of individualistic society.

7-36 Many people say that slavery system is a limitation of Athenian democracy. However, the fact that slavery abolition movement already existed in Athens during 5th century BC is not well known. Alcidas wrote, "Gods created human beings as free, and nobody is born as a slave." Euripides wrote more directly, "Name is the only thing that gives shame to slaves who can be excellent in every aspect and truly equivalent to free people."

7-37 According to Karl Popper, the movement of Athenians opposing slavery in the 5th century BC is not limited to small number of intellectuals like Euripides, Alcidas, Lycophron, Antiphon and Hippias. There are many significant evidences showing its success. The strongest of them are writings of Plato and Aristotle who supported slavery system and therefore had to oppose slavery abolition movement. [\[47\]](#)

7-38 Nowadays we have high level of ethical requirements that cannot be reached by Athenians. For instance, we know we should not hunt animals for entertainment. However, is anyone surprised by the fact that we hardly learned any of these ethical requirements from collectivistic societies and that most of them spontaneously grew up in individualistic society? What made this possible of course was the virtuous property of human beings, or the ability to empathize with other people's pain.

7-39 There is no doubt about the fact that collectivism mostly appeals to human ability to empathize. Collectivists will claim legitimacy of collectivistic revolution by showing specific cases of children suffering starvation in Africa and people dying in wars. Since collectivism always appeals to the most

humane empathy, the argument that it will create an environment to completely destroy human empathy may seem very odd.

7-40 But instead of clinging on to moral basis of collectivism, we need to think about what kind of moral environment it would bring. In resource-based society during the transition period, there is no motivation for us to work hard on tedious labor. More importantly, we do not have specific individuals to rescue by working hard. If we had motivation for our efforts, it would be the moral belief to serve the abstract whole called earth.

7-41 This difference becomes clear when compared with individualistic society. Even in individualistic society, we don't work only for our benefit. We have precious family members we need to support. In other words, *we can exercise the good while maximizing the use of ability to empathize with the most important people*. Of course, we can use leftover money for personal charity. In this case, we can give more specific virtue to specific individuals using our ability to empathize.

7-42 Such choice is not available in collectivistic society. Realization of virtue on specific individuals is the task of planners who distribute resources and goods. Individuals can merely serve for the abstract whole. You won't put anyone to death or discontent by quitting labor. However, you have to do the labor since it slightly improves life quality of the entire group. Such behavior cannot be drawn from natural ability to empathize.

7-43 It would be a lie to call people in collectivistic society immoral. Collectivistic society requires a strong moral belief that individual desires can be sacrificed to benefit the whole. Important part is that this is separate from the natural ability to empathize. It is similar to obedience to religious doctrine.

7-44 On the contrary, we often have to suppress natural feelings in collectivistic society. Our natural feeling may be to spend a little more time with family than contribute to slight benefit of the whole by voluntarily participating in labor needed in resource-based economy during the transition period. Most of our natural feelings actually become disruptions in realizing the good instead of being helpful.

7-45 *In an environment where the principle of 'one for all, all for one' is applied - this principle more accurately summarizes the nature of collectivism than what collectivists think -, individual's natural ability to empathize is not just useless but becomes an obstacle in accomplishing the good*. This is because natural human ability to empathize is so diverse and inefficient, and can only function properly when each of us act for one as one.

7-46 As unused body organs get weaker, unused ability to empathize also degenerates. Assume that the only way to stop a train with broken brake is to push a fat person off, and doing so would save 5 workers standing on the track. [\[48\]](#) What should we do? The only reason why we seriously consider this problem is because we are living in an individualistic society. If you grew up in a collectivistic society, you would push one person off of the train without any hesitation.

7-47 The outcome of such environment is beyond imagination. When the Red Guards of China draw university professors, artists and scholars out to the streets during the Cultural Revolution to perform public execution and argue it is a noble moral action, they really mean it. The argument that removing impure ideas that threaten billions of people by executing few people leads people to prosperity is very logical.

7-48 Even if resource-based economy has noble ideology differentiated from other collectivistic nations, how can we ascertain that supporters of The Venus Project would not regard treatment of people brainwashed by market economy using somewhat violent methods as being perfectly moral for

the society and patients?

7-49 A dictator operating provisional government in transition period might need a victim to blame when his policy fails. Libertarians who always make clamor and disturb things are most suited for such victim. Even if they do not impose serious threat on their system, the threat must be exaggerated. Unfortunately in many cases, they become a great threat to the system. This is especially so when a policy turns out to be a failure.

7-50 Fresco tried to get rid of division by removing all ideologies. Therefore, the new generation that grows up under such ideological education might be enraged by the fact that division still exists. They might believe that life quality of the mankind is not being immediately improved because of the counter-revolutionary force that creates division. At the moment we lose the naïve anticipation that ideologies will naturally disappear shortly, it is so natural to presume that they will be eliminated through compulsive means.

7-51 In collectivistic society, a lie necessary for maintaining the society is accepted as truth. Think about the false statistics on productivity of communist society and pseudo-science of the Nazi Germany. People who think that such lies were made because the Nazis and communists were evil and they cannot exist in properly formed collectivistic society do not understand the nature of collectivism.

7-52 *The planners have many good reasons to lie.* If you ever read an ancient Chinese literature called *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, you probably would remember the scene where Cao Cao tells a lie to his thirsty soldiers that a plum garden is nearby. Soldiers were able to overcome the thirst and safely cross over the hill. Leaving alone the story of *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, there are many cases in which white lies told by wise leaders save their groups and are told as tales.

7-53 The planners of collectivistic society have the right and obligation to make use of their psychological knowledge - remember that the planners of resource-based economy are engineers - to make up lies for the best outcome. Blaming of responsibility for policy failure on liberalists and opponents can be justified, as long as it is the method of achieving 'maximum happiness for the majority' and 'construction of utopia.'

7-54 Further, they might argue that failed policies are successful in order to prevent confusion. They might even make up pseudo-science to justify the system. [49] This is better than moving away from construction of the optimal society by neglecting confusion to take place in the society. In fact, such lies are not different from the lie told by Cao Cao.

7-55 But whether or not it is the best means for the planners, it always results in death of the truth. Truth is no longer truth but falls into something we need to trust for maintaining and unifying the system. The planners will be forced to suppress scholars trying to tell the truth. Uncontrolled fields of study disappear. All theories must be examined by the authorities to verify their appropriateness, or more accurately, social benefits.

7-56 A field of study loses its creativity when all views are controlled by the authorities. Moderate description that the speed of academic development will be slowed down is not enough to correctly describe the enormous consequence. Academic development, even including natural sciences, practically stops. Science cannot persist without critical thinking. Also, technological development will also stop as a natural consequence.

7-57 Even the technology on automation cannot develop faster than it does in market economy. Soviet Union was unable to self-sufficiently secure CNC technology until it collapsed. Market economy -

which is often criticized by collectivists including Jacque Fresco for requiring labor to maintain the system - was the first to secure this technology. This happened because planned economy is so inferior, not because market economy is superior.

7-58 The city that Jacque Fresco dreamed of may actually be constructed one day, whether it be 500 years from now or 2,000 years. However, the image of people living in that city will be completely different from what Jacque Fresco imagined. It may be similar to the future described in *1984* by George Orwell. It may be similar to the future described in *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley.

7-59 Jacque Fresco said that our descendants will blame us for making a wrong choice. But I cannot say the same. I can't think they will have enough intelligence to even blame us. Once existing cities are excavated and destroyed, there is no way they can learn about the past. They might thank us for creating an environment which will be much interior than today's environment, believing that today's conditions would have been worse.

7-60 Someone might realize the social contradiction or encounter traces of the past civilization uncontrolled and undistorted by the planners through some kind of miraculous luck - whether or not it is an intentional remain left by the last generation of liberalism - and begin an anti-establishment movement. However, he will soon recognize how hard it is to start a revolution in an environment where distribution of all goods is controlled and monitored. He needs to risk his life to gain the principle of freedom discarded by ancestors.

7-61 However, our story ends here.

7-62 One thing that supporters of The Venus Project do not realize is that *advanced technology of today can not only be used to improve quality of life but to suppress and monitor us*. Jacque Fresco says that we must be able to grant the right to use all technological capacities to small number of engineers who claim they can resolve the problem. Few people think serious about the threat imposed by this idea.

7-63 They will decide what we wear and eat. They will decide where we live. In these fields, the range of our choice will be limited to the range they offer. Along with this, there are numerous fields for which we have no right of choice. They will decide what we produce. They will decide what we can freely possess and what to share. They will decide what to educate us.

7-64 We are seriously deceiving ourselves if we were to believe that we are simply returning to the constraints and restrictions that governed economic activities in the past and that the power we are going to face is not as extreme as that of the Middle Age. Means of control used at that time were not sufficient enough to be compelling. At the time, there was wide range of activities in which individuals could be self-sufficient. Individuals could freely behave according to their choice within the scope.

7-65 The situation has now become completely different. The planning body today has to give incomparably many commands. Hitler and Stalin were not the most terrible dictators in the history because they were more wicked compared to Roman tyrants. It was because their power was stronger. Today's technology is much better. Imagine what would happen if it were to be used by a tyrant.

7-66 Some people say we should try out resource-based economy despite the possibility of failure. The old-fashioned attack saying 'how do we know it's going to fail without trying' is based on the thought that we should experiment on all social systems with slight chance of success. [\[50\]](#) Such thought is

more dangerous than they think. *It can be compared to human body experiment. Failure of an experiment means loss of ability to conduct another experiment.*

7-67 More importantly, we have no way of precisely determining whether resource-based economy is being successful or not. Jacque Fresco once said that resource-based economy can be accomplished in 10 years. This means it takes at least 10 years to accomplish. We cannot judge whether his alternative will be a success or failure in 3~5 years.

7-68 *If nothing is improved despite the troubles you went through for 10 years, are you willing to give up on the expectation that supported your efforts for 10 years, the expectation that everything will be better one day, return back to where you were? If this is too short, are you determined to make that choice after 15 years? Are you ready to undo 15 years of history? I don't know a single supporter of The Venus Project with such resolution.*

7-69 The new generation won't even know what market economy is, because ceaseless ideological education will only infuse the idea that market economy is far worse than resource-based economy. If we lose the chance, we won't even be able to go back. We must disregard the belief that helped us break through various hardships in 15 years. We have to give up on the belief that resource-based economy will be successful. We have no idea whether we can do so.

7-70 Mistakes that occur in resource-based economy during the transition period cannot demonstrate that resource-based economy is destined to fail. We have to wait until resource-based economy is completed or at least until we can ascertain that Jacque Fresco's plan in the transition period cannot complete resource-based economy. In substance, it can only mean the following statement: *We will learn that our experiment was a failure after we mess up everything to irrevocable state.*

7-71 Even if many people quickly give up on the possibility of resource-based economy and start the anti-establishment movement to return back to market economy, still more people who believe resource-based economy to be the only way to save mankind won't leave their opponents alone. They are going to argue that various problems have to occur in transition period and nothing can be said about resource-based economy yet.

7-72 As the possibility of anti-establishment movement destroying the system increases, the belief to stop such dangerous act using strong means will also grow. It is needless to say which among protecting the mankind from counter-revolution by executing or imprisoning 100 libertarians and neglecting such libertarians from destroying resource-based economy accomplished through revolution will be chosen by faithful supporters of The Venus Project.

7-73 Such measure will always be taken before anti-establishment movement grows to become an actual threat to the system. The provisional government will turn into a more oppressive and suppressive dictatorship as it eliminates anti-establishment activists. Unless everyone miraculously becomes anti-establishment activist together, there is no possibility for the experiment on planned economy to stop in its early stage. We cannot leave our destiny up to such miracle.

7-74 We should worry more about the worst outcome than best outcome, and we need to approach alternatives that and over the right to use all of our technologies with the most critical mind. However, supporters of The Venus Project don't do so. They might worry about the worst result of neglecting market economy, but they are not worried about the worst result of their experiment.

7-75 It is generally not true to think that opponents of The Venus Project are not concerned about the worst outcome of the current system. In fact, the main reason why they oppose Jacque Fresco's plan is

because its consequence is even worse than the worst outcome of rejecting his plan. We should not accept it if we were to truly avoid the worst.

7-76 Furthermore, as this is forgotten by many supporters of The Venus Project, radical experiment like resource-based economy can only be accepted when social chaos becomes unbelievably gigantic. Deepening of economic crisis is not an unfortunate event to Jacque Fresco. In fact, he says the best way to completely collapse the current system is to leave it as is. [\[51\]](#)

7-77 Great social chaos will lead many people to starvation. It might give birth to desire for fascism instead of resource-based economy. Even if the revolution turns out to be a success, people who threw away logical thinking in despair might follow the planners of provisional government as religious leaders. This will make it easier for the planners to betray Jacque Fresco's expectation. There are much more risks we need to endure in following his plan.

7-78 Frankly speaking, the fact that Nazi used to stand for Nationalsozialistische or National Socialist is not widely known. Hitler despised communists because communism included the idea of internationalism. When we focus on economic system, we would have to classify Nazism and communism together as planned economy though their background ideologies are different. There was an undeniable similarity between the two ideologies: They were both collectivistic.

7-79 Differing ideologies beneath two collectivistic planned economies failed to create as large of a difference. There is no doubt that communist idea is much more ethical than Nazism. This is incomparable. However, such a huge difference was not enough to yield much more ethical things to happen in Soviet Union that went through communist revolution compared with Nazi Germany.

7-80 What economic crisis generally arouses is the desire for collectivism. Fascism, communism and resource-based economy commonly share the trait that they are collectivistic planned economies. Nobody would believe that Germans in 1920s had to choose communism in order to avoid fascism. Similarly, we don't have to choose resource-based economy to avoid fascism. As a religion cannot be an alternative of another religion, collectivism cannot substitute another.

7-81 When we chose collectivism in order to escape from the pain of reality, it always brought us a greater pain than what we were trying to eliminate. Tyranny of Stalin was more dreadful than Czar's state, and Hitler's seizure of power resulted in death of more people than the Great Depression. Even when the mankind chooses collectivism to overcome economic crisis, the effect can only get worse than its cause. In this case, the entire mankind will be permanently enslaved.

7-82 Someone might ask. Isn't there a way for the mankind to be freed from economic crisis, warfare, destruction of resources and labor? Do we need to accept them as destiny? It may be so, but I don't believe so. *The fact that collectivism cannot resolve a problem does not necessarily mean we cannot resolve the problem.* Collectivism is the most immature and primitive among methods we can use.

7-83 Many people believe that market economy inevitably results in economic crisis, warfare and resource destruction. They believe that as long as market economy exists, the mankind cannot be liberated from labor. None of these is true. We have many alternatives we can implement without educating the entire mankind or consciously control production and distribution of all goods. We will discuss about such alternatives in Chapter 10.

7-84 However, what's more important is the experimental program we would use to test such alternatives. There is no way to scientifically justify the inefficient method of completely destroying existing social system and experimenting on a social system fundamentally different in every aspect.

This primitive experiment in which failure results in loss of ability to start another experiment cannot be scientifically justified.

7-85 The experiment of changing social system is special in that the subject of experiment is our own environment. However, it does not mean there is no method of applying the principle of scientific experimentation to the society. Once we understand what scientific experiment means, we can automatically find out how to apply it to the society. We will learn about it in Chapter 8. The gamble demanded by Fresco on us is far away from scientific experiment.

[45] Properly speaking, he seems to regard these freedoms as being unimportant. The ground often used by Jacque Fresco to emphasize uselessness of the rule of law and democracy is that only technology can give electric vehicles and desalination plants. Unless he thinks that freedom of expression and personal freedom are not important and that only electric vehicles and desalination plants are important, there is no way such argument can be justified.

[46] The reason why such prejudices are interesting is because they tear down Jacque Fresco's claim that prejudice always serves to perpetuate the system. Is there anyone willing to raise an objection to the fact that people living in places with abundant water do not realize preciousness of water? If so, how can we exclude the possibility that we are not realizing preciousness of the rule of law because we are living in a society governed by the rule of law?

[47] Plato wrote, "But the height of all this abundance of freedom... is reached when slaves, males as well as female, who have been bought on the market, are every whit as free as those whose property they are... And what is the cumulative effect of all this? That all the citizens' hearts become so very tender that they get irritated at the mere sight of anything like slavery and do not suffer anybody to submit to its presence." Plato is saying exactly what I would like to say.

[48] Though for the purpose of accomplishing a good deed, most people hesitate using evil means when they encounter such type of choice. Refer to Michael Sandel's book named *Justice*. Refer to cognitive psychologist Marc Hauser's *Moral Minds* for strong evidence that this tendency is a moral instinct unrelated to our moral beliefs and ideologies.

[49] The most obvious case of this is the absurd goal of *Strong and Prosperous Country by 2012* announced in 1998 by North Korea. However, I mainly think about the windmill plan presented in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Napoleon's sweet talk that they should work hard because everyone will live well once the windmill is completed reminds me of Jacque Fresco's grand urban plan. It may be used by future planners as a means to make us accept tyranny as temporary and natural course of event

[50] Surprisingly, Jacque Fresco has similar view. He says in *Zeitgeist: Moving Forward*, "I think that every system that can be put to test should be put to test." This sounds specious, but it completely distorts the method of scientific experimentation. He is trying to use an experimental program which is scientifically wrong. Refer to Chapter 8 for the truly experimental program we must apply to our society.

[51] Refer to the FAQ page of The Venus Project website. Jacque Fresco writes on question #36, "I see the 'the turning point' of the future as resulting from a social and economic breakdown of existing social designs as older values become less effective." He repeats the same thing more directly in his film *Paradise or Oblivion*.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
Go to [prior chapter](#)
Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
Go to [prior chapter](#)
Go to [next chapter](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 8.

Because it is exactly a utopian engineering predicted by Karl Popper.

8-01 Summary) According to collectivists, we must first think about what is the best social system for us if we were to improve the society. Then we must completely destroy current system to accomplish it. Such teleological approach to social engineering is what Popper exactly referred to as utopian engineering. [52] Such experiment is incapable of teaching us large amount of knowledge, whether it succeeds or fails. It can be compared to an experiment in which variables are not controlled.

8-02 Experiment with uncontrolled variables fails to teach us any applicable knowledge. If we are experimenting the effect of environment on growth of a plant but have different temperature, sunlight exposure, soil and water supply to the experimental and control groups, we cannot find out the reason for difference in speed of growth between two groups. It may be able to tell us which among the two groups is a better environment, but that is all.

8-03 If the perspective of a utopian social engineer is consistently applied, we will have to destroy the society through another revolution and create a completely new society whenever problems occur in the new society we accomplish through revolution. In order to find the best among countless many social systems, we must completely destroy conditions of our lives without end. We cannot make such choice.

8-04 The society cannot be innovatively improved at once. We can only change one system at a time. This is the easiest experiment we can perform, and we can learn the most from this experiment. If we wished our descendants to live in a better world than we are, we must give them useful knowledge as an inheritance. There is only one experimental program we can use to do so, piecemeal engineering.

8-05 Karl Popper classifies social engineering into two types in *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. One is utopian engineering. It can be explained as follows: All rational behaviors must have rational purposes. If we were to behave rationally, what we need to do is to choose a rational purpose. This means that we must have the image of the best society we are trying to accomplish before starting a

social movement.

8-06 Utopian engineering can coexist with the belief that perfect society does exist or at least cannot be known. We can at least design a feasibly best society within the scope of our knowledge. Once we reach an agreement on the realizable image of the optimal society, what we need to do to accomplish it will become clear.

8-07 Of course, we must be careful about determining this rational purpose. It is the most important aspect of utopian social engineering. We should be careful about deciding this practical purpose, and this must be distinguished from intermediate purposes that are meaningful as methods and steps. This is boiled down to the following attitude: Utopian social engineers endeavor to find the ultimate and common cause of evilness instead of removing each evil.

8-08 Undoubtedly, The Venus Project is a utopian engineering. *Zeitgeist Addendum* says, "We must first find the true underlying cause. For the fact is: The selfish, corrupt power and profit-based groups are not the true source of the problem. They are symptoms." The Venus Project has never supported any social movements like the movement to abolish the Federal Reserve that can directly improve the situation. [53] They would say we should spend our time on a more important thing because such movement is not a fundamental solution. Construction of the best society is the more important thing.

8-09 Before I get into detailed criticism on utopian engineering, I would like to briefly talk about a healthier method called Piecemeal Engineering. Those who adopt this method may or may not have a blueprint about the ideal society, but they will not regard such thing as important. *They will set an ultimate purpose and find the most urgent evil in the society for modification instead of fighting for the purpose.*

8-10 The blueprints for piecemeal engineering are simple. They are the blueprints about single systems such as health, unemployment insurance and education reform. The damage from abuse of these blueprints is not large, and it is not so difficult to readjust them. They are less dangerous and therefore are less controversial. Thus, we have greater possibility of using democratic and logical means over passionate and violent methods.

8-11 The claim that we need not to configure the ultimate purpose of social engineering may sound absurd. However as a scientist conducting research about the effect of environment on plant growth doesn't need to have any conviction about the optimal environment in advance, people trying to improve the society do not necessarily have a view on what is the best society. Instead, we can hope to create the optimal society on day through repetition of mistakes and corrections. This holds true even when we don't know what the optimal society is like.

8-12 Therefore, the value of social engineering should be determined by whether it can bring some kind of *experimental knowledge* to us, because such experimental knowledge is the only thing we can permanently inherit down to our descendants. Accordingly, utopian engineering and piecemeal engineering represent two different experimental programs about the society. piecemeal engineering is superior to utopian engineering as an experimental program.

8-13 As we discussed earlier on, mistakes that occur in resource-based economy during the transition period cannot demonstrate that the experiment in resource-based economy is destined to fail. We will learn that our experiment has failed after everything is irreversibly messed up. If we are wise enough, we are going to stop the experiment before such things actually happen. However, this means we can never find out the result of our experiment.

8-14 We cannot expect utopian social engineering to always come to an end. If an experiment seems to fail, we should stop it. Judging whether an experiment will succeed or fail without seeing its end is a hasty decision, but we still have to make the judgment. If we have to do it one day, there is no reason why we shouldn't do so right now. There is no reason not to decide whether to try it by analyzing the experiment ahead.

8-15 Even if we succeed in finding out the failure of our experiment before things go irreversibly bad, we cannot gain much knowledge. Overall restructuring of the society is too elaborate an experiment. The most miscellaneous error accompanied by its setting can spoil the entire experiment. In this case, we cannot determine whether this experiment failed because of a simple mistake or was problematic since the beginning. [54]

8-16 We will have to spend too much time on each experiment. Much more, it is almost impossible to cope with the consequence of failure. Further, there are possibilities of the experiment being modified or altered. We may not learn any lessons after enduring significant loss every time. All of these demonstrate that utopian engineering is an interior experimental program.

8-17 The bigger problem is in extremely low applicability of knowledge obtained by utopian engineering. Let us assume we learned the fact that communism is destined to fail. This doesn't mean we learned that planned economy is destined to fail or democratic centralism is destined to fail. The simple fact of failure in communism can yield millions of interpretations. Even Jacque Fresco has his own interpretation.

8-18 Interpretations without persuasive power can be filtered by discussion, but this would simply reduce the number of interpretations from a million to a hundred. In the end, failure of communism cannot say anything more than the fact that communism fails. This is not an applicable knowledge. We might have to attempt planned economy once again, even if it actually is the cause of failure of communism.

8-19 I have only been talking about cases in which the experiment fails, but the opposite is the same. Successful experiment cannot teach us a lot. Let us assume that resource-based economy miraculously turned out to be a success. In this case, we have no idea as to what led to the difference between that and current society. This means that we have no knowledge we can apply to cope with a new problem that may occur in the new society we create.

8-20 If another problem occurs in resource-based economy, future utopian engineers must destroy the better society created by their ancestors by going through another revolution. They might reintroduce money. They simply learned that some market economies are worse than resource-based economy. They did not learn that market economy is always worse than resource-based economy. [55]

8-21 In conclusion, utopian engineering is similar to an experiment with uncontrolled variables. For example, imagine we are conducting an experiment about the effect of environment on plant growth. When we compare the experimental group with control, all variables including temperature, wind, sunlight, soil and water are different. This way, we would never be able to find out the reason why the speed of growth differs in experimental plants and control plants.

8-22 In social engineering, the experimental group is the alternative society we are trying to test. The control group is the existing society. This has a clear meaning. *We can learn the most through experiment in which only one system is changed at a time.* This is because we can only use this method to learn how systems harmonize with other systems and how to adjust the systems in order to make

them work according to our intent. [56]

8-23 In this case, failure of one experiment will not result in serious damage. Besides, we can easily readjust the experiment. As time goes on, our knowledge will be quickly accumulated. We might even be able to build up the same level of applicable knowledge as modern science about education system, political system and economic system. The fact that obsession about the best society leads to inability to further progress this task is one of Popper's strongest refutations against utopian engineering.

8-24 We simply try to learn from trials and errors, or by making mistakes and fixing them, about all problems. It is not rational to assume that complete restructuring of our society would immediately yield an operable system. Instead, many mistakes will occur due to lack of experience, and we can only expect to remove them through piecemeal engineering of slowly adjusting them for long time.

8-25 If we consistently apply utopian engineering, we would have to remove newly constructed society before starting over. Since the new start would not reach its completion, they will end up repeating this process without reaching anywhere. There is no utopian engineer who argues we should do this. They will say we should apply utopian engineering only once and then make use of piecemeal engineering.

8-26 This attitude can be justified only by the conviction that the first utopian engineering will be successful. Utopian engineering cannot sustain without such conviction. *Supporters of The Venus Project protesting against their opponents saying 'how do we know it is going to fail without even trying' are deceiving themselves. If we are unsure about whether utopian engineering will be successful or not, we naturally have to choose piecemeal engineering.*

8-27 Piecemeal engineering is the only experimental program we can use when we frankly acknowledge the fact that we don't know what the best society is. Utopian engineering cannot be used without a conviction that it is going to be successful. The question of 'how would we know whether it's going to succeed without trying' is the one and only proper questions that must be answered by all utopian engineers. However, it is rare to find utopian engineers who are willing to answer this kind of question.

8-28 Sometimes, moderate utopian engineers might acknowledge that the experiment of overturning the entire social system at once is unreasonable and propose a scaled experiment. This is not a completely bad attempt. However, it is still doubtful as to how valuable an experiment limited to a factory, village or area would be. The difficulty of designing a society is mainly in the fact that it handles a gigantic group of population. Experiments limited to regions cannot provide information we need. [57]

8-29 Experimentation of the best society should be carried out in an environment as similar as the environment it is going to be applied. An experiment intended to test resource-based economy to be applied throughout the entire planet should not be conducted in a region with abundant resources. Also, we cannot selectively choose people with special personalities, preferences and intellects to participate in the experiment. Material and human resources must be standardized if we were to experiment on resource-based economy.

8-30 The most difficult condition to be satisfied is the fact that all people participating in the experiment including planners should not know that the experiment will come to a stop once testing of resource-based economy is completed. This is as important in the experiment to test the best society as in psychological experiments, because whether or not the designed society succeeds depends on the behavior of participants. This can conceal the most critical problems of the system.

8-31 There is no reason for us to be greedy about seizing power if we knew we were participating in a simple experiment. The special experimental environment even turns the planners who will try to enjoy privileges once actual resource-based economy is constructed into altruistic beings. For the same reason, we can more easily trust the planners. This suppresses our suspicion about the planners and social division caused by such suspicion.

8-32 We cannot start resource-based economy after constructing all cities. We have to construct cities after starting with resource-based economy. However, it is not an exaggeration to say that most of difficult problems that can turn resource-based economy into horror exist in this transition period. In order to discover them, we may need to conduct an experiment to test resource-based economy using infrastructure during its transition period instead of completed resource-based economy.

8-33 In other words, separate from the experiment to find out how successful the completed resource-based economy is going to be, we must design an experiment to test whether we can reach completion of resource-based economy using the provisional government suggested by Jacque Fresco as a means. Utopian engineers always tend to neglect this. It is more important to test the plan they will use to create the best society than to test the best society itself.

8-34 How many participants do we need for each experiment? It is easy for members of community to cooperate in a society so small that all members have human relationship with one another. This may not be applicable to large scale societies in which people act in anonymity. Anthropologists assume that the size limit of group that can maintain mutual intimacy is 150 persons. [58] In order to test resource-based economy, we need at least 10 times this minimal size, or 1,500 participants.

8-35 The requirements above may seem somewhat excessive. However, they are the most natural requirements to be satisfied before the experiment on resource-based economy can have any meaning. Without these conditions, important problems of resource-based economy we discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 will not be revealed through experiment. It is simply a deception to argue that a specific society is the best society based on an experiment originally designed to conceal the most critical problems.

8-36 At least, there is an experiment that satisfies all of these requirements. For example, it can be an experiment that starts out resource-based economy in a relatively small area. Nobody would disrupt people empathizing on resource-based economy from purchasing land, installing solar power plan, and managing resources. Once it becomes evident that resource-based economy can offer better quality of life, number of participants will naturally increase.

8-37 However, this must be carried out for the actual purpose of improving quality of life, just like the planetary project of Jacque Fresco. In other words, it should not be a temporary event with limited period or purpose. All participants of the experiment must believe that the experiment is actually being conducted to improve their life quality as actual resource-based economy would. The only way to do so is to actually designing it in that way.

8-38 There is another merit here. Collectivistic planned economy like resource-based economy is easier to succeed in small societies. It would not be as difficult to be successful in a small society. Of course, many new problems can occur as the society grows. Participants of the experiment may be able to sequentially resolve such new problems as they expand the size of their society. [59]

8-39 Looking from the perspective of the entire society, this is a kind of piecemeal engineering. What we handled before is an experiment that accumulates small effects inflicted on all members of the society, and this experiment accumulates small number of people receiving large influence. The reason

why most of small-scale collectivistic economic communities remain small is because they can only persist as small groups. If resource-based economy is truly valid, it would be able to show different aspect.

8-40 Still there is another reason why we must oppose utopian engineering. Utopian engineers demand us to decide an ultimate social purpose and devise a detailed and long-term plan to accomplish this purpose. That is, despite the fact that we have little knowledge to decide such grandiose matters, they argue that we must devise a rational plan for the entire society. As of now, sociological knowledge required for large-scale engineering does not even exist at all.

8-41 The blueprints for piecemeal engineering are relatively simple. It is easier to reach an agreement about existing evils and how to improve them than to agree upon the ideal line and method of satisfying the ideal line. It is extremely difficult to discuss about the best society. Nobody can determine whether it is realizable, it brings actual improvements or it includes some kind of pain, and what kind of methods there is to realize such society.

8-42 We cannot determine the best society by the majority rule. The number of individual best societies and blueprints to accomplish them exceeds thousands. Even if it can be determined by the majority rule, there is a problem. There is no reason for the majority of people to agree with one of many optimal societies. In fact, there is greater probability of having more people oppose the society determined as best.

8-43 Even if a policy was selected by the majority vote, it may seem for many people as a path to the worse society. They might believe that violent methods are required to save the mankind from the worst. Ignorance or even destruction of democratic procedure is often regarded as legitimate when there is a more urgent purpose than to protect democratic procedure. [60] Determining the path of mankind is so important that it can justify any violence.

8-44 The degree of ideological unification demanded by utopian engineering is beyond imagination. The methodology of utopian engineering in which an ultimate purpose is configured first is useless if modification of the purpose is permitted. [61] If measures taken are distant from realization of the newly configured purpose, we have to change our direction according to the new purpose. All sacrifices we make until then become meaningless, and we will have to start everything over.

8-45 However, reconstruction of society is a project that can bring inconvenience to many people for significant time period. Those who enthusiastically support the project at the beginning might start complaining that their lives are not getting any better. What seemed as the best nation to people who first created the blueprint may not be seen the same to them. The blueprint about the best society, which becomes the basis of utopian engineering, is extremely vulnerable to passage of time.

8-46 Accordingly, utopian engineers are obligated to consciously educate their descendants so they will have exactly same idea about the best nation. This is because they can only prevent degeneration of the idea they decided as the best nation through this method. Such belief that all members of the society must have the same ideal is what we referred to as collectivism in Chapter 2. *Utopian engineering cannot sustain without collectivistic ideology, especially when it requires long-term plan.*

8-47 Utopian engineering demands the present and future mankind to have a common conviction about matters difficult because we have not yet accumulated sociological knowledge it requires, and important since a single wrong decision can lead to destruction. Such common conviction can never be accomplished as a result of rational discussion. It would be rational to predict such unification to be

accomplished by a type of collectivistic ideology.

8-48 Popper has already written about this matter: "We see now that the Utopian approach can be saved only by the Platonic belief in one absolute and unchanging ideal, together with two further assumptions, namely (a) that there are rational methods to determine once and for ever what this ideal is, and (b) what the best means of its realization are. Only such far-reaching assumptions could prevent us from declaring the Utopian methodology to be utterly futile."

8-49 He continues, "But even Plato himself and the most ardent Platonists would admit that (a) is certainly not true; that there is no rational method for determining the ultimate aim, but, if anything, only some kind of intuition. Any difference of opinion between Utopian engineers must therefore lead, in the absence of rational methods, to the use of power instead of reason, i.e. to violence."

8-50 Plato actually believed we can examine the idea of best nation by intuition. Jacque Fresco has similar argument: "And we really need to understand that. That's what's gonna bring us joy too, and pleasure. That's what's missing in our lives right now. We can call it spirituality, but the fact of the matter is joy comes from that bliss of connectedness. It's this amazing wonderful feeling, and you know it when you get it."

8-51 Needless to say, this is far away from rational method. It divides human beings into two types, people who know pleasure and people who don't. The majority of people who simply cannot feel such pleasure must unquestioningly accept the words of people arguing they know such pleasure, hoping they will be able to feel it one day, as people cannot see their ideas by intellectual intuition in the utopia of Plato do. Perhaps this is exactly what Jacque Fresco wants from us.

8-52 In this Chapter, I am not trying to say that all types of radical revolutions are bad. Starting a revolution when there is no means for us to progressively improve the society is legitimate. However, the goal of this revolution must be limited. The revolution must be intended to remove specific evil, not to realize an abstract good. And, most importantly, *this revolution must be a means to gain piecemeal method.*

8-53 We must accurately understand the choices put in front of us. We do not have a choice between democracy and anarchy. [62] *We can only choose between democratic government and the so-called provisional government with the right to control everything immediately after the revolution.* Democracy, no matter how useless it has become, is not something we should destroy through revolution but something we need to reconstruct and improve by revolution.

8-54 Some people complain that corporations today exercise so many lobbies that limit the function of democratic devices. This may be true, but the claim of collectivists that this problem can be resolved by abolition of money is absurd. Lobbying is only one of many corruptions of the government. If we cannot prevent corruptions committed by the government democratically elected today, it would be much harder to prevent corruptions of the gigantic government demanded by the collectivistic plan.

8-55 We have already verified in Chapter 4 that lobbying is fundamentally impossible in nations with complete rule of law. It only occurred because we permitted discretion of the government. So the solution is simple. It would be to reduce discretion of the government and further strengthen the rule of law. Unlike Jacque Fresco's computer, this is a solution that has been progressively improved by ancestors and can be immediately applied.

8-56 In fact, the rule of law is an essential condition for democracy to become effective. If the elected people exercised arbitrary power, they would be the main body applying the method of substantiation and experimentation to our system. Knowledge accumulated by predecessors will become useless every time they are newly elected. Democracy can be a method of piecemeal engineering only if it is used to establish and improve general rules. As long as this principle is observed, we have no reason to worry about lobbying.

8-57 Utopian engineering is related with the desire to construct a truly beautiful world, which is not only better and more rational compared to now but also is wearing a completely new clothes instead of messy clothes with old cloths. However, such *aesthetic enthusiasm* is only valuable when it is suppressed by reason and sense of responsibility. If not, it can easily develop into neuropathy or hysterical excitement.

8-58 Aestheticism and radicalism make us throw out our reason and take on a desperate hope about political miracle. Such irrational behavior coming out of intoxication about the beautiful world can be referred to as romanticism. This heaven may be found in the past or future. It may be able to preach to 'return back to the nature' or 'proceed to the world filled with love and beauty.' However, it always appeals to our emotion instead of reason.

8-59 Utopian engineering is nothing more than a dangerous gamble with the future of our descendants at stake. We should not jump into aestheticism without consideration just to satisfy our quick temper. If we really wanted our descendants to live in a better world, we must endure the pain. We have to carefully and progressively inherit knowledge to be used by descendants.

8-60 Piecemeal engineering is itself an alternative to resource-based economy. However, someone might demand more specific means to free the mankind from labor and allow sustainable use of resources. We are now ready to handle them, but before that, we must liberate Fresco. The last anticipation about him will melt down like snow once we realize that his scientific methodology is not scientific at all or even academic.

[52] Here, the term utopia does not refer to perfect society. A utopian engineer may or may not think they can create a perfect society one day. Of course, communists as well as Plato seen by Popper as a model of utopian engineer did not believe that realization of absolutely perfect society is possible. It cannot be the standard of classifying between utopian engineering and other social engineering. Refer to the main text of Chapter 8 for definition of utopian engineering by Karl Popper.

[53] A utopian social engineer does not always have such perspective. Many revolutionary Marxists support social movements for piecemeal improvement. However, they only understand such social movements as methods of moving up the revolution. For example, social movements can be used as tools to grow the organization for revolution. Improvement in quality of life is not what revolutionary Marxists are trying to directly accomplish through social movements. Like Jacque Fresco, revolutionary Marxists in 1920s wished to become saviors after collapse of the capitalistic system. They actually wanted to accelerate collapse of the system. Popper wrote, "According to this assertionâ€ Only the vain hopes created by democracy were holding it back in the more advanced countries. Thus the destruction of democracy through the fascists could only promote the revolution."

[54] Most of communists today find the reason for failure of Soviet Union in Stalin's state or external

factors. Likewise, supporters of resource-based economy will not find the reason for its failure from the contradiction of resource-based economy when it is actually attempted. The problem is that such argument has persuasive power that cannot be neglected. What utopian experiment is trying to experiment on is practically irrefutable.

[55] We should not think that future utopian engineers won't attempt market economy just because many market economies were worse than resource-based economy. We know the fact that all collectivistic planned economies failed. Actually, they were far worse than our society. Nevertheless, we don't think that collectivistic planned economy is proved to fail. Of course, Jacque Fresco clearly said that all market economies fail. However, Jacque Fresco's opinion is not important here. As Jacque Fresco rejected existing economics, future utopian engineers will reject Jacque Fresco's economics. They might refer to his economics as an ideology. Utopian engineering always begins from tearing down an idea that sustains a society. Future utopian engineering is not an exception.

[56] Somebody might say that this is a hasty argument. For example, it may be possible to deduce principles applied in the society from biology. However, this is as difficult as inducing biology from physics. Experimental method still seems to be the strongest method of acquiring knowledge about social problems. Refer to Chapter 9 for actual attempts made to explain the society in terms of biological knowledge about human beings.

[57] Popper reveals this with relative clarity. He wrote in Chapter 9 of the first volume of *Open Society and Its Enemies*, "An experiment in socialism would be of little value if carried out under laboratory conditions, for instance, in an isolated village, since what we want to know is how things work out in society under normal social conditions."

[58] Here, I am citing the view of Robin Dunbar. He discovered the relationship between the degree of development in brain neo-cortex and overall size of the group. According to him, when size of the group reaches 150 persons, people begin to lose track of who is doing what to whom. Refer to *How many friends does one person need?* by Robin Dunbar. 150 is the most efficient size of the group. Refer to *The tipping point* by Malcolm Gladwell.

[59] People worried about the possibility of such experiment from failing because of suppression by the governmental authority must realize the fact that this is the greatest evidence that The Venus Project will succeed when left intact. It can bring greater social influence than 1,000 video clips going on and on about Jacque Fresco's personal opinions. It is foolish to worry about suppression by the governmental authority without even trying.

[60] This attitude is best shown by supporters of The Venus Project. They believe that scientific principles - which are more accurately described as their opinions - must determine policies instead of democratic majority vote. They will not accept the best society determined by the majority vote if it differs from their thoughts. They are likely to persist with their thoughts using violent means. However, what I want to stress out is that this attitude is not entirely wrong. If the government is trying to pass an ethnic cleansing policy, we must prevent it even if the majority agrees with the policy. Fortunately, we very rarely face such choice. Policies handled by piecemeal engineering are mostly small, and damage from failure of such policies is minor. The problem of utopian engineering is that it forces us to face important choices for almost everything.

[61] This makes it more difficult to apply democracy to utopian engineering. We cannot force the future mankind to not modify our long-term plan. We cannot deprive the mankind of the right to decide its problems after 15 years. This means abolition of democracy. The only thing a utopian engineer can do is to simply hope that the mankind, or at least its planners, after 15 years will have the same goal as we do now.

[62] Anarchism means we must give up on all plans. It cannot coexist with utopian engineering as well as piecemeal engineering because it means abolition of social engineering. However, anarchism does not pursue complete disorder. Anarchists expect people to create a spontaneous order once all systems are removed. In my view, this is at least healthier than utopian engineering. But if anarchism argues that a provisional government is necessary in the transition period on the way to anarchy, it is simply utopian engineering wearing a mask. What they are actually attempting is exactly opposite of anarchism. It expands the role of the government. The problem is that most of ideas arguing for revolution based on helplessness of the politics today are such false anarchism. I doubt whether there had been any revolution that truly pursued anarchism.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 9.

Because it is not based on a scientific method, and not even based on a science.

9-01 Summary) It is not true to say that we can always predict how human group will behave in a specific society using knowledge about the effect of environment on human beings. Even if we have enough knowledge to perfectly predict human behavior under specific environment, it is still difficult to deductively estimate the behavior of human group within specific social system. It is nonsense to think that we can draw scientific conclusion on such problems without any statistical physics approach.

9-02 Fresco's opinion about human nature is opposite to opinions by most of socio-biologists, evolutionary psychologists and geneticists. Human beings, like all other animals, are only altruistic to the extent advantageous for survival of genes. Commonness between different tribal societies that are completely isolated in terms of culture and space overwhelms difference. Bloody conflict, obstinate class order and taboo are common in all types of tribal societies.

9-03 New terms created by Fresco in order to replace existing terms with prejudice are not academic, let alone scientific. The definitions of resource-based economy and money-based economy are unbelievably unclear that we cannot even ascertain whether they contradict each other. Vocabularies and classifications he created bring about more critical prejudices instead of eliminating them.

9-04 If one cold-headedly analyzed the so-called scientific methodology of Fresco, he will only find

complete ignorance about the subject, vague idea, intentional and critical ambiguity, extreme jump of thoughts, humanistic inference and guessing that always replace scientific deductive reasoning, and unbelievable prevalence of academic dishonesty. Calling this as scientific methodology is nothing more than an insult on Newton, Einstein and Schrodinger.

9-05 As Jacque Fresco correctly pointed out, human behavior is determined by a complex interaction between genes and environment. We cannot always distinguish between behaviors determined by genes and behaviors determined by the environment. Most of behaviors cannot be explained without understanding the complex interaction between the two. The effect of genes on human behavior can be completely changed by the environment in which they operate.

9-06 However, we should not think that Jacque Fresco will be able to remove all prejudices just because he succeeded in removing one prejudice - which in fact is not very difficult to remove -. There is a truly important prejudice that has scarcely been discussed. It is the belief that we can easily predict movement of the system created by elements once we completely understand movements of such elements that compose the system.

9-07 I would like to especially emphasize that in most cases, properties of a system differ from properties of its constituents. Properties of water are completely different from properties of molecules that make up water. No property of molecules discontinuously changes. Individual water molecules do not have a property equivalent to gas-liquid phase transition. Sudden change in density and property under 1 atmospheric pressure and 100 degrees Celsius is the property of water which is not possessed by individual molecules.

9-08 *We must not conclude that human groups will share the same attributes with individuals.* Individuals have conscience, whereas groups do not. The belief that there must also be a social environment that can turn large group of population good if there is an environment that can turn individuals good is wrong. The problem of handling large group of population is not the same as handling individuals.

9-09 First, we need to summarize the terms we will be using in this Chapter. I would like to sue the term human nature, but it can be easily misunderstood as a term referring to specific human behavior or character determined solely by genes without relation to the environment. What I want to express is actually closer to a complex function that determines how human behavior, personality and belief will change according to the environment. I am going to use the term nature function, though it seems a little difficult.

9-10 In addition, we must distinguish between individual environment that determines individual behavior and personality through interaction with genes and social environment applied to large group of population. Influence by surrounding people has greater impact on formation of individual personality. Individual environment actually includes behavior of surrounding people and more universally includes behavior of all individuals excluding him.

9-11 Social environment is completely different. It refers to the political and economic system that becomes the background of resource, technology and individual interaction. This may or may not include culture and ideology. Here, we can accept the thoughts of Marx and Jacque Fresco that they are mere outcomes of political and economic system. Whichever it is, social environment does not include specific behaviors of individuals that compose the society.

9-12 It is now clear as to what is the difficult part. *We may know social environment of the society we are trying to create, but we do not know about individual environment that determines behavior of each individual.* Even if we pretend we knew the nature function and initial status of all individuals, we cannot easily determine whether the society will succeed or not. We must acknowledge the fact that this is a complicated problem and need to make appropriate intellectual efforts.

9-13 This is not different from the difficulty that exists in statistical physics, for instance to deduce properties of water from properties of individual water molecules. It is not difficult to predict how a water molecule will behave under specific environment. The problem is that the environment we need to understand for such prediction includes position of all other water molecules. In order to predict behavior of one water molecule, we must know position of all water molecules.

9-14 One of methods that help theoretically solve this type of problem is mean field approximation. [\[63\]](#) Unfortunately, it does not yield accurate answer in all cases. There are many systems of statistical physics in which mean field approximation is not accurate despite the fact that each component moves according to a much simpler principle compared to water molecules. It is more difficult to solve the problems theoretically. Statistical physicists often need to rely on computer simulations instead of theories.

9-15 Information scientists try to gain about models of statistical physics is not immense. This is nothing more than finding out whether phase transition exists and conditions under which it exists. We hardly know anything about systems of particles that follow much simpler principles than human beings. Since nature function of human beings differs according to genes, it is not only complex but also diverse. Therefore, it is more difficult to study properties of a society than you imagine.

9-16 We can theoretically predict phase transition of water. However, it is impossible unless we make a conscious effort to deduce properties of water from properties of each water molecule. We cannot expect to magically understand properties of water using our understanding about properties of water molecules. We can only rely upon scientific methodology based on demonstration.

9-17 Similarly, we cannot think we will be able to naturally draw desirable structure of human society from nature function. We have to use scientific demonstration method. I think that this work is also most likely to be accomplished through statistical physics. This is because deduction of system properties from properties of its constituents exactly belongs to statistical physics.

9-18 This is not a perfectly unrealistic story. As a student of statistical physics, I meet people who make the same attempt every time I participate in academic conferences. Their research still remains at the level of simple modeling on spreading of information on the internet. However, it may one day become possible to formulate a model that describes the entire society. By that time, it would be possible to apply scientific methodology to social sciences.

9-19 Of course, this is far away from what Jacque Fresco is trying. Instead of clarifying his assumption and simplifications to come up with deductive reasoning, he relies on poor humanistic inference. If it is difficult to draw satisfactory conclusion based on strict approach of natural sciences due to complexity of problems handled in social sciences, he can say so. The act of deceiving humanistic inference as methodology of natural sciences is merely a representative case of intellectual dishonesty.

9-20 When we use strict standard of logic, Jacque Fresco's error is obvious. He is confusing between the environment that determines individual behavior and social environment that can be changed

through revolution. We can only change social environment, specifically political system and economic system, through revolution. If we want to discuss possibility of resource-based economy being successful, we should start the discussion from political system and economic system to be created by resource-based economy.

9-21 The argument that cooperative environment creates cooperative people may be mostly correct. However, is cooperative environment in this context really the social environment we mentioned above? Of course the answer is no. In fact, cooperative environment refers to an environment in which neighbors behave cooperatively more than anything else. *If all surrounding people behaved selfishly, a person will grow up as a selfish individual under social environment of resource-based economy.*

9-22 It is a mere circular reasoning to presume that most people are altruistic and argue that somebody in resource-based economy must become altruistic. Using the same method, I can argue that someone in resource-based economy must become selfish by presuming that most people are selfish. It is appropriate to expect someone to do the same when everyone else is committing murder and rape in a society that cannot punish people.

9-23 Fresco's claim may indicate that once everyone becomes altruistic, such situation can be maintained for long time. In other words, the situation in which all people behave altruistically seems to correspond to a type of equilibrium state in his system. But this is not sufficient to prove that resource-based economy will ultimately turn people altruistic. We should first examine whether this is a stable equilibrium state or unstable equilibrium state.

9-24 If a ball is placed at the center of a round bowl, we can say it is in stable equilibrium state. We can slightly move the position of ball by pushing it, but it will eventually return to its original position. On the contrary if a ball is placed on top of a dome, we would refer to it as unstable equilibrium state. As soon as the ball moves 0.1 cm away from the center, it will fall off to the ground without returning to its original position.

9-25 It is extremely difficult to determine whether the state of everyone in resource-based economy being altruistic is stable or unstable. Let us consider an example with easier model. In this model, an individual can only be in one of the two states, being good or evil. An individual has greater probability of being good if there are more good people around him. Probability of the individual being evil is greater if there are more evil people. Let the ratio of good people around him be x and the probability of him being good be $f(x)$.

9-26 If the distribution of good and evil is always geographically uniform, we can say that goodness or evilness of an individual is determined by how many good people are there on average. [64] Now, consider two models with different values of $f(x)$. One is $f(x)=x^2$. The other is $f(x)=-x^2+2x$. Both models satisfy the condition that when x is 1, $f(x)$ is also 1. The two models are identical in the way that if everyone is good, this state can be maintained.

9-27 However, there is a large difference between the two models. In the former model, $f(x)$ is always smaller than x . This means that the probability of an individual being evil is greater than the ratio of evil people, as long as there are one or more evils. If a single person becomes evil, it will eventually prosper to cover the entire society. The latter environment is exactly opposite. If there is a single good person, the probability of an individual being good is greater than the ratio of good people. The state of everyone being good is only stable in the latter environment.

9-28 Why do we have to care about this? Isn't it sufficient enough if we can make everyone good and

maintain this state? It is right. The problem is that unexpected events can always occur. Natural disasters, mistakes made by the planners and accidents change the environment. 'Abandoned experiences' that Fresco pointed out as harmful for children in infancy can occur by death of parents due to accident. Fosterers cannot replace parents, no matter how considerate they may be.

9-29 The probability of unexpected events is the same as what we call temperature in statistical physics. Electron in hydrogen is mostly in ground state, but it sometimes becomes unstably excited. The rate of this event is determined by temperature. However, temperature is the most important variable in statistical physics instead of being a secondary variable. As shown by the case of water, temperature can sometimes change the stable state in statistical physics. [65]

9-30 There is no doubt about the fact that resource-based economy immediately after the revolution corresponds to an extremely high temperature environment. Social confusion which inevitably follows sudden change and immaturity of the planners who have to work on things that the mankind has never succeeded will increase the probability of unexpected events to an unprecedented level. Unstable equilibrium state will not be sustained for a single moment.

9-31 In my opinion, resource-based economy is extremely vulnerable to unexpected events. If there are no laws and punishments, a single villain would result in enormous social chaos. *The trust between people demanded by the social environment called resource-based economy is always greater than the actual trust between people who make up the environment.* In other words, $f(x)$ is always smaller than x . This is the reason why I believe that the all-altruistic state of resource-based economy is closer to an unstable equilibrium state than stable equilibrium state.

9-32 A problem remains even if resource-based is actually in stable equilibrium state. It may only be locally stable. While an eraser stood up vertically is stable within small angle of about 10 degrees, but it falls over once greater impact is applied. Does such thing also exist in statistical physics? Of course it does. Representative example is super-cooled water that remains in liquid state below zero temperature. Statistical physicists refer to it as metastable state.

9-33 Let us design a more interesting model. In this model, the probability of an individual becoming evil is determined by how many evil people there are and how many crimes occur in places geographically close to him. Let x be the ratio of evil people among 100 people closest to him including himself and let y be the ratio of people who committed crime. In this case, the probability of him becoming evil is $(x/2)+y$.

9-34 Let us now consider two social environments called A and B. A has a criminal law to suppress crimes. If there is no criminal law, an evil person commits crime. That is, $x=y$ is true. On the other hand if a criminal law exists, only 1/3 of evil people commit crime. However, there is a cost. As pointed out by Jacques Fresco, criminal law is an irrational system that makes the society more irrational. [66] It increases the probability of an individual being evil by 5%.

9-35 B does not have a criminal law. Instead, it has an education system that can get rid of crime by turning people good. This decreases the probability of an individual being evil by 5%. Separately, both A and B has temperature, or possibility of unexpected event. Accordingly, the probability we calculated may differ by about 5% on average. Our interest is about which among A and B to choose if we had to choose one of the two societies.

9-36 In case of social environment B, about 5% of people are expected to maintain evil state for long time. Difference from the earlier model is that it is definitely in stable equilibrium. For instance, states

in which 2% of people are evil or 7% of people are evil will gradually move towards 5%. The former happens by unexpected events and the latter happens by the influence of education system that controls evil people and crime. This clearly appears attractive.

9-37 On the contrary, A does have stable equilibrium state but it is not as attractive as the state in B, because about 30% of people are expected to be evil in the stable state of this society. Even the crime rate is 10%. Needless to say, this is higher than 5% crime rate of society B where criminal law does not exist. You might make fun of the criminal law in A and consider it as being useless.

9-38 However, this problem has a trap. The stable state of society B we discussed is actually a metastable state. As soon as the ratio of evil people exceeds 10%, education loses its ability to suppress spread of evil. Even if the ratio of evil people is 5%, there is a change of a cluster of 12 evil people gathered at a spot. Such cluster, once formed, never disappears. It will proliferate at a tremendous rate until 95% of the entire society is covered by evilness.

9-39 I did not design A and B to accurately correspond with market economy and resource-based economy. There is no meaning in doing so, but it is possible to turn B into a better social environment than A by changing some conditions. Do not place excessively large meaning on A and B. The lessons we need to learn are as follows: First, intuition is not always right. Second, it is impossible to scientifically determine success of social environment without considering details of statistical dynamics.

9-40 Nothing has yet been demonstrated about success of resource-based economy. This Chapter explains that it is practically impossible to scientifically prove it. It is extremely difficult to scientifically deduce from nature function of human beings whether a specific social environment or system will be succeed or fail, and it cannot be performed yet without introducing a daring assumption with extremely low reliability.

9-41 I am not saying we should give up on it. We should not stop such attempt. The problem is that the impatience of making hasty decision and attitude of skipping all essential intermediate processes are not helpful for improving the society or developing science. This is unquestionable when academic performance of my colleague statistical physicists is compared with poor claims of Fresco.

9-42 *Correct attitude of a scientist is to frankly confess that he doesn't know things that he cannot perfectly draw, not to make a bluff that he can find out about everything.* As already emphasized in Chapter 8, it is clear that experimental method based on piecemeal engineering is the only way to save us from the state of ignorance for some time. We do not have a magical method of determining success for a given social environment without such effort.

9-43 Perhaps I used too much space to explain something obvious. However, the purpose of this Chapter is not simply to reproach the so-called scientific methodology of Jacque Fresco which is actually unscientific. Through this Chapter, I struggled to demonstrate a more sound scientific methodology that can be distinguished from the method of Jacque Fresco. I believe I am not the only one who finds joy of precise deduction instead of supposition.

9-44 The best method of distinguishing between scientific methodology and its imitation is to see whether its argument is fun. Pseudo-science has a tendency to convey emotional affection instead of fun. They always talk about what is emotionally correct, not about what is logically correct. Poor but emotional persuasion is used in order to inspire the ethical demand that the subject of explanation must be correct, not to give a conviction that it is correct. Those who are trying to apply scientific thinking

should naturally be aware about it.

9-45 It is not a good idea to talk about statistical physics if we were to focus on dishonesty and deception of Jacque Fresco as a scholar. We should move on to the fields of genetics and evolutionary psychology. Once they realize the fact that stories proudly told by Jacque Fresco as if to represent opinions of scientists are actually opposite of stories told by scientists, supporters of The Venus Project will be shocked.

9-46 *The argument that human beings are born to be selfish, which Jacque Fresco opposes as being 'unscientific', is not something claimed by some foolish people who have never studied science. It is exactly an established theory of modern genetics and socio-biology.* Jacque Fresco's belief that cooperative society can undoubtedly become successful because human nature can be developed in any way contradicts opinions by most scientists. There is no specific environment that can turn all human beings indefinitely altruistic.

9-47 It would be appropriate to cite the words of geneticists for supporters of The Venus Project who probably cannot accept this outrageous exposure. Richard Dawkins wrote in *The Selfish Gene*, "Human society based solely on the universal principle of genes called cold-hearted egoism will become an extremely dangerous society. No matter how deplorable, the fact remains true... There is nothing we can anticipate from biological nature if we were to create an altruistically cooperative society." [\[67\]](#)

9-48 Matt Ridley wrote in *The Origins of Virtue*, "There are as many negative instincts to human beings as positive instincts. Our mind is sometimes too easily sunk into racial discrimination and genocidal conflict due to tendency of human society to competitively aim for small group divisions." Fortunately, this book offers a solution: "Once we know how human beings acquired the ability of social credibility through evolution, we will learn how to cure lack of credibility." But do not get your hopes up too high, because this is about private property and market economy.

9-49 Of course this is his personal opinion. The proposition that we cannot draw the best society from nature constant of human beings is applied to Matt Ridley as it is to Jacque Fresco. The difference is that at least Matt Ridley knows his thoughts are mere opinions. Focusing on the genetics, it is obvious as to what the common argument of Matt Ridley and Richard Dawkins is.

9-50 Here, I should answer a question thrown out by all supporters of The Venus Project. Why do geneticists deny the belief that we can undoubtedly create an all-altruistic society through education? [\[68\]](#) Don't they already know that human personality is determined by mutual interaction of genes and environmental factors? Why do they talk like genetic determinists? The truth is, as we already discussed in Chapter 6, that we do not have to be genetic determinists to deny this argument.

9-51 Jacque Fresco and his supporters tend to jump to conclusions from obvious propositions. It is true that only some of people having genetic factor with breast cancer get breast cancer. However, how is it related to the fact that there is no such environment that allows everyone to lift 10 tons of weight? Explicitly speaking, there is no relationship. But we don't necessarily have to be genetic determinists to acknowledge this.

9-52 Speaking of breast cancer, there may be an environment that makes people with breast cancer gene to get breast cancer and environment that prevents breast cancer. However, we do not expect the same for everything. *There is no such environment that allows people to develop wings.* We may or may not believe that there is an environment in which all human beings become altruistic. It is absurd

to denounce this as genetic determinism.

9-53 The thought that human nature can be developed in any direction is wrong. As human body has body organs with unique functions, it is an established theory that our mind also has a type of psychological organ with unique functions. We either reinforce or do not reinforce functions of existing organ. Not many things can be completely changed by environmental difference. It may overwhelm the area determined by genetic difference, but the area of genetic commonness dominates it.

9-54 If you are a supporter of The Venus Project, you may feel free to say that the mainstream geneticists and socio-biologists have fallen into prejudice. In fact, scientists who only study genetics for their lifetime may be those who can most easily fall into prejudice of overestimating the effect of genes. It is clear that the mainstream geneticists have never attempted to self-examine their prejudice, like economists.

9-55 However, supporters of The Venus Project that unhesitatingly accept such conclusion must be ashamed, because they have always been talking about superiority of natural sciences compared to social sciences. They behaved as if they were true spokesmen of natural sciences. They and Jacque Fresco never stopped to rely upon the authority of natural sciences in order to make their belief appear objective and appropriate.

9-56 Now they are throwing away all scientists that have opposing arguments. They openly claim that scientists who agree with Jacque Fresco are the only scientists with proper scientific thinking and that other scientists are those with prejudice that must be rescued through their scientific methodology. *They selectively choose the performance of natural sciences.*

9-57 Of course, scientists can have ideas different than the mainstream. Hamilton's selfish gene theory is accepted by geneticists today as the mainstream, but not all scientists agree with Hamilton's selfish gene theory. But such scientists frankly acknowledge that their opinions are different from the mainstream idea. Fresco strictly conceals this. He disguises his argument as something that all scientists agree with. He covers up his argument using the authority of science.

9-58 There is an astonishing similarity between supporters of The Venus Project and Christians whom they despise. Someone might argue that creationists have no interest in science, but this is not true. If an argument made by a scientist helps justify their belief, they enthusiastically cite the argument. Especially, creationists have unusual interest in the field of my major, statistical physics.

9-59 However, nobody would think that creationists are the true protectors of natural sciences. They selective choose science. What creationists do is to borrow a theorem or principle of science, reinterpret it as they please in terms of philosophy, and use it to negate another theorem or principle of science. Generally, the law of entropy increase, the most important law of statistical physics, is used to negate the evolutionary theory. I doubt whether they even know how to calculate entropy.

9-60 But we saw exactly same thing performed by Jacque Fresco and his supporters. According to them, the obvious fact that human beings are influenced both by genes and environment entirely negates the mainstream view of modern genetics and socio-biology. I am willing to make a bet on the fact that the argument they use is even poorer than the argument used by creationists.

9-61 The only difference between creationists and supporters of The Venus Project is that creationists at least do not think of themselves as the true protectors of natural sciences. Supporters of The Venus Project are not. They groundlessly conclude that any opposing arguments are objecting to science and scientific methodology. They actively use the authority of natural sciences by selectively choosing what

they need. Such enormous intellectual dishonesty is incomparable to creationists.

9-62 Many theories about human nature today are based on scientifically incorrect knowledge about tribal societies. A tribe called Bushman living in the Kalahari Desert of Africa appears in the film 'Bushman'. This tribe is completely isolated from the civilization and is living primitively in peace without knowing war and fight. Human beings in nature are peaceful without greed. Greed, worry and violence are the products of incorrect social systems, namely capitalism. The term 'noble savage' represents such thought.

9-63 However in reality, most cases have been reported as opposite to Bushman. Warfare, rape and obstinate class order are as common as mysticism and collective formality in all types of tribal societies. There was no society without selfishness or jealousy. Steven Pinker's book *Blank Slate* reveals through evidences in cultural anthropology, archeology and biology the fact that arguments for existence of such society are lies. [69]

9-64 It is not true that the Native Americans had environmental ethics that could prevent excessive exploitation on nature. There is no evidence of 'ritual appreciating the dead animals' among Indian practices before the 20th century. Chief Seattle's emotional speech about the relationship between human and nature was made up by someone else. He was not an environmentalist. One of few facts about him is that he was a slave owner who massacred nearly all of his enemies.

9-65 The case of Chief Seattle suggests that the argument that the natives were described as overly cruel in order to justify the invasion is wrong. While the speech of Chief Seattle was quickly spread out despite its recent creation, its fakeness is not well known. Romantic descriptions on tribal societies are much exaggerated. What distorts the truth is not simply the effect of the privileged class to protect the system. Our own narrow-mindedness to only see what we want to see is greater. [70]

9-66 In 1768 when Rousseau's Noble Savage became popular, Louis-Antoine de Bougainville discovered the Tahiti Island. Diderot added an imaginary story to Bougainville's travel record. The scene where a sage of Tahiti describes their lives reminds us of the myth of Chief Seattle. On the following year, Captain Cook visited Tahiti and came back with a report on rich, comfortable and harmonious life of residents. They did not know embarrassment, hard labor, cold and hunger.

9-67 The dark side of the Tahiti Island was revealed on Captain Cook's second trip, including the custom to offer human beings as sacrifice, regular infanticide, obstinate class order, and strict taboo where women cannot eat in front of men. Explorer Jean Francois de Galaup wrote in his voyage log before he disappeared, "Even the most daring villains of Europe are less hypocritical than the natives of this island. All of their hugs are lies."

9-68 The same episode was repeated in the South Sea Islands. In 1925, the 23-year-old Margaret Mead visited Samoa. Just as Bougainville and Captain Cook did 200 years ago, he returned back with a story of natural paradise unstained by the sins of the Western world. For about 50 years from then, the story of Samoa was accepted as firm evidence on perfectness of human beings. However, as the mirage of Tahiti by Bougainville was, the mirage by Mead was transiently died away through precise investigation.

9-69 Purity of unmarried adolescent girl was a subject of worship protected by death sentence, even in societies where Christianity did not reach. Far from being free of rape, Samoa was one of the regions with highest ratio of rape in the world at the time. All of these cases were cited from *The Origins of Virtue*. Cases introduced in *Blank Slate* are even more terrifying. The ratio of men dying from war in

native tribes of South America and New Guinea exceeds 20 percent. [\[71\]](#)

9-70 Hamilton's selfish gene theory begins with the insight where genes that can spread their duplicates best are naturally selected. This does not mean that genes only evolve selfish behaviors. In the Selfish Gene, the term 'selfish' does not refer to individual selfishness but to selfishness on the genetic level. Behaviors that seemingly appear as altruistic can be evolved, if it served for the selfish benefit of genes.

9-71 This suggests the following: If a gene that leads to selfish act is more advantageous than a gene that leads to altruistic act in driving competitors out and spreading its duplicates, the selfish gene will prosper. The altruistic gene can only prosper when it is more advantageous than the selfish gene in driving competitors out.

9-72 The core of socio-biology is in that it is actually possible. There are many cases in which altruism on the individual level serves for the selfish benefit of genes. If you can sacrifice to save 4 sisters, it would be advantageous for your genes to do so. This is because sisters with same parents share at least 50% of genes. Your genes gain benefit from your altruistic act.

9-73 What I am trying to emphasize is that this is a zero-sum game. Population of most organisms in nature remains constant. When the population of antelope increases, the amount of feed each antelope can eat will be reduced. This results in reduced antelope population. Even if genes of antelopes are matched to 99.99% on average, it is not a good strategy for genes of an antelope to sacrifice itself to save 10 other antelopes. This is nothing more than suicide. [\[72\]](#)

9-74 The message thrown out by socio-biology about evolution of cooperation is clear. A completely altruistic act can only evolve for entities that share more genes with an entity than average, or family. We can predict whether a behavior will or will not evolve through genetic familiarity, or genetic distance among family members. The behavior of sacrificing one's life to save 3 siblings or 5 cousins can evolve, but the behavior to save 1 sibling or 3 cousins cannot.

9-75 Such predictive ability of socio-biology actually achieved a fruitful outcome with studies on social insects such as honeybees and ants. Honeybee and ant societies are made of large families. Since worker ants and worker bees can only spread their genes through queen ant or bee, it is not surprising to see them form a cooperative society. However, the threat of individualistic rebellion exists even in such societies.

9-76 Unlike working ants, working bees are capable of reproduction. Working bees can spawn eggs without mating. Of course, these eggs give birth to drone bees since they have not been fertilized by drone bees. This has the same principle as unfertilized eggs spawned by queen bees that give birth to drone bees. Why don't they spawn their own eggs? In fact, they sometimes do. One of the duties of working bees is to kill the babies of other working bees. Eggs without the queen bee's pheromone are eaten by working bees.

9-77 Queen bees mate with several drone bees. This means that not all working bees share the same father. Working bees have closer genetic familiarity with the queen bee than other working bees. Working bees might prefer their sons compared to sons of the queen bee, but working bees prefer sons of the queen bee over sons of other working bees. Working bees protect the collective benefit by monitoring their system.

9-78 The colony of bumblebee is small in size. Bumblebees form small groups of about 400 entities, working bees and drone bees combined. When the active period comes to an end, the queen bee flies away for hibernation and starts over on the following year. None of the working bees follows the queen bee. A very interesting fact was discovered about such difference between bumblebees and honey bees. Unlike queen honey bees, queen bumblebees practice monogamy and only mate with a single drone bee.

9-79 While sperms made by a human male have different genetic compositions, sperms made by a drone bee are identical. This is because drone bees are born from unfertilized eggs. All drone bees are pure clones having half of mother's genes. This suggests that in bees, genetic familiarity between siblings is 75% instead of 50%. They receive different genes from the mother, but they receive identical genes from the father.

9-80 Working bumblebees are genetically closer to sister working bees than they are to the queen bee. Once the colony begins producing drones, working bees resist the queen bee together instead of cooperating with the queen bee like honey bees do. They breed sons of working bees instead of sons of the queen. This is why bumblebee colonies remain as small groups and are disassembled at the end of each active period.

9-81 Socio-biology does not predict that no cooperation can evolve except for family relations. Unconditional altruism definitely cannot evolve, but conditional altruism like reciprocal altruism may evolve. A reciprocal altruist cooperates with someone who has never betrayed but refuses to cooperate with someone who betrayed before. It satisfies the condition of evolutionarily stable strategy often abbreviated as ESS.

9-82 ESS has the same meaning as metastable state we discussed in statistical physics. [73] It suggests that once such strategy is widely spread in a society, another strategy cannot infiltrate. For instance, there cannot be a turncoat in the society where most individuals are reciprocal altruists. He will lose the opportunity to receive cooperation and become miserable.

9-83 This doesn't mean that altruists always expect rewards in doing altruistic acts. In fact, the behavior actually expected to be naturally selected is a slightly 'excessive' reciprocity, not the reciprocity that can give greatest help to the individual. Genetic benefit does not always accord with individual benefit. [74] It is impossible to make individuals to perform excessively reciprocal behavior based on calculation. The supposition that reciprocity will be evolved as a type of instinct is more persuasive.

9-84 Our thoughts are full of reciprocal ideas such as loyalty, debt and revenge. It is not a coincidence that most of tribal societies have religions that offer sacrifices and pray in expectation of reward by God. Our reciprocal habit is so explicit that we even utter curses on the spite of inorganic matter when we kick a broken machine. [75] Our desire to punish non-cooperative individuals surpasses the desire to cooperate.

9-85 People who already knew that human nature is not determined by genes but by complex interaction between genes and environment probably needed patience to read along. For convenience, I presumed that there is a gene that determines specific behavior such as cooperation and sacrifice. However, it is erroneous to think that a gene that determines specific behavior is naturally selected. Behavior is not decided single-handedly by genes.

9-86 However, this problem can be easily resolved by recalling that genes determine nature function instead of human nature. Nature function is naturally selected, not the nature itself. This makes our

subject a little complicated, but the essence does not change. Nature function that can best spread its duplicate will survive and leave more descendants.

9-87 We can easily predict that human behavior requires certain level of plasticity. Under any environment, nature function that creates reciprocal nature in reciprocal environment and selfish nature in selfish environment will be advantageous for survival compared to nature function that simply creates reciprocal nature. (In relation to this, studies tend to show that our personalities are influenced more by current environment than environment in which we grow up.)

9-88 But whether genes determine human nature or nature function, unchanging truth is that there isn't much to expect from human genetics that have evolved most of its time in the ecosystem which works like zero-sum game. [76] Considering the fact that not all traits are naturally selected and there are many traits obtained as by-products of evolution, we cannot expect to have perfect cooperation as to build a perfectly collectivistic nation or nature constant necessary to create such cooperation.

9-89 What is Fresco's view on human nature? He does not believe that there is no inherited human nature. We have desires for comradeship, intimacy and love regardless of our culture. The problem is in that Fresco believes we only inherit positive natures. We are born with good traits, and bad ones come from the culture.

9-90 He says, "We have certain human needsâ€¦ The only way that you can talk about human nature concretely is by recognizing that there are certain human needs. We have a human need for companionship and for close contact to be loved, to be attached to, to be accepted to be seen, to be received for who we are. If those needs are met, we develop into people who are compassionate and cooperative and who have empathy for other people."

9-91 However, according to recent studies, we naturally have desires such as jealousy, vengeance and possessiveness, a truly wicked habit according to collectivists. We also seem to naturally have a habit to create small group divisions and detest outsiders. We make up groups with everything and fight: Sexual orientation, favorite soccer teams, and Microsoft users versus Apple users, etc.

9-92 It is easy to say that all negative behaviors are created by the environment or suppression during childhood just because some negative behaviors are so. However, something that makes us feel comfortable doesn't prove it is right. *There is no reason for only the positive natures to be naturally selected.* Especially since it is gradually being revealed as false by recent studies, it is not only dishonest to positively describe human nature but also dangerous.

9-93 I would like to point out one last thing. Study on genetics and environment is meaningless when it is performed without strict variable control. Studies on adopted children only handle children who were grown up in the same home environment but have different genes. Studies on identical twins handle children with the same genes who were grown up in different homes. Only such types of studies can be acknowledged with scientific value.

9-94 For instance, studies arguing that a child grown up in a violent home environment is likely to become violent can be interpreted in any way. Children who have grown up in violent home environments mostly are the ones who have violent parents. This may only indicate that children with violent genes are likely to become violent.

9-95 Unfortunately, it is impossible to distinguish whether studies introduced by Fresco have scientific rigor. If he were to quote studies supporting his arguments and introduce specific papers and academic data, we could have easily read and verified them. However, Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph don't do

so. We are extremely lucky to even know names of scientists who conducted such studies. In many cases, they are introduced as anonymous.

9-96 There is nobody with a degree in genetics among few scholars who appeared or were cited in Zeitgeist series. The field of their study mostly belongs to a strand of psychology, namely psychiatry which only focuses on pathological behaviors. If pathologically serious violence is caused by the environment, would it suggest that violence itself is caused by the environment? There is no ground to expect any scientific rigor in their discussion about general human nature.

9-97 As I finish up the story about genes and environment, I would like to introduce my opinion about why collectivism must fail because of human nature. To speak of the conclusion first, *collectivism will fail by positive natures in addition to the most selfish human natures that we wish did not exist*. They include everything from desire to be loved to desire for comradeship and intimacy.

9-98 None of our instincts perfectly aims for the greatest happiness of the greatest number. All instincts are selfish to some extent. Love towards relatives is relative-egoistic. Affection towards intimate ones is group-egoistic in that it differentiates between intimate and non-intimate ones. Our natural sympathy also differentiates between people we can see and people we do not see.

9-99 However, such tendencies lurking behind our instincts are not unfortunate at all. Neo in the film 'Matrix' chose to save one woman precious to him instead of saving the world, but none of us criticize him as being unethical. The problem is that in collectivistic society, such instincts disrupt realization of social virtues as much as selfish instincts limited to individuals do.

9-100 We should not think an instinct that brings mostly good results in individualistic society would also do so in collectivistic society. Our 'humane' affection towards relatives is as critical as selfish desires in collectivistic society. Regarding benefit of 5 or 6 relatives including oneself over benefit of 100 million people is nothing different than regarding one's own benefit over benefit of 100 million people.

9-101 As the phrase 'one for all, all for one' tells, the important good of collectivistic society are efforts that are beneficial for the whole. For example, labor performed by laborers in the transition period without reward is so. However, even the people who most romantically illustrate collectivistic society do not feel moved by such type of good. They simply feel moved by improvement in life quality to be offered by collectivism and imagination on affectionate exchange between individuals.

9-102 Therefore, we would be deceiving ourselves if we were to believe that our human desires will help us perform the good required by collectivism. Giving up the time we can spend with family and friends for 100 million people we don't know or for the abstract whole is the one thing that our human desire would never want. Thus, given the fact that all mistakes of collectivism are the consequence of such virtue, who would voluntarily perform such virtue?

9-103 It may be true that collectivism, if successful, will bring greater leisure time than individualism. It may be able to remove some unproductive labors such as advertisement industry. Romantic collectivists support collectivism because of such promise. The problem is that this promise can only be accomplished when most individuals can perform the virtue demanded by collectivism.

9-104 In order to do so, individuals must not only suppress selfish desires but also the most human desires such as the desire to spend more time with family members. We can have greater leisure time as a result of most people giving up on such desires. [\[77\]](#) Who would be willing to endure such sacrifice? Wasn't the exact reason why romantic collectivists supported collectivism because they wanted to

acquire the opposite?

9-105 Primitive men were able to exhibit the spirit of cooperation on mammoth hunting solely because they could share mammoth after hunting. Cooperation by laborers in communist society appeared in a totally different way. They cooperated to deceive the party leadership and become indolent. This was the only way they could gain and share their mammoth, the right to be indolent. Such cooperative mind was what spoiled the collectivistic societies as much as selfishness did.

9-106 However, cooperative mind that sometimes allows us to resolve difficult problems together in an individualistic society and collectively selfish cooperative mind which always spoils collectivistic society are not different desires. They are exactly the same desire. Our humane emotion was evolved to share 100 of benefit to small group of people around us rather than sharing 1/100 of benefit to a million people.

9-107 Accordingly, the human desires we have become as large an obstacle as egoism in realizing the virtue required by collectivism. Unlike Jacque Fresco's belief, collectivistic society can only be rescued through a kind of brainwashing that strictly destroys individual human desires instead of reinforcing them and inserts value system of the society. We saw the same thing happen in collectivistic nations of the 20th century.

9-108 Someone might have to say that our desires are way too imperfect to make global collectivism successful. However, this imperfectness is what we regard as most beloved. I feel fortunate that we are definitely not perfect utilitarians and that we consider one important person as more precious than thousands of people we don't know. I am not a collectivist, since I love human nature and desire.

9-109 Collectivists might argue they can rescue collectivism by arousing a panhuman community spirit based on emotional persuasions such as everything-is-connected theory, but I doubt whether this would succeed. Arousing romantic enthusiasm through emotional media is a different problem than making people endure trouble for the whole. Enthusiasm helps to start a revolution, but that is all.

9-110 Large group of population cannot be as altruistic as small scale workplaces where individuals form intimate relations. All 'unregretful' human desires resulting from mutual intimacy and fellowship are helpless in preventing our discrimination between people close to us and people we have not seen before within a group with anonymity. If something is formed, it is nothing more than collectivistic enthusiasm created by our tribal spirit. It justified massacre in Hitler's system.

9-111 Of course, the theory on connection of all things is not a simple emotional persuasion, if we were to take Jacque Fresco's word as is. It is the method of giving pleasure to our souls and a magical means to acquire universal truth and regain cooperative nature. At the very last moment, such anti-scientific mysticism rescues collectivism, not scientific proof. Needless to say, this is not related with scientific methodology at all.

9-112 If all human beings have the ability to gain pleasure from the fact that all things are connected regardless of the environment in which they grow up, it would be proper to refer to this ability as a type of human nature. My question is as follows: How is this nature naturally selected? Of course, supporters of The Venus Project probably have never asked this type of question. This suggests that they are actually far away from the scientific mind of inquiry. I would have been extremely curious about this topic.

9-113 Some people might argue that recent findings in brain science and cognitive science demonstrate mystical psychological capability in human beings. However, this is one of many lies spread out by those who believe in new age science. Not only that, believing in books like 'Water Knows the Answers' and 'The Secret' is nothing different from believing in books published by creationists. New age scientists are as threatening as people who believe in intellectual design as a pseudo-science group.

9-114 As a science student, I feel extremely unfortunate about books like 'The Secret' being very popular in the United States and circulated under the name of science. [78] As stressed out in the 68th annotation, the best method of distinguishing between pseudo-science writing and true science is to look at the appendix. I have never seen any of these books with such arguments that provided a single journal entry of 'Science' that supports their arguments.

9-115 New age scientists frankly acknowledge that their views are different from views of ordinary scientists. They consider themselves as revolutionists of the scientific circles. As material success of market economy is insufficient to Fresco, the fruit of natural sciences is insufficient to them. As Fresco believes that money disturbs improvement of our society, they believe that classical methodologies disrupt further development of science. [79]

9-116 In fact, Fresco's position about most topics is closer to the position of new age scientists than the position of scientists. His mysticism and view on human nature are very similar to attitude of new age scientists. If he were really influenced by new age scientists, his deception becomes more fatal. He is officially uniting with those who deny the methodology of modern science. Think about what this means. He has been claiming that he is a protector of scientific methodology.

9-117 People who saw Note 30 in Chapter 4 probably recognized the fact that Jacque Fresco does not accurately understand the meaning of 'rule of law'. To tell the truth, he actually fails to understand most of things he is trying to criticize. His ignorance about money is especially critical. He imitates error easily made by people who don't know economics. It is the naïve expectation that all cost problems will disappear with abolition of money.

9-118 However, large cost of producing a good or service means it requires large amount of resources and labors, because the cost is used to purchase resources and labors necessary. *Resource-based economy cannot resolve the problem of cost. It is simply translated into the problem of conserving, or efficiency using, resources and labors.*

9-119 Supporters of The Venus Project might argue that supporters of market economy worship money as a panacea, but the opposite is closer to reality. They mysticize cost because they do not understand the essence of cost. They believe that cost will disappear with money since cost is shown in the form of money. The truth is that the money is incapable to creating problems of cost which did not exist. Cost exists, whether or not money does.

9-120 Many supporters of The Venus Project, as well as Fresco, seem to superficially understand the fact that money is merely a means of exchange in market economy. But the problem is in that superficial understanding is not always reflected in thoughts. They probably have never seriously thought what it 'actually' means to say that renewable energy is economically infeasible. They are the ones who overestimate the power of money. They worship money as a devil.

9-121 According to the theory of labor value by Ricardo and Marx, price of a good is proportional to total time of labor required to produce the good. If a good that can be made by 5 hours of labor has the

same price as another good that requires 8 hours of labor, everyone will produce the former good. The law of supply and demand will reduce price of the former. If we do not consider profit of the capitalist, it is easy to prove that price of a good will be exactly proportional to total labor time used to produce the good.

9-122 Here, total labor includes labor necessary for finding raw materials, processing, and make machineries required to produce the good. For instance, if 1 hour of labor is exchanged with 10 dollars, a machine maker will sell a machine made through 300 hours of labor at 3,000 dollars. If the machine can produce 100 goods on average during its life span, price of a good will be increased by 30 dollars.

9-123 Imagine what this means. The fact that it takes 300 hours to make a machine and that the machine can produce 100 goods means we need 3 more hours of labor per good on average, excluding any labor required to actually use the machine and produce goods. The essence of the theory of labor value is that we can explain all cost problems in terms of labor.

9-124 The theory of labor value is not accepted today because of a few problems. According to the theory of labor value, price of a raw material is only proportional to labor needed to excavate and process it. This fails to explain changes in price of resources caused by scarcity. Thus in this text, I will use labor and resource to explain cost instead of explaining it solely based on labor. It is still not perfect, but it should be sufficient as a primary approximation for our discussion.

9-125 What does this mean? It is simple. *The most efficient investment for capitalists in capitalistic economy is also the most efficient investment for wise planners of resource-based economy.* If capitalists are not automating tableware production line due to 'economic infeasibility', the wisest planners of resource-based economy should not automate it either. This is because automation of tableware production line would mean consumption of greater resource and labor

9-126 This always happens when the technology is in its early stage. If life span of machineries is short, it requires much labor to repair them, and amount of labor and resource necessary to manufacture them is large, it can require smaller amount of resource and labor for production by not implementing automated production. A wise planner of resource-based economy will not introduce such machines, not for his benefit but for the society.

9-127 I am not arguing that the best decisions made by each economic subject in capitalism will always accord with the best decisions made by wise planners of resource-based economy. The essence is that there is no dramatic difference between them. Except for special circumstances that require intended situation design, economically feasible choice is never exchangeable with economically infeasible choice.

9-128 This holds true for both choices by economic subjects and national policies. The best decisions to be made by the government of a capitalistic nation with a specific purpose are not much different from the best decisions to be made by the planners of resource-based economy with identical purpose. *Policies regarded as excessively radical in capitalistic nation is also excessively radical in resource-based economy.* Policies that fail in capitalistic nation will also fail in resource-based economy.

9-129 What would happen if we were to immediately force over 80% of energy we use to be renewable energy? Price of energy will rise by a factor of 3 or higher, and all necessities will become doubly expensive. This is because economic infeasibility of renewable energy refers to such things. As a result, it is easy to recognize that our life will become unimaginably devastating.

9-130 We should not believe we can avoid such consequence in resource-based economy just because

there is no money. Speaking in the language of resource-based economy, the fact that price of energy will increase by a factor of 3 means we need to invest 3 times as much resource and labor as we did to gain the same amount of energy. Since the amount of resource and labor we can invest is limited, the planners of resource-based economy would have to make us conserve energy.

9-131 Of course we cannot permanently rely on fossil fuels. Then what is the best policy? It's simple. It should be in the form of gradually increasing the rate of renewable energy in our lives through sustainable and progressive investment. In fact, we are already doing this. The research paper from MIT cited by Peter Joseph in *Zeitgeist Addendum* is about this topic. Where is the dramatic difference?

9-132 Someone might want to talk about 'planned obsolescence'. However, there is no such thing in truly free market. In the market, corporations must not only compete with other corporations that are already competing with them but virtual corporations that may enter their market one day. If there is a method of supplying a good with longer life span at the same price and existing corporations do not apply this method, a new corporation will appear, introduce the method and take away all consumers. [80]

9-133 Those who argue for planned obsolescence provided many actual cases supporting their argument. The case of incandescent bulb is probably the most dramatic among them. Some of early incandescent bulbs have life span of over 100 years. Right now, life span of incandescent bulbs is 1,000 hours. There is a slight exaggeration, but this is true. Does this prove existence of planned obsolescence?

9-134 We can find a perfect refutation to this argument at http://www.fact-index.com/li/light_bulb.html. The refutation says, 'Incandescent lamps are extraordinarily sensitive to changes in the supply voltage. Operating a 100-watt, 1,000-hour, 1,700-lumen bulb at half voltage would extend its life to about 65,000,000 hours or over 7,000 years.'

9-135 I won't expose all cases of 'planned obsolescence' here, but I do want to point something out. The reason why goods like personal computers and cell phones are quickly replaced is because technological advancement is fastest in that field. In fact, consumers are the ones who do not want durable goods. Entrepreneurs are simply obeying instructions of consumers. It would be a great waste to make a good with 30 years of life span when the good is only going to be used by consumers for a few years. [81]

9-136 Ignorance about economics is revealed in different places of the *Zeitgeist* series. Look at the following sentence from *Zeitgeist: Moving Forward*: "And even with the 20 trillion dollar bank bailouts starting in 2007 an amount of money which could have changed say, the global energy infrastructure to fully renewable methods instead going to a series of institutions that literally do nothing to help society institutions that could be removed tomorrow with no recourse." 81)

9-137 What Peter Joseph does not realize is that inflation occurs when the amount of dollars in circulation, not total amount of dollars, increases. Even if you have 100 trillion dollars' worth of gold, gold stored in storage would not have any effect on price of gold. This is the very reason why the US government could resolutely spend 20 trillion dollars in relief loan. This money is not circulated. That is, it does not affect remaining parts of the economy.

9-138 Of course, 20 trillion dollars of relief loan can bring serious inflation. However, the term serious is not appropriate for describing the catastrophe to be aroused when 20 trillion dollars is placed into real economy. It is ruinous. Remember that the current money in circulation in the United States is 1

trillion dollars. The relief loan will drop the value of dollars by a factor of 21 because the value of money is inversely proportional to the amount of money.

9-139 Many Americans are enraged because investment of 20 trillion dollars was put into unproductive cause. However, *this investment did not bring catastrophe because it was put into unproductive cause*. Many intellectuals who criticize relief loan today do not wish such investment were made in real economy. They wish such investment did not happen. They will agree with my view that it is very fortunate for us that Peter Joseph is not the president of the United States.

9-140 But let us return back to the original topic. The purpose of this Chapter is not to expose ignorance of Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph. It is to expose that what they claim to be scientific methodology is not scientific. The effort of Jacque Fresco to become scientific in the field of economics is shown by denial of existing economic classifications or terms and creation of new terms.

9-141 Jacque Fresco does not acknowledge traditional classification between market economy and planned economy. Instead, he generates a new classification of an economy based on resources and an economy based on money. In fact, his new terms are found here and there, and there even exist terms as strange as 'ruling value syntax'. However, we should focus on the classification between an economy based on resources and an economy based on money. Is his new classification more scientific than the traditional classification of economics?

9-142 So many supporters of The Venus Project carelessly say there is planned obsolescence in money-based economy. However, money-based economy includes communism with money. Planned obsolescence clearly does not exist in communism. They sometimes denounce money-based economy, calling money as debt. But money-based economy clearly includes systems that use commodity money such as gold and silver.

9-143 But if we were to nitpick about this, what can we say about money-based economy? The fact that this concept is useless for any kind of discussion is obvious to all serious observers. When discussing about profit system or fractional reserve banking system, using this term is not simply inappropriate but arouses bad influence. Even Fresco keeps failing to provide general theorems and propositions that can be applied to all money-based economies.

9-144 We have been classifying economic system into two according to how we distribute resources and goods: Market economy and planned economy. Someone is probably aware that these two form antithesis in their meaning. The market performs distribution of resources and goods in market economy. This is exactly what the plan does in planned economy. If the market distributes resources, it is market economy. If the plan distributes resources, it is planned economy.

9-145 Of course, there is a wide intermediate area between perfect market economy and perfect planned economy. However, we learned from the past experience that an economic system gets closer to planned economy as it moves away from market economy. There has not been any economic system distant from both market economy and planned economy, except for completely self-sufficient economic systems like food-collecting societies in the primitive age. It seems as if we must choose between market and plan in distributing resources.

9-146 The term planned economy does not sound well, but market economy is the same. Scientific language must be so. Studies may one day find out that planned economy is better than market economy, but we should not indicate such conclusion in the words in advance. In science, terms that do not suggest anything other than the concept they represent are considered as most desirable.

9-147 *The biggest problem of classification into an economy based on resources and an economy based on money is that it does not form an antithesis.* There is nothing in common between the role of resources in an economy based on resources and the role of money in an economy based on money. Except for play of words such as 'An economy based on resources is based on resource and money-based economy is based on money' that mean nothing, there is no way we can define the two concepts so they would form an antithesis.

9-148 What does it mean for an economy to be based on something? If you interpret dictionary meaning of the word base, you would have to acknowledge the fact that an economy based on money is based on resources, too, as much as resource-based economy is. Money-based economy also collapses when there is no resource. The word base should have some kind of context, and I am asking what it is.

9-149 Does it refer to the base of rational judgment by economic subjects? Someone might say that while the planners and computers of an economy based on resources economy make judgment with consideration on the amount of resources and demand, economic subjects of money-based economy consider signals sent by prices. This sounds plausible, but the problem in this case is that the concept of money-based economy cannot include communist system in which the government arbitrarily decides prices - and therefore price cannot be a tool for economic calculations.

9-150 The word base is used within different context in the two. The base in an economy based on money means an economy based on money is maintained by circulation of money. The base in an economy based on resources means the planners and computers make decisions based on the amount of resources and demand. Such definition of terms means we are giving up on the semantic antithesis. Yet, this is what Jacque Fresco is doing.

9-151 The reason why we demand semantic antithesis is simple. It is because we cannot determine whether or not they contradict without it. *It is uncertain as to whether judgment based on the amount of resources and demand can be made in an economy maintained by circulation of money.* This is a subject of economic discussion. In any case, remember that money-based economy includes communist systems with money. [\[82\]](#)

9-152 In comparison, the fact that market economy and planned economy contradict each other is indisputable. They refer to two different methods that can be alternatively used for the same purpose. We cannot leave the work of distributing resources and goods completely to the market while completely planning it out. You cannot simultaneously cook an egg into fry while hatching it. This may sound like nothing special, but we expect such clarity in scientific classifications.

9-153 Until now, we have only been talking about whether or not there can be an economic system which is money-based and resource-based at the same time. However, we must discuss whether there can be an economic system that does not correspond to either of the two. In fact, this is not even a subject of discussion, because it clearly existed in the past. There are many economic systems without money that supporters of The Venus Project are not willing to call an economy based on resources.

9-154 In fact, it is not sufficient to define an economy based on resources as 'an economy in which economic decisions are made based on the amount of resources and demand.' Wicked dictators can survey the amount of resources and demand for their ambition. Ancient dictators did similar things, but we do not refer to it as an economy based on resources. It actually refers to 'an economy based on the amount of resources and demand with the purpose of distributing resources using sustainable method

for benefit of the greatest number.'

9-155 *Why must an economy based on resources always be 'good'?* Such obsession makes definition of an economy based on resources overly complex, but this is unnecessary in terms of classification. [83] It complicates the definition of an economy based on resources. It critically reduces academic utility of classification between an economy based on resources and an economy based on money.

9-156 It is easy to determine whether something is planned economy or not, since it is defined by structure of the economic system. However, it is much more difficult to judge whether or not something is an economy based on resources. It requires information about things not designed within the economic system. *Intentions of the planners cannot be pre-designed.* We might be able to speculate on it from social environment, but it is not as easy as it sounds.

9-157 If we classify economic systems according to their structure, the subject of study would be on what common outcome will be derived by economic systems that belong to the same group. But if we classify economic systems according to the outcome, the subject of study would be to determine which category each economic system belongs. I can only say that the classification criteria which include purpose of the planners belong to the latter not former, and that it is a foolish classification method.

9-158 Please don't think of this as a mere nitpicking. Inappropriate classification is not dangerous simply because it is unscientific. It has awfully bad influence on our thoughts. As I said, it is completely uncertain as to whether money-based economy maintained by circulation of money and an economy based on resources based on the quantity of resources and demand contradict each other. However, we are implicitly accepting the presumption that they do contradict one another by using this classification.

9-159 We sometimes hear people say we need to choose between growth and distribution. Many people complain that such dichotomy arouses the delusion that growth and distribution are contradictory. I would like to emphasize that the problem of growth and distribution is not about classification. [84] I can only imagine about the enormous chaos to be caused by inappropriate classification between an economy based on resources and an economy based on money.

9-160 The term resource-based economy has a problem, too. This word simultaneously has two meanings that cannot completely accord: First, specific alternative proposed by Jacque Fresco and second, economic system that altruistically distributes resources based on the amount and demand. Do the former and latter accord? Or, is it at least true that the former is included within the latter? The claim that Jacque Fresco's alternative is 'an economy based on resources' is not as obvious as the fact that it is planned economy.

9-161 In reality, opponents of Jacque Fresco like me are exactly arguing that his plan cannot be so-called 'an economy based on resources.' [85] If resource-based economy falls into dictatorship as I predict, think about what people with the exactly identical ideas as Jacque Fresco after 100 years would say about it. Nobody will refer to it as 'an economy based on resources.' (Likewise, nobody calls North Korea as a truly socialistic nation.)

9-162 Many supporters of The Venus Project have at least three prejudices. First, it is fundamentally impossible to manage resources on earth based on the plan under economic system maintained by circulation of money. As I will demonstrate in Chapter 10, this is not only untrue in planned economy with money but also in market economy with money. Second prejudice is that Jacque Fresco's plan will obviously bring about 'an economy based on resources.' We cannot assure that.

9-163 And third is that we must give up on money-based economy to resolve problems in specific type of money-based economy. [86] The argument that we must end money-based economy because of the so-called money=debt problem is wrong. It can more easily be solved by the gold standard or greenback system. Unless there is a greater problem in the gold standard or greenback system, it cannot increase the reason for us to end money-based economy.

9-164 Did Fresco really not know the fact that his ambiguous use of terms arouses prejudice? It is a fact that he is not very knowledgeable. However, he warned more about the danger of improper terminology than anyone else. Though he did not say anything about the dangerous habit of collectivists to identify individualism with egoism, his criticism was valid about tendency of free-marketeers to regard opposition to free market as opposition to freedom.

9-165 I think Fresco is intentionally generating prejudice. Why must an economy based on resources be 'good'? It's simple. It should be superior to other things because it is Fresco's alternative. *He created classification not to classify economic systems but to differentiate between his alternative and others.* He even gave up on clarity and utility of classification for this purpose. In the end, what is 'ruling value syntax'? What is ideology?

9-166 What I introduced in this Chapter does not even explain half the dishonesty of Jacque Fresco as a scholar. Listen to what he says in *Paradise or Oblivion*: "This system will keep installing more and more automation cutting down on the purchasing power of the majority of people. There will come a time called the Gaussian curve where employment is that, production is this and purchasing power is that."

9-167 The Gaussian curve generally refers to the shape of function we call normal distribution function. Refer to the Wikipedia document at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gaussian_function. Unfortunately, this document will not be very helpful in understanding the words of Jacque Fresco. Don't be disappointed. I have earned more than anyone else about the Gaussian curve and I do not understand what he is talking about.

9-168 What he is trying to say is clear. He is talking about large scale unemployment caused by mechanization, reduced purchasing power, and failure of the system. But what is the 'Gaussian curve'? What shows the 'Gaussian distribution'? In normal market economy, there are factors that seem to take the 'Gaussian distribution'. [87] However, there is nothing in a stopped system with the 'Gaussian distribution'. Employment, production and purchasing power do not resemble the Gaussian distribution.

9-169 Even if something in a stopped system shows the Gaussian distribution, it would be incorrect to refer to the stopped system itself as the Gaussian curve. It is as inappropriate as calling human beings as the Gaussian curve just because human height shows the Gaussian distribution. It is never based on the custom. Nobody before Fresco used the term Gaussian curve in this sense. Only Fresco 'calls' it the Gaussian curve.

9-170 Perhaps Jacque Fresco newly defined the term Gaussian curve in one of his writings. However, how can he do so? He may be able to refer to it as the Fresco curve, but he cannot refer to it as the Gaussian curve. He is not Gauss. It is totally absurd to give another person's name to a concept one defines. This is an insult on Gauss.

9-171 Using curve as a term to show specific economic viewpoint is also inappropriate. It is as foolish as calling boiling temperature as inflection point. Even this is not a sufficient analogy to describe its stupidity. It is closer to calling electromagnetic force as elastic constant. This may seem like an

exaggerated analogy, but it sounds as plausible as Fresco when we explain that 'Charged objects attract or repel each other, it's called elastic constant.'

9-172 Why did he use such an inappropriate term? Why did he add the sentence 'It's called Gaussian curve' that nobody but himself would understand? Academic people are not very suspicious about other people. They are familiar with reading incomprehensible sentences in research papers written by others. They habitually believe there must a context. This is also applied when such context practically cannot exist.

9-173 Jacque Fresco is probably aiming for people with little academic knowledge who have never heard of the term Gaussian curve or do not understand its meaning. Jacque Fresco mysticizes himself by saying things they do not understand. The problem is that it was actually successful. [88] Do I need to further describe his intellectual insincerity?

[63] There is a model in statistical physics that examines properties without approximation. One-dimensional and two-dimensional Ising models are examples. This is possible because Ising model is a model that handles 'spins' fixed on top of rectangular lattice. It is impossible to find general solution for movement of objects flying while exchanging gravitational force when there are 3 particles. Refer to the Wikipedia document at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three-body_problem.

[64] This is what statistical physicists refer to as mean field approximation. It presumes that the state of system components is geographically uniform. Therefore, we can handle a single variable - mean evilness of the entire society in this case - without considering complex geographical factor. If about 30% of social members are evil, we can assume that about 30% of people nearby someone are evil.

[65] Let us make clear what it means by equilibrium state in statistical physics. For instance, assume that 10% of electrons are in excited state at room temperature. Looking at a single electron, ground state is the most stable state. However in a complex system with 10,000 electrons, unless electrons have mutual interaction, equilibrium state would be the state in which about 1,000 electrons are excited. Only this state can be maintained for long. The equilibrium state will change in this model when temperature becomes absolute zero. Since electrons cannot be in excited state at absolute zero, all electrons will be in ground state. The model we considered in the main text was the absolute zero model where unexpected events cannot occur. We did not consider the fact that unexpected events changing our environment can occur. The equilibrium state will be changed if we devise a new model with consideration on this.

[66] I am thinking about Jacque Fresco's trite argument that a criminal is not ethically responsible for committing a crime because the surrounding environment gave psychological problems to him. In fact, my interest about necessity of criminal law is functional. That is, I do not care much about its ethical legitimacy. My viewpoint on criminal law is that it is a necessary evil. I included it in my model in a way that Fresco would agree with.

[67] This sentence and the following sentence are probably written with slight difference from the original text. As a Korean, I only have Korean version of *The Selfish Gene*. I had to translate the sentences in Korean version back to English. The cited text appears in Chapter 1 'Why Are People?' of *The Selfish Gene*. The sentence from *The Origins of virtue* quoted later on appears in Chapter 13 'Struggle of All People against All People'.

[68] Someone might say that the expression 'undoubtedly' unnecessarily limits the argument of

supporters of The Venus Project. As we already mentioned in Chapters 7 and 8, The Venus Project is a type of social engineering that should not be attempted unless there is an absolute certainty that it will be successful. Supporters of The Venus Project who think 'undoubtedly' can be omitted undoubtedly do not understand what they believe in.

[69] In this writing, I mainly quoted contents from *The Selfish Gene* and *The Origins of virtue*. However, if you are willing to root out the myths that human beings can be developed through culture and there is a noble savage somewhere on earth, there is no better book than *Blank Slate* by Steven Pinker. This book on the environment and human nature is so excellent that it single-handedly is a perfect refutation of Jacque Fresco. I randomly chose the these from the book: The power of language in restricting our thoughts is exaggerated; Image does not decide our view of reality; Environmental determinism is as dangerous as gene determinism and was historically more dangerous; Exposure of violence in the mass media has little or no influence on violent behavior in real life; Animals sometimes kills another animals for fun; Animals that form societies do not go into war and violence because they are short of food or land. Of course, some books have opposing arguments than *Blank Slate*. The problem is that most of these books were not written by scientists with expertise in this topic. I recommend people to always check out the appendix of books when they cannot distinguish between them and truly scientific books. If the appendix has a list of references and papers extending over 10 pages, you may believe that the book contains opinions by scientists. *Blank Slate* satisfies this criterion.

[70] If the myth that there is a peaceful tribal society with social system equal for all people is true, it would be more proper to call this 'pleasant truth' instead of 'inconvenient truth'. It clearly makes us feel pleasant. Whether we are in hell or purgatory, the myth that heaven exists makes us feel pleasant. The truly inconvenient truth is that it is only a myth. I will return to the topic of human nature function that can easily fall into romantic myth of collectivism at the end of this chapter.

[71] Romanticists may want to believe that these natives were deviant in a way, but such thought is very wrong. It brings the thought that native culture can be acknowledged only by passing a moral test, and this test cannot be passed by anyone. Unlike what is generally accepted, we cannot justify massacres by recognizing that natives are human beings with the same desires as we do. The opposite is even more dangerous.

[72] Perhaps it would be better to describe in this way. Even if population of a species is actually increased by the altruistic gene, the gene that makes us do selfish behavior always benefits in terms of ratio. The selfish gene will eventually prosper to the extent that population increased by the altruistic gene is reduced.

[73] Keep in mind that the concept corresponding to ESS is metastable state, not stable state. As several metastable states can exist within a system of statistical physics, many ESSs can exist. Although cooperation-competition model takes reciprocal altruism as ESS, it also takes complete egoism as ESS. Which of the two is more stable is not important here. However for several reasons, it would not be bad to emphasize the fact that reciprocal altruism is closer to a more stable ESS. While a reciprocal altruist cannot survive in the group of complete egoists, entities belonging to a cluster can gain greater benefit compared to complete egoists once reciprocal altruists can successfully gather to create a cluster of sufficient size. Here, greater benefit refers to increased opportunity for reproduction. The cluster of reciprocal altruists will gradually proliferate. Someone probably is aware that this result is the opposite of social models A and B we mentioned earlier. It is easy to explain the reason. It is impossible for people who belong to specific cluster in completely collectivistic society to enjoy greater material benefit. Under such environment, reciprocal individuals cannot win competition against complete egoists. Competition does not exist. The two models look similar, but their essence is completely different.

[74] If you were a gene related to reciprocity, it would be more advantageous for you to make your host perform a greater reciprocal behavior than what is expected to be beneficial for him. Your host entity will experience loss due to excessively reciprocal behavior, but another reciprocal entity anticipated to have high probability of possessing a copy of reciprocal gene can benefit. Excessively reciprocal gene can be naturally selected because of exactly the same reason as sacrifice for relatives. Of course, this is not a pleasant thing for other genes that share the same host with you. However, they cannot alter the situation since they are not genes related to reciprocity. As far as natural selection of reciprocity is concerned, they are nothing more than bridesmaids. Genes are 'selfish' in this sense. I know that this is an extremely unpleasant description, but I can't help it. Socio-biology is always like this.

[75] What we need to keep in mind about this is that emotion is not logical. Jacques Fresco's claim that a criminal committed crime because of the environment in which he grew up may be correct, but this does not help us remove our hatred unless we actually know the environment in which he grew up and empathize with him. If you are suspicious about this, think about how the fact that machines do not have thoughts cannot prevent us from attacking machines.

[76] People have a tendency to think of wildlife as romantic because they have not experienced cruelty of the Mother Nature. While Jacques Fresco argued that animals would only cooperate under abundant environment, there is no such thing as abundant environment in the natural world. Abundant environment results in increased number of animals and becomes less abundant as a result. Furthermore, the argument that animals only cooperate under abundant environment is far from the truth. As far as sexuality is concerned, animals can never have complete abundance. Chimpanzees are as political as human beings. However, chimpanzees do not form hierarchical order because of food shortage. It is intended to determine the order of priority for mating. The reason why male baboons and dolphins cooperate is to rape females. In fact until detailed research on chimpanzees and dolphins was conducted, we believed that they are peaceful animals. This reminds us about the case of Samoa and Tahiti.

[77] The argument that we can gain more leisure time by giving up on leisure time might sound somewhat strange, but this is not strange at all. This is the classical problem of prisoner's dilemma. It is advantageous for individuals to not give up on their leisure time. However, collectivistic society will collapse if everyone does so. We can obtain greater leisure time while producing the same amount of goods as in individualistic society when everyone gives up on leisure time to a certain degree.

[78] I have nothing to complain about positive thinking as a belief. More research is necessary, but it may be true that positive thinking increases the possibility of success. However, it is not correct that this happens because of a supernatural 'law of attraction' instead of a psychological effect influencing our abilities. At least, it is a fact this contradicts with modern science.

[79] It's not a fact that research method of natural sciences was innovatively changed by the quantum theory and theory of relativity. Research method has not changed much, both in terms of experiment and theory. So far as I know, the quantum theory and theory of relativity were created using the method that Faraday and Maxwell used to complete classical electromagnetism. Therefore the argument that such change is necessary is actually funny. Almost no quantum scientist or cosmologist believes that the methodology of natural sciences should be changed because of the quantum theory and theory of relativity.

[80] There is no reason to assume that corporations newly entering a specific market will have weaker marketing ability compared to existing corporations. In fact, there is greater possibility that they are actually not new - Microsoft and Sony jumped into the game console industry which had been shared by Nintendo and Sega in the past. Is anyone surprised by this fact?

[81] Someone might condemn such behavior of consumers as being irrational, but exactly how is it

irrational for consumers to prefer products with life span of 3 years which is 20% cheaper than a product with life span of 10 years? This really is not irrational or wasteful compared to Jacque Fresco's plan to completely destroy existing, imperfect but still useful, cities and rebuild new cities from the beginning.

[82] In fact, no economic planner believes there is a need to devise specific plans on how to distribute each good to individuals. The essence is about how many of each good to produce, or how to distribute resources and labors. Market economy makes use of market mechanism and planned economy uses plan. Many supporters of planned economy acknowledge that markets are necessary in the process of distributing produced goods. Though market was not proposed as an alternative, Jacque Fresco also believes that it is unnecessary to devise a plan for detailed distribution of goods. He promised he would allow us to take whatever we want. Therefore, his plan about production and distribution of goods is only a comprehensive plan like the plan devised by the authorities of communistic society. I cannot understand why such comprehensive plan suddenly becomes impossible just because of money.

[83] This will become clear when we compare traditional classification with Jacque Fresco's classification. I support market economy, but I do not think that all market economies are good. Those who support planned economy also do not believe that all planned economies are good. We can recognize advantages and disadvantages, and try to correct disadvantages by using the terms market economy and planned economy. Jacque Fresco's classification does not permit this.

[84] In my viewpoint, the problem of selecting among the value system prioritizing growth and system prioritizing distribution can be separated from the question of whether they contradict each other. In fact, we must answer the question of whether policies for growth and distribution always accord instead of whether they always contradict. If the former is not true, we may one day need to choose between growth and distribution.

[85] Of course, I have been using the term 'resource-based economy' to refer to Jacque Fresco's alternative. There is no other way to refer to it. Perhaps to supporters of The Venus Project, I could have seen as opposing 'distribution with consideration on the amount of resources on earth and demand' when I opposed 'resource-based economy'. However, this is not my fault. We really do need to use proper terminology.

[86] This prejudice is formed because Jacque Fresco attacks the current system based on the evidence that can only refute one of many money-based economies and deceives that overcoming money-based economy is the only solution. For instance, it seems unimportant to him that communism is money-based economy without planned obsolescence. This of course is not important to me since I am not a communist, but he is not in the position to think as I do.

[87] There are many things around us that show the Gaussian distribution. However, it is wrong to think that everything shows the Gaussian distribution. For example, our wealth does not have the Gaussian distribution, and so does purchasing power. The central limit theorem guarantees that a random variable will show the Gaussian distribution only if it is a combination of many random variables with finite mean and dispersion. It would be wrong to think that other random variables will also show the Gaussian distribution. Recent studies are showing that things happening in market economy are actually far away from the Gaussian function. For example, it is more accurate to approximate fluctuation in stock market using Levy alpha-stable process than using Weiner process based on the Gaussian function. While employment and production seem to have the Gaussian distribution under ordinary conditions, we cannot hastily ascertain it.

[88] When I searched Jacque Fresco and Gaussian curve together, I found people using Gaussian curve in incorrect meaning as they believed that he taught them a new knowledge. It was painful to look at them. Peter Joseph claimed that having hopes on democracy is an act of insulting one's own

intelligence, but I think there is no greater insult on intelligence than this.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Chapter 10.

Because we have better alternatives already.

10-01 Summary) It is a prejudice to think that the mankind cannot be liberated from labor as long as money exists. We have at least two ways to drive out labor in our lives while maintaining market economy. We can accomplish it through shortening of legal working hours. We can accomplish it through basic income system. Like all other welfare systems, it helps us create a more equal society.

10-02 It is true that money cannot exist in a perfectly abundant society. However, all we need to do for this is to perform our duties in developing the technology and increasing productivity. Increased productivity will reduce prices of goods until they converge to 0, which will become as abundant as water and air. Goods will be driven out of the market. Once price of all goods becomes 0, the market and money will cease to exist without any revolution.

10-03 How can we perform integrated management of resources on earth? Isn't it impossible to manage resources according to plan if we were to leave production of goods to the market? Of course it is not. We can control the use of resources by levying taxes. We can also decide the limit of resource use for each year and allow economic subjects to buy and sell the right to use resources within the limit.

10-04 One day, we might be able to accomplish a perfectly abundant society free from labor. If economic problems caused by scarcity of goods disappear, we would be able to attempt many things we could not attempt before such as the marine city. It might create a society similar to what we are calling 'resource-based economy'. However, even if it is true, we should not follow the path presented by Jacque Fresco.

10-05 Some says that the mankind must overcome an economy using money in order to be liberated from labor. This argument is invalid if there is an economy using money that does not require labor. But is this really true? Is it really true that no money-based economy can exist without labor? Most of

us do not raise such question. We intuitively know that it is an obvious fact.

10-06 Where does this intuition come from? The reason why we must be cautious about abuse of intuition is because it is often wrong. *We tend to recall current system when we think about money-based economy or capitalism.* This is because current system is all we saw and learned about economic system with money. We really cannot imagine anything else. Most of prejudices about the so-called money-based economy are created here.

10-07 I would like to stress out once again here that introspection is not very helpful in curing our prejudice. It can help cure prejudices that we are aware of, but it is helpless in curing prejudices we cannot imagine. It is not even value neutral. It is biased. Supporters of The Venus Project would not have imagined themselves having some kind of negative prejudice about money-based economy.

10-08 Scientists sometimes use intuition to come up with something, but it must be proved by scientific reasoning in order to become science. How can we demonstrate that there cannot be money-based economy without labor? Someone may have realized such proof does not exist. There is no reason for money-based economy to always require labor. [\[89\]](#)

10-09 Those who claim that automation will generate unemployment tend to forget the fact that automation increases production per hour of labor and leads to increased wage per hour. Once the value created by unit labor increases, competing entrepreneurs would try to employ as many laborers as possible and offer higher wages. Short-term effect of automation is increase, not decrease, in demand for labor.

10-10 Entrepreneurs are not interested in how many hours of labor they are to employ. They are interested in the value they can produce through labor. Wage determined in free market is proportional to productivity, not to labor time. If we can create the same value as we do by 8 hours of labor now in 4 hours someday, the price for 4 hours of labor will be identical to the price for 8 hours of labor now.

10-11 Thus, the essential question is as follows: Will we be willing to continue the same amount of labor under increased wage rate? Are we going to prefer working 8 hours to receive twice as much real wage than working 4 hours? Of course, we might choose the former until our savings reach particular level. However, we will end up reducing labor hours because the utility of added wage does not reach disutility of labor.

10-12 Our prospect includes time during which laborers increase their savings, the time when they do not spend the value they produce. This is the time when productivity increased by automation and non-reduced labor coexist, resulting in greater supply of goods than what can be spent. (In fact, these two are different methods of explaining the same thing.) In terms of economics, it is clearly a temporary phenomenon triggered by sudden change in conditions. However, critics of free market misunderstood it as a permanent state.

10-13 Even if the described process cannot smoothly be progressed for some reason, there is no reason to worry about it. There is a way to resolve the problem of unemployment without overly increasing unproductive labor. It is shortening of legal working hours. This is not a new idea, and this is not an unrealistic idea. Ever since the first enactment of the Ten Hours Act during 1847 in the UK, it has decreased.

10-14 One day, we will be able to produce the same amount of goods as we do right now using half as much labor. At that time, we are going to reduce legal working hours to half. It is self-evident that this cannot reduce our real wage below the level prior to automation because the value created by 1 hour of

labor was increased by a factor of two. (This really is not a principle that needs to be explained twice.)

10-15 Shortening of legal working hours can be applied step by step. We can apply this in societies where only 20% or 30% of labor should disappear. The Venus Project always speaks about 'high-technology resource based economy' where 90% of labor is gone. However, it fails to say anything about transition economies where 20% or 30% of labor is removed.

10-16 Ordinary alternatives like shortening of legal working hours cannot easily satisfy the desire of people who dream of perfect society. But at least we won't have to take a step backwards in order to advance two steps. It will not demand wholehearted revolution for which we are unsure about sacrifices and side effects we need to endure. It does not require an adjustment period so long that will actually diminish quality of life instead of improving it. It is more attractive than Jacque Fresco's plan.

10-17 Shortening of legal working hours is not the only way to liberate the mankind from labor. Another method of removing the necessity of labor in maintaining livelihood on top of reducing pain from labor was proposed: Basic income. Basic income refers to offering of regular income sufficient enough to maintain livelihood to all citizens by the government, regardless of whether or not they work.

10-18 If we can maintain livelihood without working, considerable number of us will not be willing to work under low wage condition. Some may actually stop working. However, we should point out that it is no long an unfortunate event because the purpose of basic income discussed within our context is in preventing oversupply of labor - in fact, basic income is only rational when it is spoken in terms of this purpose -.

10-19 As for shortening of legal working hours, basic income can also be applied step by step. At the beginning, it may be in the form of providing income just enough to barely maintain livelihood. Most people will still prefer working, and supply of labor is not going to decrease by large. This must be so when the technology has not yet been developed enough to automate many things.

10-20 As technological development further decreases demand for labor, we will be able to increase the size of basic income. We would gradually be able to enjoy abundant life without labor. How about laborers? They will be required to sacrifice greater part of their income. This reduces supply of labor. Only a small number of people who need money for special purposes or enjoy working will gladly work. Demand and supply are balanced once again.

10-21 Of course, this can only be accomplished by forcing laborers to sacrifice their income. Future laborers might end up paying most of their income as taxes. Money required to provide basic income to all citizens is not gained for free. [\[90\]](#) However, this sacrifice is still fractional. Even if laborers must pay over half of their income as taxes, their income will far exceed income of those who do not work.

10-22 The fact that laborers need to endure sacrifice for free-riders does not sound well, but it is nothing compared to the overwhelming sacrifice demanded on laborers by resource-based economy of Jacque Fresco. Laborers in resource-based economy are not rewarded with anything except for intangible things like people's respect. Supporters of The Venus Project see no problem in it.

10-23 In fact, the logic of supporting basic income is completely identical to the logic of supporting resource-based economy. Since automation begins to remove the simplest and most mechanical labor, remaining labor works will be more creative and amusing. Jacque Fresco and I share the common thought that no incentive is necessary for scientists and engineers. Of course, I serious doubt whether Fresco really has scientific and technological passion.

10-24 The difference is that the logic of supporting basic income does not need to be doctrinaire. Basic income allows laborers to at least receive some kind of material reward for their labor. This can always be adjusted. Psychological reward may be sufficient to make laborers do some works but is probably not sufficient enough to make them do other works. I think it is rational to use both methods in order to give incentives to labor.

10-25 If the criticism on basic income focuses on the fact that basic income requires redistribution of income through taxation and results in big government than small, it is correct. Redistribution of income through taxation distorts the market. However, we can still compare between positive and negative effects. Big government becomes a threat mainly because it is arbitrary. Individual policies are not always bad, as long as they are not arbitrary.

10-26 As Hayek wrote in *The Road to Serfdom*, "The question whether the state should or should not 'act' or 'interfere' poses an altogether false alternative, and the term 'laissez faire' is a highly ambiguous and misleading description of the principles on which a liberal policy is based." The important question is whether the individual can foresee the action of the state and make use of this knowledge as a datum in forming his own plans."

10-27 Therefore, size of arbitrary power which determines what is the best policy for the greatest number, not size of the government, is dangerous. It is obvious that redistribution of income through taxation will not threaten our freedom only if it does not permit any discretion to the bureaucrats executing redistribution and we can predict all details based on law.

10-28 Basic income is superior to other welfare systems requiring redistribution of wealth. [91] For example, basic income is the only system that can predict without error how much budget must be used. This means that we do not have to create funds like pension fund in order to respond to 'elastic' demand. As the ratio of basic income in the budget increases, residual fund operated by the government is reduced.

10-29 Shortening of legal working hours and basic income are not automatically given to us when we sit around doing nothing. They are close to something we need to gain through ceaseless struggle. Also, they are political struggles. Some people claim that political struggles are useless. *However, almost everything we accomplished is an outcome of political struggle.* The fact that we have labor laws allowing us to work less than 18th century British people did is not because of mercy by capitalists.

10-30 Jacques Fresco would say we should give up all efforts to rescue the money system. The money system will collapse because of its hypocrisy, for example the large scale unemployment caused by automation. However, we should rather welcome this instead of regarding it as unfortunate, because we will be able to construct a true paradise.

10-31 But if we need to endure the pain of unemployment and famine that have never existed in the history during collapse of the money system and we must hand over the right to use technologies, which might permanently fall the mankind into slavery, to small number of planners, should we really welcome it? Is it valuable enough for us to give up on the way to liberate us from labor through basic income?

10-32 Supporters of The Venus Project would answer that death of the money system cannot be avoided. They might say that since politics is fundamentally corrupt, it is impossible to accomplish good political objectives such as basic income and legal working hours. Death of money-based economy cannot be avoided. We can only reduce accompanied pain. Such fatalistic view about the

history agrees with what Popper referred to as historicism.

10-33 It is hard to find something that supporters of The Venus Project are not doing among things Karl Popper warned not to do. Since behaviors of collectivists have not changed much for hundreds of years, it was probably not a surprise that the warning of an intellectual given 50 years ago is applied to collectivists of today. Popper's criticism on historicism was intended to refute Marxism, but his logic of criticism is applied as is to Jacque Fresco.

10-34 Most of his criticisms as a scientist-philosopher were scientific criticisms. The argument that one found the law of historical development is not and cannot be an outcome of scientific thinking. [\[92\]](#) However, we need to focus on his criticism about conclusion of historicism, not his criticism about non-scientific aspect of historicism. Historicists claim that all efforts to alter the society are useless, except for efforts 'permitted' by the law of history.

10-35 There is no doubt about the fact that historicism of Marx was wrong. Today, we are living in a society in which free education is provided to all children and most of communication and transportation means are controlled by the central government, which were considered by Marx as impractical to achieve without abolishing capitalism. What resulted in failure was the attempt to rebuild the society at once, not the political struggle to progressively reform the society.

10-36 You can laugh at people who support The Venus Project when they claim that basic income and shortening of legal working hours are fanciful dreams that cannot be accomplished. In terms of practicality and possibility of accomplishment, basic income and legal working hours are incomparable to resource-based economy. What determines possibility of accomplishment for something depends on how many people agree with it, not how well it accords with the abstract law of history.

10-37 Can other goals promised by resource-based economy be achieved through piecemeal method? For instance, can we create an abundant society without scarcity of all goods using piecemeal method? It is true that money is unnecessary in a society without scarcity of all goods. If so, shouldn't we bring the current money-based economy to an end in order to create a society without scarcity?

10-38 The meaning of the term scarcity was one thing that Jacque Fresco and his supporters never understood properly. If we had sufficient iron to construct all railroads we need in the future, does it mean there is no scarcity of iron? Of course it doesn't. Iron must be used for other purposes. Quantity of iron may not be enough to satisfy all purposes.

10-39 However, if we were to declare a planned economy and decide to only use iron for construction of railroads, does it remove scarcity of iron? This might seem plausible at the first sight, but this is far away from the truth. The planners probably chose what to satisfy among various uses of iron. We simply cannot recognize the fact that there were other possible choices because the choice was already made by someone else.

10-40 The reason why we agonize to use something according to plan is because it is scarce. Nobody would agonize to use sunlight according to plan. However, Jacque Fresco's claim about resources is exactly opposite. Resources are limited, and we must always choose where to use them. *Choice is an act of giving up on a demand in order to satisfy another demand.* So, what in this world does not have scarcity? [\[93\]](#)

10-41 Anyway, it is absurd to think that market system creates scarcity that does not exist. *The market*

exists because of scarcity, not the vice versa. As the market cannot create non-existing richness, it cannot create non-existing scarcity. Such misunderstanding is caused by supporters of The Venus Project who mysticize money without recognizing it as a simple tool for exchange.

10-42 If an entrepreneur wishes to increase price of a good he produces using the law of scarcity, he needs to reduce its production. Such thing does not happen except in small number of monopolistic markets. It can only be good for his competitors. Unless all capitalists around the world are colluding, capitalism cannot create a non-existing scarcity. Nobody would seriously make such argument.

10-43 If we really were to create an abundant society, what we need to do is simple. It is to develop the technology and increase productivity of the society. Increased productivity will reduce prices of goods to 0. Many goods have already gone through this path. Books and watches were more expensive than vehicles and personal computers today in the past, but they are no longer the subjects of serious economic trouble.

10-44 Where does this path lead to? One day, this path might be able to drop prices of most goods to 0. A good with price of 0, as most of good except for public goods are in the completed resource-based economy of Jacque Fresco, can be picked up in the market without price tags. Money will cease to exist without any revolution when price of all goods becomes 0.

10-45 Of course, this is only an analogy. Considering the incentives for capitalists, price of a good cannot be 0 even if there is no cost involved with production of the good. However, capitalists who produce the good would at least reduce the price so that it converges to 0. Unless they do so, other capitalists will take away their remaining profit by providing the good at a lower price.

10-46 But the lessons we learn from this are clear. First, *expulsion of money is the result, not the condition, of limitlessly abundant society.* Our economic troubles created by expensive prices of some goods will be naturally resolved by developing the technology so that their prices can be reduced. Compulsory expulsion of money is as unnecessary as pulling the limbs of a child to turn him into an adult. This would only result in side effects.

10-47 Second, *money can be partially driven out.* If a good is no longer our economic trouble due to technological development, we can say we drove out half of the money about that particular good. We may someday succeed in completely removing necessity of money about the good, but money would still be necessary to distribute other goods.

10-48 Therefore, even if it is true that we can accomplish abolishment of money system one day, it does not have to be accomplished by radical revolution. We can allow the government to produce and distribute for free important goods for which price has reached 0. For example, if energy can be supplied in renewable way without limit, we can make the government produce and distribute it for free, leaving distribution of other goods to the market.

10-49 How about resource and environment? Wouldn't it be impossible to perform integrated management of resources on earth by leaving production of goods to the market? Of course, it is not. Sustainable management of resources on earth requires plan, but this plan is only a comprehensive plan. The plan we need is about total amount of each resource. There is no need to give instruction for specific use of each resource.

10-50 We can control the amount of resource used by changing its economic environment. For instance, we can control the use of a resource by levying tax on its use. At first, it would be difficult to obtain intended result. However, an advantage of this method is in that it can be consistently readjusted.

If a resource is not being used enough, we can adjust it simply by reducing tax on it.

10-51 This of course is not the only way we can use to prevent waste of resources. For example, we can decide limit of resource use for each year and allow economic subjects to buy and sell the right to use resources, just as we do with land properties. We have many legal devices to prevent monopoly of land. It can be applied to preventing monopoly of resource use.

10-52 The essence is that we do not have to control movement of all water molecules in order to pull water out of a piston. Finite goal can be accomplished by finite adjustment. If we wanted to control volume of a balloon, we can apply heat or add more air. Such adjustments affect all air particles in the balloon and change their physical environment, but they do not control each particle. Our attitude towards resources should be the same.

10-53 Of course, there is a limit in managing global resources and environment this way because the stakes of different nations conflict each other. I expect this problem to be resolve through international treaties. Someone might argue that there is no promise about this. However, it would be ridiculous for supporters of The Venus Project to claim the same. International treaties are still easier than uniting all nations. [94]

10-54 The same logic is used to prevent conflict and warfare between nations. War between nations will disappear after we unite the world as a single nation. The problem is that uniting the world as a nation is even more difficult than eradicating wars between nations. However, even this is nothing compared to difficulty of making a single ideology to govern the entire world. It is a deception to argue that we can resolve a problem using solution more difficult to apply than the problem itself.

10-55 The truth is such beliefs always resulted in horrible massacres. Collectivism gives birth to war. The grand pretext will justify any wars and massacres. For instance, if resource-based economy dominates most of the world and a few small nations are resisting it and spreading their dangerous ideas, imagine what the virtuous planners would do to improve psychological environment of the mankind.

10-56 Jacque Fresco's wish to remove conflicts by turning all people into truth-seekers who realized unity of all things is as immature as the wish of Christians to remove conflicts by turning people into 'children of God'. What we need is a rational alternative. It may be an international organization or treaty on prevention of war. Existing organizations are not perfect and maybe unfair. However, we can at least place efforts to make them fair.

10-57 What about humanness? As Jacque Fresco says, our environment affects formation of our personality. Wouldn't human beings be forever unable to overcome egoism as long as they live in the money system? My answer is the opposite of that. All collectivistic societies, whether or not they have money, reinforced negative aspects of human beings instead of removing them.

10-58 It is a fact that comparing the merits between different cultures is wrong. However, there is no reason for me not to do so if collectivists were to start on it. Scientific studies on ancient people or today's hunting-gathering societies suggest that the truth is exactly opposite of what most of romanticists believe without evidence. I doubt whether there was a past generation richer in emotion, sympathetic and conservationist than the modern civilization. [95]

10-59 People were most virtuous when they were grown under the most individualistic environment. [96] It is uncertain as to whether this was caused by the general material abundance that accompanied individualistic environment or by the individualistic environment itself. But no matter which of the two

is true, there is no reason for us to select collectivism in order to make people good or fundamentally eradicate crimes.

10-60 Grand collectivistic experiments always start out by promising they will turn people into virtuous and altruistic beings. They always end by turning everyone less virtuous and altruistic. It is uncertain as to whether this was caused by the poverty and inequality resulting from economic failure of collectivism or by the collectivistic environment. But no matter which of the two is true, there is no doubt about the fact that it is insane to repeat such experiment now.

10-61 The conclusion is obvious. *Most of problems that Jacque Fresco claims to be irresolvable unless we accept resource-based economy are not irresolvable at all, and some of them can be easily solved by not accepting it.* I did not mention problems of money-based economy suggested by Jacque Fresco in this Chapter, but they are the same.

10-62 Problems created by debt can be resolved through the commodity standard or greenback system. Inequality can be adjusted by welfare system or basic income. Inheritance of wealth can be removed by heavy inheritance tax and transfer tax. If electric vehicles were not produced because oil companies have patents for battery technology, it is the negative effect of patent system instead of money-based economy. We can settle this problem by amending the patent law. [97]

10-63 If you wish to eliminate the government, consider the method of reinforcing the rule of law. It practically gets rid of the government by withdrawing the authority on policies from the government bureaucrats. Do not be deceived by Jacque Fresco's play of words to directly abolish the government. *His plan requires a gigantic provisional government which has never even existed in the history.* Size of the government demanded by planned economy is beyond imagination. As we saw in Chapter 4, there is extremely small number of functions that a computer can replace.

10-64 I do not want readers to think about the purpose of this Chapter as perpetuation of money-based system or market system operated by the logic of profit. If we can one day supply all goods without scarcity using sustainable resources and not doing unwanted labor, it is self-evident that money and market system will no longer be necessary. I am not trying to claim or even to believe that such future cannot come true.

10-65 The reason why I oppose argument of collectivists to immediately abolish money is simple. They always talk about radical abolition of money, but market system and money system can also be abolished partially. Of course, it must be demonstrated through the experimental method proposed by piecemeal engineering. If it is successful, we will be able to gradually expand the scope of money abolishment. I do not oppose any of these. [98]

10-66 One of the methods for understanding piecemeal solutions is to consider it as an intermediate process. Natural decrease in price caused by technological development may be one of steps needed to reduce price of all goods to 0. The system in which tax is collected from laborers to provide basic income may be a step towards a perfectly egalitarian system - these two can be exactly identical when tax rate is 100% - in which no laborer has any privilege and everyone earns same income.

10-67 What we really need is the alternative for such intermediate process. Conditions of the intermediate process require an alternative for the intermediate process. While necessity and scarcity of labor today are smaller compared to the past, they have not completely disappeared. We should only eradicate parts of labor, not the whole. When technological conditions of the society progressively change, there is little need for radical change. [99]

10-68 We cannot create the optimal social system through a single revolution. The truth is that even the optimal social system is changed by changing conditions. We must continuously experiment and change our social system. Of course as often pointed out, this experiment can be disrupted by people who benefit from existing system. We must ceaselessly fight in order to further shorten working hours or introduce and expand basic income.

10-69 Individual experiments may turn out to be a success or failure since our social engineering knowledge is insufficient. Sometimes, hardly acquired outcome can turn out to be something that impoverishes our life instead of improving it. However, we can at least obtain knowledge. As the same mistake is accumulated, the possibility of repeating the same mistake will decrease. Piecemeal social engineering makes it possible.

10-70 However, we would be deceiving ourselves to believe that we can skip this difficult process of readjustment and experimentation by fundamentally changing the society through a single revolution. Resource-based economy in transition period is as distant from completed resource-based economy as the current system. It cannot remove the government, and it cannot eradicate labor. We must acknowledge that even it can only get closer to completed resource-based economy based on continued experimentation and readjustment.

10-71 Therefore, the choices given to us are not about whether we will momentarily eliminate labor and scarcity through revolution or go through the difficult process of struggle proposed by piecemeal engineering. We can only choose between taking the responsibility to continuously struggle and experiment for better society and leaving it up to people who claim to be engineers with a solution.

10-72 Our first enlightenment comes from this. *Our desire for utopian engineering does not originate from courage and sense of responsibility but from our laziness of shifting our responsibilities to someone else.* Piecemeal engineering demands endurance of difficult struggle for which we cannot predict success and failure in order to reduce one hour of labor. We simply try to avoid it because we are already too tired and have no courage to continue this path.

10-73 However, the consequence of such escape is frightening. *It demands the right for planners promising the best society to exclusively use all sciences and technology, and the right to educate anything to us which may remove our ability to think as we wish.* It is most probably going to be used in creating their utopia, not a utopia for all of us.

10-74 Those who acknowledge this and are willing to select piecemeal engineering will suddenly realize that we are already in the middle of this path. Our ancestors had to shed blood and fight to gain the rights we now regard as trivial, such as the universal suffrage. Quality of life we enjoy today not only resulted from development of science and technology but also from such piecemeal struggle.

10-75 Jacque Fresco, probably except for engineers like him, asks us to hate ancestors. [\[100\]](#) He asks us to think of all struggles and outcomes by ancestors as useless. Utopian engineering must be so. We cannot start with utopian engineering without turning back on the path of piecemeal engineering. The path to utopian engineering requires us to give up not only what we can acquire through piecemeal engineering but what ancestors have already acquired.

10-76 Jacque Fresco does not speak about the long and tedious process of transition period. He always talks about completed resource-based economy. He creates a fantasy that his plan must be self-evidently accepted if we were to accomplish resource-based economy. Is this really true? Do we have

to hand over the right to decide everything from production and distribution of goods to education to the provisional government uncontrolled by laws and democratic devices in order to achieve resource-based economy?

10-77 The truth is that Jacque Fresco's plan has great possibility of bringing horrible oppression rather than creating resource-based economy, regardless of whether we have enough resources and technological capability to realize his plan. *We have to reject Jacque Fresco's plan not because it pursues a wrong goal, but because his plan is inferior in terms of methodology.*

10-78 We may one day be completely liberated from labor. We may one day accomplish a perfectly abundant society. Once economic problems caused by scarcity of goods disappear, we can attempt many things we have never attempted before like the marine city. This might be considerably similar to what we refer to as 'resource-based economy'.

10-79 However, such future cannot be obtained by applying utopian engineering. We must continue the duty we inherited from ancestors. We should fight for small things rather than throwing ourselves into large stakes, and we have to consider the outcome of such struggle as precious. This is the only way we can prepare a foothold for the best society, whether it is resource-based economy or something else.

10-80 There is nothing in the alternative suggested by piecemeal engineering that we need to wait until the time comes. In fact, there already are various movements having the purpose of each. You can participate in the movement to stop wars, receive basic income, or limit power of the Federal Reserve Bank right now. As long as the desire for collectivism robs the driving force from all these things, the future of such movements is more hopeful than ever. This text is intended to explain this.

[89] Somebody might say this: "We have to use money in order to maintain money-based economy, but we can only earn money through labor. Therefore, labor is necessary in money-based economy." Of course this is wrong. There is no ground for the argument that we can only earn money through labor in money-based economy. This is not even true in the current system. Some people make a living with dividends from equity, and others make a living with government subsidies.

[90] Whether the tax for basic income should be collected from laborers or capitalists is not an important problem. If all taxes are collected from capitalists, supply of labor will be increased. This allows capitalists to slightly reduce wages of laborers. At the point where demand and supply reach equilibrium, where the taxes are collected does not change anything. Of course, this is not the result wanted by people who believe that the tax for basic income should be collected from capitalists. They want the profit of capitalists to be sacrificed for basic income. The essence of what I am saying is that collecting taxes from capitalists is not helpful in doing so. We cannot accomplish it without making the government directly intervene in the price decision process of labor market. Such intervention does not always bring desirable outcome.

[91] In fact, welfare nation models until now have not been successful unlike what is commonly known - mainly by the propaganda of anti-marketeters. For instance, as pointed out by a Swedish politician, success of Sweden was possible because of economic policy that began in 1990s, not welfare. Read an article of Wall Street Journal at http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704698004576104023432243468.html?mod=googlenews_wsj.

[92] Especially on prejudice, Popper wrote, "The poverty of historicism, we might say, is a poverty of imagination. The historicist continuously upbraids those who cannot imagine a change in their little worlds; yet it seems that the historicist is himself deficient in imagination, for he cannot imagine a change in the conditions of change." There is no better explanation about supporters of The Venus Project who frequently emphasize imaginary power but cannot imagine more than what they saw and learned about money-based economy.

[93] Fresco is mainly conserving resources by driving out specific goods from the market or turning them into public goods. His argument that there is no scarcity in resources is probably correct about goods except for public goods and goods driven out, or goods to be freely distributed in his system and resources used to produce such goods. I am pointing out that it is illogical to discuss scarcity after excluding a part of demand. Refer to the discussion in the latter part of Chapter 9 about the argument that scarcity will disappear because Fresco's system uses all resources more efficiently. From the beginning, it is mathematically obvious that the market cannot select production processes in a way that all resources are wasted at the same time. There is no price structure that can make the process using resource $3a+b$ cheaper than the process using resource $a+2b$, while simultaneously making the process using resource $a+3b$ cheaper than the process using resource $2a+b$.

[94] Even if it is true that we must unite all nations in order to manage resources and environment on earth, there is no logical reason for us to accept other suggestions of resource-based economy. We do not have to rebuilt all cities in round form, abolish money, or devise plans on specific use of resources in order to manage resources and environment on earth.

[95] Arguing that modern people are less of conservationists than natives of Amazon and people in the past because they are destroying the nature more than natives of Amazon and people in the past is wrong. As Matt Ridley wrote in *The Origins of virtue*, this is simply because they do not have as many means to destroy the environment. Look at *Human nature* written by Allyn M. Stearman, especially volume 5 *Only slaves climb trees*.

[96] Let's first clarify what individualistic environment means. Many people consider this as a synonym of egoistic environment. However, this is not true. Individualistic environment refer to an environment in which individual independence is respected. That is, unless wanted by the individual, with whom he forms human relationship, what he loves and hates, and what kind of ideas and beliefs he has cannot be intruded by others. Collectivistic environment is the opposite. It is an environment that shares the belief that there an optimal idea and belief, and that the idea and belief of all human beings must accord with the optimal idea and belief. For instance, you are living in a collectivistic environment if someone forces you to salute to the national flag. The modern United States described by Jacque Fresco is not an individualistic environment.

[97] We have nothing to worry about the future of electric vehicles without making any improvement in laws. Since the patent will expire in 15 years, oil companies cannot permanently monopolize battery technology. One day, vehicles that run on petroleum will have to compete with electric vehicles in the market. However, if electric vehicles are really cheaper and safer than vehicles run on oil, there is no reason why they cannot dominate the market.

[98] In fact, Jacque Fresco is a true ideologist. The system of partially introducing money and market in resource-based economy is one of the things for which Jacque Fresco will never apply the method of substantiation and experimentation. He believes that money and market will self-evidently fail, whether they are fully or partially introduced. Such conviction made without experimentation is exactly what we decided to call ideology - in narrow sense.

[99] As phase transition exists in many models of statistical physics, it is true that phase transition can also exist in the optimal social environment. For instance, the optimal social system may

discontinuously change according to technological development. My point is not in that necessity of such discontinuous change cannot exist. It is that there is a tendency for this to be exaggerated. We are not familiar with brainstorming about the intermediate process between social systems on the two ends. We hastily believe that it does not exist. We fail to recognize that many problems of our society can be resolved by minor adjustments. We are too hasty in believing that they are fundamental problems of our social system. Imagining a grand utopia covered up by contradictions is always easier than imagining detailed adjustments.

[100] If we accept Jacque Fresco's groundless declaration that quality of life can only be improved by technological development, we cannot respect any of our ancestors except for engineers. In fact, Fresco quite directly asks us to detest all figures of the past excluding scientists and engineers. He says we must care less about intellectuals like the founders of the United States, independence fighters, Locke and Adam Smith. The truth is that we cannot evaluate figure of the past without considering the environment - it is symbolic that Fresco, who prioritizes environment more than anyone else, did not recognize this. It is much more difficult to become a cosmopolitan in 1800s than in 2000s. Most of their ideas were closest to freedom and equality at the time, and some of their ideas are still closest to freedom and equality now. As far as freedom and equality are concerned, we owe a lot to their struggle.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Appendix A. About Economics

11-01 Someone might have noticed that I did not use a term - Technocracy - that refers to things like The Venus Project. The reason is because first, the term can arouse unnecessary hostility by supporters of The Venus Project who refuse to be included in existing categories. Second, I thought it would be more proper to analyze technocracy through The Venus Project than to analyze The Venus Project through technocracy.

11-02 However, keeping existence of this word as a secret is not a good idea when we are trying to focus on the fact that things like The Venus Project have existed and been refuted since decades ago.

Jacque Fresco's idea is as obsolete as himself. What's new in The Venus Project is the pathetic argument that all ground cities should have round shape regardless of location.

11-03 What is technocracy? It is an odd trend that was born in 1930s. It claims that since politicians elected in the complex modern industrial economy are destined to be incompetent, all rights to make decision on production should be delegated to competent engineers who know how to resolve the problems. Since this expression was created by technocracy instead of Jacque Fresco and every aspect of technocracy is identical to Fresco's idea, it would be a waste of time to explain technocracy in greater detail.

11-04 We have already reviewed systematic problems of technocracy. They would be sufficient enough to permanently ostracize it. However, if we cannot criticize technological visions offered by technocrats, it is still incomplete. Even if we assume that all technocrats are as virtuous and wise as they advertise themselves to be, their plan must fail because of the error in their plan. This will be clearly shown through this supplementary discussion.

11-05 Let's first understand the ground on which technocrats argue their plans to be realistic. They offer technology as their ground. To them, the fact that we have all resources and technologies required for a plan means the plan is realistic. They really do not consider anything other than technology and resource.

11-06 What is the problem? We can consider a simple case. We have enough resources and technologies to build 800 aircraft carriers. But does this mean that the plan to build 800 aircraft carriers is realistic? The truth is that we cannot discuss practicality of something without economic consideration. We never think it is realistic to launch 40,000 satellites, but we were never short of resources to do so.

11-07 Economic consideration was the one thing that all technocrats coherently despised. They affirmed that all of their plans can be accomplished, as long as we do not have to be restricted by the logic of profit. They testified that entrepreneurs that must make profit will not attempt their plans because they require extreme cost, but they never correctly understood what it means.

11-08 Unfortunately, such excuse does not seem to resolve our doubt. If manufacture of 800 aircraft carriers is only unrealistic in places where market prices exist, Soviet Union would have easily dominated its arms race against the United States. Even if we assume - though it is uncertain as to what this assumption means - that Soviet Union abolished money in order to realize this plan, there is no doubt that it would not have suddenly become a realistic plan.

11-09 Many technocrats argued that scarcity is something created by money economy because of planned obsolescence - which has already been shown to have no grounds. However, such argument was always about final products purchased by the public. What they actually failed to understand was scarcity of the factors of production, not final products.

11-10 Consider an example of labor. It is self-evident that there is a limit in the amount of labor that the entire society can employ. Labor placed in a field must be reduced in order to put more labor into another field. Even if all entrepreneurs wanted to increase the number of laborers by a factor of 10 and they are willing to pay for corresponding wages, labor cannot be increased by 10 times. The same principle is applied to all production factors.

11-11 Many engineers complain that investment on their field is insufficient. However, what is actually insufficient is not the money itself. It is something we purchase using money. In material sense, it is

impossible to invest equally large sum of money in everywhere. Though this is not being understood correctly, but it should be accepted as one of basic truths of economics: We cannot increase the amount of the factors of production put into a place without reducing the amount of production factors in another place.

11-12 The plans of technocrats are unrealistic for the same reason as in 40,000 satellites. They will improve the standard of living. The problem is that they have to draw the factors of production needed to execute such plans out of more valuable areas. Based on consumer evaluation, the fact that something does not return profit means its value is lower than prices of its factors of production. Why do we have to move the factors of production from profitable area to unprofitable area?

11-13 Even among the pathetic plans proposed by technocrats, intercontinental magnetic levitation railroad plan by Jacque Fresco is one of the most pathetic. Let us briefly review this problem. He emphasizes that money-based economy shows its wastefulness by not selecting interoceanic magnetic levitation train as transportation means instead of airplanes. This probably means that intercontinental magnetic levitation train is less wasteful than airplanes, even under *current* technology and conditions.

11-14 However, how can a magnetic levitation train connecting Sendai and San Francisco help a traveler trying to go from Shanghai to Santiago? He would have to move to Sendai on a ship, go to San Francisco, and then go on a long trip to Santiago. This is even worse than riding a ship to Santiago. If there is only one intercontinental magnetic levitation train, it would not be able to provide the utility of airplanes.

11-15 So, how many trains do we need? At least 30 trains are necessary to make it more economically feasible for everyone to take magnetic levitation train for intercontinental trips. For convenience, let us assume it is possible for trains to change their track at intersections. Total length of track, using the most conservative estimation, will be 10 times longer than a single track crossing the Pacific Ocean.

11-16 I simply provided minimal requirement. Some people will reach their destination after than they would on an airplane. However, still more people have to move long distance on land and sea in order to take nearby magnetic levitation train. As a result, they will reach their destination more slowly. Leaving out the fairness, there is no guarantee that the total utility of earth that uses intercontinental magnetic levitation train will surpass total utility of earth that uses airplanes.

11-17 Our analysis cannot be completed before we discuss the cost of each. This is easy for airplanes. No entrepreneur will operate his business while intentionally experiencing loss. Total sales of the airline will be at least greater than the total cost to be burdened. This includes the cost for everything we need to calculate including price and maintenance expense of passenger planes, price of fuel, airport construction cost, and cost of all in-flight and airport services and labor.

11-18 Is price of a passenger plane really the same as cost of manufacturing the plane? Of course it is. Aircraft manufacturers will not operate their business while suffering loss, too. The advantage of economics is that it reduces time wasted on needless calculations. Anyway, we can easily verify through a bit of research that annual sales of global airline industry are about 500 billion dollars. Cost is slightly lower than that. However, it would be fine to assume that the sales and cost are identical.

11-19 What is the total cost of airline industry in the history? The very first jet liner was built about 70 years ago. Therefore, assume that 500 billion dollars were continuously put into airline industry for 70 years. Total cost is about 35 trillion dollars. This of course is a ridiculous assumption. Size of airline industry today is much larger than its size in the past. However, this at least offers us the maximum

value of cost we are trying to find. It would be helpful to use the maximum possible value.

11-20 More difficult calculation remains now. How would we calculate total cost required by a magnetic levitation train crossing the Pacific Ocean? Here, let us briefly speculate the cost required by its railroad. Construction of magnetic levitation railroad requires at least 25 million dollars per km, and width of the Pacific Ocean is about 15,000 km. Since we have to build 10 of such railroads, we will have to prepare for at least 3.75 trillion dollars.

11-21 However, this calculation is even more ridiculous than the previous one. 25 million dollars is the cheapest cost of magnetic levitation railroad, which definitely is not the cost of cutting edge vacuum tube demanded by Jacque Fresco's plan. Furthermore, it is the cost of constructing magnetic levitation railroad on land, not in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. Most conservatively estimating, the actual cost of constructing the railroad will be at least 10 times the value calculated above.

11-22 The conclusion is clear. Quantity of capital required to construct interoceanic magnetic levitation railroads easily surpasses the amount of capital put into airplanes by the mankind until now. We did not even consider time required for construction. It takes at least 50 years to complete Fresco's railroads. If we were to accept Fresco's plan, we would not be able to have any long-distance transportation means except for ships.

11-23 Someone might point out that unlike airplanes, railroads of magnetic levitation trains can be used for long time once they are installed. However, exactly how long can they be used? Let us ask Jacque Fresco who has obsession for new things. What would we do if we develop a new railroad which allows trains to move much faster after 50 years?

11-24 Advantage of airplanes is that quickly advancing technologies can be applied as they are developed. Railroads that demand enormous basic capital investment cannot. After 5 years, current technology becomes old. We will be forced to rebuild the entire railroad in order to apply new technology. If it must happen whether it is 200 years or 300 years from now, utility of existing magnetic levitation railroad may not be sufficient to cover depreciation.

11-25 We still did not include other expenses required by the plan for intercontinental magnetic levitation train, especially maintenance cost of railroads, in our discussion. Railroads are as notorious for astonishingly high maintenance cost as airplanes. While magnetic levitation trains have relatively low maintenance cost compared to existing railroads, it is still about half of existing railroads. No matter how the maintenance work is performed in the middle of the ocean, it clearly is going to require greater cost than ordinary maintenance cost.

11-26 At last, The Venus Project was completely buried with nails down to the coffin top. However, this case is more valuable in that it well represents the unrealistic thoughts of technocrats who claim to they can resolve the problems. Nobody among ancient and modern technocrats was in a better state than Jacque Fresco.

11-27 How did they come to call the most ridiculous things as being realistic and believe in the most wasteful things as being conserving? It is simple. They always talk about efficiency and rationality to be accomplished after enormous capital investment has been already made. They did not realize the fact that this investment is most problematic. They simply presumed the investment as a given factor because they did not understand scarcity of the factors of production.

11-28 The magnetic levitation train advertised by Jacque Fresco is known as Vactrain, and the concept of Vactrain existed since 1940s. However, the cost necessary for installation of vacuum tube was so large that nobody in market economy could dare to attempt it. Now, Jacque Fresco argues that we can always make such things as long as the profit structure does not disrupt our way. Only if he recognized that its cost accurately reflects the amount of labor and resource to be purchased!

11-29 Technocrats really need to learn economics from the beginning. Flash game series called Storm the House would be better fitted for their education level than Monopoly. We start out this game with a technology to make all weapons that exist in the game. However, we do not try to buy gravity cannon or mini-gun from the start. We buy a double gun, SMG or shotgun and slowly save money.

11-30 Technocrats might ask why we would be satisfied with ordinary high-speed railroads when we have the technology to build Vactrain. This is nothing different than asking someone playing Storm the House 3 why he buys a shotgun when he can have a mini-gun. He buys other guns because he cannot play the game with basic pistol until he can purchase mini-gun. Likewise, we cannot get rid of railroads until we have enough capital to build Vactrain.

11-31 Such intermediate goods may not be great compared to the optimal possibility offered by the technology. However, they help improve quality of life, and as a result, help us to more quickly accumulate our capital. Which civilization among civilization that decides not to use any railroad until construction of Vactrain and civilization that decides to use intermediate railroads will reach Vactrain first is clear.

11-32 Vactrain may one day become a marketable transportation. We will have much higher productivity compared to now, and the initial investment required by Vactrain can be not as large of a burden compared to the services it provides at that time. However, such productivity can only be obtained through preceding capital investments - that is, appropriate investments about goods at lower levels than Vactrain. Technocrats neglected this.

11-33 As Mises correctly pointed out, the fact that technology is relatively less important than supply of accumulated capital becomes evident when we simply look back on the past or examine underdeveloped nations. These nations are not lack of technology. An African farmer would not gain much benefit from looking at a tractor design from the United States. What he needs is the money required to make or purchase a tractor.

11-34 Think about a farmer living alone who has to do farming using hands but knows about all modern machineries like tractor which can be applied to farming. Let us assume that he is producing just enough to make a living, but he can use some time he used to spend on farming in producing something else by reducing his food expense to the minimal level.

11-35 Of course, he would not produce tractor first. If he did so, he needs to save only a part of his farming time - finite production factor - for production of tractor. This would take several hundred years to finish. He must first make farming tools like sickle and plow. They will help him produce crops with less labor until tractor is completed. Once they are manufactured, he would be able to spend most of his time on production of tractor.

11-36 This principle is applied better to complex modern economy than the farmer living alone. Savings of individuals in market economy - which means the individual spent less than what he produced - are given out as loans for use as capital for new production. However, we clearly cannot invest more than what was saved by individuals. We need to carefully choose where to invest limited

capital. The wisest investment is not solely determined by technology. It is determined by supply of accumulated capital.

11-37 From the perspective of unrealized technology, there is not a great difference between citizens of developed nations and citizens of underdeveloped nations. Many technologies gained an opportunity to be applied to increase quality of life ever since settlement of economic freedom. However, the rate at which technological and scientific knowledge is accumulated always exceeded the rate at which it is applied. The mankind was never able to utilize all opportunities provided by technologies of the era.

11-38 Technocracy started out from such background. They deluded that sufficient supply of money would allow anything to happen because they did not realize scarcity of production factors. They misunderstood all limitations levied on us by the nature as the result of money economy. As a result, the problem of enormous capital investment demanded by their plans was completely ignored.

11-39 Unfortunately, technocrats have never understood economics as well as they claim they do. As knowledge explosively increased and unrealized possibilities were accumulated, their outcry grew larger. They proposed marine cities and undersea tunnels as realistic plans without hesitation based on technology, failing to realize what it means to be realistic. They did not stop this when everything began to appear as unbearably stupid.

11-40 They were the true deformities created by 1930s.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Appendix B. About Current Crisis

12-01 These days, there is a vogue among ordinary people rather than serious scholars to blame all evils of economic crisis on capitalism or free market. The fact that must be emphasized is that this is not as clear as you think. We are not living in a perfectly free market society. This is why problems that were seemingly created by the market are often found out as problems created by intervention of the government.

12-02 Economists have different interpretations about economic crises that seem to occur periodically.

(This is not particularly distinctive compared to the difference in opinions about complex topics easily shown among theoretical physicists. Refer to Chapter 9 about complexity of the work analyzing human society as a complex system.) Here, I would like to briefly introduce the view of Austrian school that succeeded in most accurate and persuasive prediction of recent crisis.

12-03 In free market, interest rate balances demand and supply of loan fund. If banks can only give loans using deposited money, excessively low interest rate will result in overly high demand for loans. This cannot be maintained, as other overly low prices cannot. However, central banks can actually give out loans using money newly printed out. Therefore, low interest rate can be maintained as long as sustainable increase in money supply is accompanied.

12-04 Low interest rate allows entrepreneurs to easily make adventurous investments, which brings temporary economic boom. But is this really sustainable? Interpretation on economic crisis by Austrian school is simple. The government - more accurately the central bank - always attempts to create artificial economic boom by dropping interest rate below the level of free market, which inevitably leads to collapse.

12-05 Consider the following case: A baker bakes 10 breads and consumes 2 breads himself. He sells 8 breads to a wholesaler and receives 8 dollars to save all of this money in a bank. The bank gives out 8 dollars as a loan to a shoemaker. The shoemaker buys bread using his loan. The 8 breads will feed the shoemaker while he makes his shoes. This process can continue on because there is an actual saving that allows all production projects to be completed.

12-06 However, the story must be changed if loan is given out using printed money: A baker bakes 10 breads. He consumes 2 breads and sells remaining breads. He earns 8 dollars and saves all of it in a bank. The bank lends 8 dollars to a shoemaker. As another shoemaker asks the bank to give out a loan of 8 dollars, the bank prints out 8 dollars. Such economy cannot be maintained because there is no actual saving that allows all production projects to be completed.

12-07 This story gives exactly the same lesson as what we discussed in Appendix A: Since we purchase production factors using money, it is easy to think that unlimited money - or abolishment of money system - will allow us to utilize abundant production factors. However, this thought is a complete delusion. We cannot increase the amount of production factor used in a place without reducing the amount of production factor used in another place.

12-08 Therefore, the solution to economic crisis by Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph is untrustworthy. This is because it replaces the large and hollow investments encouraged by the government today by even larger and hollow investments through abolition of money. An architect cannot accomplish his plan to build a gigantic house without accurately knowing the amount of bricks he has. His plan must be stopped at one point, but the pain he needs to endure because of it is unrelated to existence of money.

12-09 As we verified in Chapter 6, many communistic societies initiated unrealistic plans. Most of them were not completed until the last moment. (In fact, completed plans resulted in greater damage because production factors had to be drawn out of more valuable places.) Since the market did not have self-purification function, economic crisis was chronic. As a result, we do not even say that economic crisis occurred in these nations.

12-10 The biggest crisis is not created by the market but by intervention. Today's governments intentionally intervene in the loan market to create artificial economic boom. However, such

intervention always brings overall collapse of the entire economy. This is the identity of the Great Depression in 1930s and economic crisis we now experience. The solution is simple. It is to prevent expansion of money. Austrian school argues for the gold standard and abolition of the central bank system. Milton Friedman argues for normative system.

12-11 Since the theory of Austrian school is only one of many interpretations on economic crisis, we do not have to accept it. However, it must be pointed out that interpretation by Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph cannot be its alternative. According to Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph, market economy will collapse by unemployment from automation - which is somehow called the Gaussian curve for some reason. This theory clearly cannot explain the crisis today.

12-12 When did economic crisis begin with reduced purchasing power caused by unemployment? Unemployment has never been a cause of economic crisis. It was the consequence. Today's economic crisis began with collapse of bubble as the economic crisis of 1930s did. Other consequences expected to be caused by large scale automation never occurred. Consumer goods were never oversupplied. Bubble always occurred in real estate and capital goods industry.

12-13 Speaking of real estate bubble, it is easy to denounce imperfectness of human beings and their greed to irrationally bear risks - or capitalism, which is often claimed to create such things. The truth is that it is impossible to discuss about bubbles without mentioning the environment created by the government. A cheap money policy preceded the real estate bubble of Japan in 1980s and economic booming of the United States prior to the Great Depression. However, this fact has never drawn attention of economic planners.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Appendix C. About FED

13-01 Only a short mention is necessary about the conspiracy theory on the Federal Reserve System which appears in Zeitgeits Addendum. It is fact that the Federal Reserve System receives interests on

money made out of nothing. So Peter Joseph says, "An analogy would be a game of musical chairs, for the once music stops, somebody is left out to dry. And that is the point. It invariably transfers true wealth for the individual to the banks."

13-02 What he does not say is that the most of profit earned from interest by the Federal Reserve System is being returned to the Department of the Treasury every year. If he understood this correctly, he would have been able to criticize the government instead of the Federal Reserve System! Look at http://www.publiceye.org/conspire/flaherty/Federal_Reserve.html, especially <http://www.publiceye.org/conspire/flaherty/flaherty7.html>. Wealth is not transferred from individuals to banks. It is transferred to the government.

13-03 In reality, the argument that insolvency inevitably occurs is wrong. If an interest recipient expends money through consumption or investment, this expenditure becomes income of somebody and can be used to pay for the interest. (This expenditure only needs to be made using newly created money at the very first time. Money returned as interest is used on the second time.) This becomes more important when the government is the interest recipient. The government is an institution that exists in order to spend.

13-04 I am not arguing that the current Federal Reserve System is entirely desirable. In my opinion, it should not be allowed to make money out of nothing no matter who receives interest. Libertarians like Ron Paul have long been criticizing the Fractional Reserve Banking System and Federal Reserve System. Peter Joseph is failing to catch the essence. Read Ron Paul's *End the Fed* for correct criticism and alternative for the Federal Reserve System.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Appendix D. About Impossibility of Self-purification

14-01 Some people argued that even if resource-based economy becomes corrupted, the future mankind that started the revolution won't neglect it for long and, if necessary, overcome corruption of the system through struggle. It is not important to them as to what problem exists in Fresco's detailed plan, since the future mankind with improved consciousness will resolve problems by filtering his plan

and only accepting core ideas.

14-02 It is a surprise that such argument was widely accepted by *critical supporters* of The Venus Project who argue that they do not agree with the entire plan but sympathize with the purpose of *overcoming the current system*. According to their perspective, The Venus Project is nothing special compared to revolutions in the past. But if this is true, exactly what can make its outcome so special?

14-03 The communism experiment promised a better society but corrupted. To speak about consciousness, it would be impossible to find any difference between Russians immediately after the revolution and supporters of The Venus Project now. Because they also believed that human instinct is virtuous, that human thoughts and societies are created by ideology, and that they overthrew such ideology through the revolution.

14-04 We might even be able to claim that no nation built up through revolution can corrupt. If we call *the general state of conviction that we can change the system* as improvement in consciousness, all revolutions show improvement in consciousness. The only method of rescuing the logic presented by supporters of The Venus Project is to assume that only The Venus Project reflects improvement in consciousness and other revolutions do not. However, only a small number of critical supporters understood this point.

14-05 But exactly why is their argument wrong? Whether it is The Venus Project or not, the argument that people brave enough to start a revolution to get rid of exploitation will not neglect beginning of a new exploitation sounds very plausible. Weren't they sufficiently independent people who could resolve any problems created in the new system? Why did they fail to do so?

14-06 Time taken for the communism experiment to spoil in Russia and China was unbelievably short that it sometimes makes people most hostile towards communism to be surprised. Stalin came to power 11 years after Bolshevik successfully started the revolution, and he established a completely dictatorial power within 1 year. Instead of modifying the errors of the Cultural Revolution, young revolutionists of China took the initiative in accepting it and destroying everything. This happened 17 years after starting of the experiment.

14-07 This is probably not an astonishing outcome to those who remember the discussion made in Chapter 8. Utopian engineering always appealed more to our emotion than reason. As a result, the dominant psychology in everything such appeal became successful was esthetic enthusiasm dreaming about the world with unprecedented beauty instead of cool-headed criticism and sense of responsibility. It was impossible for rational efforts to modify huge problems of the system under such intoxication.

14-08 The truth is exactly opposite from what people who claim to be critical supporters believe. Underlying psychology on the back side of collectivistic solution is distant from positive things like 'improvement in consciousness.' It always meant abandonment of reason, not the use of reason. It is truly correct to point out that The Venus Project is not special. Far from not being an ideology, it is actually the most dogmatic ideology. Therefore, there is nothing more uncertain than the expectation that it will be able to resolve problems on its own.

14-09 The time taken for the experiment that was begun to create a better society to fall into worst form was so short that it still requires special explanation. Perhaps it would be helpful to review a study by an American psychologist named Leon Festinger. An ordinary housewife called Marian Keech received a letter one day. The letter said that the world was going to end on December 21, 1954 at midnight and it can only be saved by those to believe in a God named 'Sananda'.

14-10 She trusted the letter and created a religion to prepare for the end, leaving behind her family members who did not believe in 'Sananda'. The believers disposed of their properties and threw away all gold ornaments on their bodies. This is how they believed they could survive from the great flood. Leon Festinger secretly sneaked into this religion as a disguised believer in order to observe them. The promised day approached, but nothing happened after all.

14-11 Here, Festinger witnesses an extremely irrational and incomprehensible thing. Keech yelled out, 'our belief gave light to the world, and God has decided to save the world.' None of the believers was suspicious or disappointed about this. They competitively called newspapers and broadcasting companies to propagate that they saved the mankind from catastrophe.

14-12 In 1957, Festinger announces the 'theory of cognitive dissonance'. It describes the tendency of people to devise a new theory or ground to sustain their belief when a clear counter-evidence to their belief appears. When religious groups began to turn into a desperate defense mechanism, it happened at the exactly same time as when their belief became uncertain. As they sacrificed more for their belief, their efforts to not give up on that belief grew larger.

14-13 Somebody may already have noticed the fact that collectivistic society immediately after the revolution is the most appropriate environment in which cognitive dissonance can occur. As we found out in Chapter 4, it is not desirable to democratically determine matters such as where to construct cities and build power plants in planned economy. Most people do not have technological capability to make the decision. What we will end up selecting is the system in which such decisions are made by something else.

14-14 The problem is that it is impossible for us to have definite criteria to determine whether or not our system is properly operating, no matter what specific system we choose. There is no means for the general public without technological capability to monitor whether the planners applying the method of substantiation and experimentation are doing the right thing. They can merely believe in one of many factions created by engineers who have different views.

14-15 At a glance, it seems that such situation can be helped by a simple logic. If there is no actual improvement in quality of life, it would indicate that the system has a problem. However, this declaration cannot be supported. As we verified in Chapters 3 and 5, actual improvement in quality of life cannot be accomplished immediately after the revolution in any case.

14-16 New cities and power plants have not been built yet. It is clear that actual improvement in quality of life can become possible only after such constructions that require time are complete. Side effects during early stage of revolution are foreseen, because the method of substantiation and experimentation requires many trials and errors. In the history, no collectivistic alternative was proposed in an immediately verifiable form. *The beautiful world was always promised to appear after the mankind endures sufficient times of tribulation.*

14-17 Therefore, our question is about what kind of social atmosphere will be formed if there is no hope for improvement after 10 or 20 years. Counterrevolutionary movement can grow by people who were skeptical about The Venus Project. However, there is a group of people who have sacrificed too many things for The Venus Project. As future of the system becomes increasingly uncertain, their efforts to protect the system will become blind.

14-18 Unfortunately, the theory of cognitive dissonance does not predict that this conflict will be resolved peacefully. Faithful supporters of The Venus Project might blame all failures on division and

conflict, trying to remove division based on the method of Jacque Fresco to make everyone has the same hope. As failure of the system becomes clear, it is very likely that an absurd public sentiment will be formed that the situation will be improved by isolating counterrevolutionists, and that it is the only thing they can do for their descendants.

14-19 In case of people who have fallen into fraudulent pyramid companies and pseudo-religions, there are ways to get help from family members or friends who can diagnose the situation more objectively. However, everyone whom we encounter during transition period of The Venus Project is someone already participating in the same experiment as we are. Under such environment, incorrect thoughts are more likely to be endlessly reproduced than to be resolved.

14-20 In Chapter 7, I threw out a symbolic question to supporters of The Venus Project about the resolution required by re-revolution: *If nothing is improved despite the troubles you went through for 10 years, are you willing to give up on the expectation that supported your efforts for 10 years, the expectation that everything will be better one day, return back to where you were?* Most supporters of The Venus Project have never given any thoughts about this matter. Their expectation that the problem will resolve itself is empty.

14-21 Critical supporters wrongfully presumed that The Venus Project will be accepted only after sufficient social discussion. The truth was opposite. The Venus Project, as collectivistic alternatives in the past were, can only be accepted impulsively when the romantic desire to discard old things and construct a completely new world becomes dominant. Now is the time when we need to have critical view on this.

14-22 *We can never postpone the use of reason. If we cannot use reason right now, we won't be able to use it in the future.* Under an environment like planned economy in transition period, we cannot expect much from even the most rational people in the world. Much less can we expect from supporters of The Venus Project floundering in the state of euphoria.

14-23 Furthermore, the attitude of persisting on positive view on The Venus Project because most of problems will be resolved by the time it is applied is ridiculous. *If the problems can be resolved so easily, why was Jacque Fresco unable to do it after investing decades on it?* The Venus Project fell into a tedious cult, exactly because of many supporters who cover this up.

14-24 Finally, it must be pointed out that his effort will be unsuccessful even if he were to recover his senses and fix the problems of The Venus Project. This is because, as we have seen in this writing, nothing in The Venus Project is right. If we had to reject things we should reject and accept things we should accept in The Venus Project, our choice is obvious: complete and full disuse.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [next chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Appendix E. About Cities

15-01 Among things that Jacque Fresco brags about, only his round city plan remains unhandled. As pointed out in Chapter 3, the shape of city really makes no odds. However, it still takes up a significant part of Fresco's plan. It may be valuable to discuss about it shortly before finishing up this writing.

15-02 The claim that all cities must be round shaped regardless of geographical conditions, as almost all urban engineers would testify, is stupid. Cities must create harmony with surrounding natural environments. Cities surrounded by mountains have their own beauty, and cities nearby coasts have their own beauty. The attempt to standardize cities into a few types cannot be successful.

15-03 Of course, future cities illustrated by Jacque Fresco seem pretty nice. However, any city can be described as beautiful. Zurich, Praha, Sevilla and even New York are more beautiful compared to cities of Jacque Fresco. What we need is a photographer to shoot good photographs and a poet to romantically describe them. Coldly speaking, it is true that Jacque Fresco's cities are less beautiful than other cities that are equally described as beautiful.

15-04 Why does Jacque Fresco persist on round city? Let us listen to his story: "Its role is to enable efficient access to the necessities of life along with increased social support and community interaction. So how would we go about designing an ideal city? What shape should we make it? Square? Trapezoid? Well, given we are going to be moving around the thing we might as well make it as equidistant as possible for ease... hence the circle."

15-05 Of course, natural environments that limit the shape of cities are completely out of consideration. He continues, "What should the city contain? Well, naturally we need a residential area, a goods production area, a power generation area." And since we are working with a circle it seems rational to place these functions in Belts based on the amount of land required for each goal along with ease of access. Very good."

15-06 What is very good? It is impossible to understand his explanation. For example, there is no reason to arrange factories and schools in belt form. It is desirable in terms of transportation expense for schools to be positioned between residential areas. It would be desirable for automotive production factories to be clustered with steel production factories, tire factories, and ultimately with all factories in a factory area to reduce transportation cost of materials. This is more so when labor is not required for production.

15-07 We did not listen to an explanation on efficiency. We simply heard explanation on his fetish of being abnormally obsessed with conformity and circle. 'Very good' doesn't mean anything other than the fact that it simply fits his preference. And he saw that it was very good! His urban plan is certainly very groundbreaking as a sample of sloppy and irresponsible thought. The problem is that he is serious about it!

15-08 Of course, most efficient city is not always the best city. Aesthetics of cities are also important. Fresco seems to implicitly acknowledge this. There are not many reasons why cities will become more efficient by arranging facilities in belt form. In fact, there are more reasons why they will become less efficient. Nonetheless, he claims to use belt arrangement because it gives a neat and organized feeling.

15-09 Even the specific buildings he plans to construct are distant from the most efficient form. For instance, one of them is a building with a shape of large globe placed on top of a tripod. This building is the strangest of Fresco's buildings with unclear purposes. Leaving out the beauties, it is clear that such design is inefficient for any purpose.

15-10 When we take beauties into account, his error becomes more evident. There are no objective standards for us to determine the best city, since it differs according to individual preference about beauty and all other things. What we really need is a blueprint for the design that can harmonize conflicting preferences of individuals and satisfy greatest number of people, not the best city arbitrarily selected by engineers.

15-11 Fresco does not give any room for individual opinions to influence his urban plan. The best city is already defined by the absolute law of nature. The problem is that such absolute law of nature includes his personal preferences and values. His best city is nothing more than a boring dogma. Why do we have to keep chime with his perverted preference?

15-12 His city, as we have already seen in Appendix A, is also mixed up with unrealistic suggestions. Many facilities like tunnel-type transportation suggested by Jacque Fresco can also be made in market economy, as long as we have sufficient capital. There is no reason why they should be treated differently from power transmission facilities and water or sewage facilities of today.

15-13 The problem is that the capital needed to make construction of such facilities realistic does not exist right now, at least in material sense. Jacque Fresco reversed this condition in his statement again. He says, "There is not enough money to feed or house all people on this planet let alone accomplish these more ambitious ends. But Earth has more than enough resources to meet the needs of all people but only if managed intelligently."

15-14 Now we all know that the opposite of this is correct. Money is already overfull. The US government put money 20 times as much as money in circulation into relief loan. 20 times as many American people would have escaped from starvation if the money was entirely spent on the poor! However, the actual consequence is 21 times as high inflation. There are no 20 times as many goods for them.

15-15 It would be a waste of time to return back to a problem for which discussion is over. Whether it is tunnel-type transportation, waste disposal or enclosed 50-floor farm, none of specific technologies applied in Fresco's cities is incompatible with money or market economy. They will be naturally applied once they become sufficiently realistic. However, there is no doubt that the shape of cities is not so important for all of these things.

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

Go to [prior chapter](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)

[Contact me](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Closing Remark

Correct alternative is born from correct knowledge.

Where should we begin? It may be suitable to start from an error that had the biggest influence on the popular collectivistic movements including Marxism until today, which was shared by almost all ancient and modern collectivists as well as most supporters of The Venus Project, but was not mentioned in the body. It is the theory of exploitation; an argument that laborers are being deprived of values they produce by entrepreneurs or capitalists and living under quality of life far less than quality of life they could have enjoyed without such exploitation. Marx even argued that in a developed capitalistic system, laborers will only receive survival wage to just maintain their livelihood - often referred to as labor reproduction cost by Marxists - as reward.

Of course, the theory of exploitation is not treated as important by Fresco. His major point is that the currency economy is wasteful, not that it exploits laborers. Nevertheless, Fresco seems to be not free from the influence of this famous error created by Marx. This is because he definitely says the following in his book, *The Best That Money Can't Buy*: "During the thousands of years of monetary system, most workers have been paid just enough to make it necessary that they return to work, even when higher wages have been possible. How else can the wage-payer keep the workers coming back? If the employees received wages that allowed them to work a few weeks and then take time off for a world cruise, an extended vacation, or some other luxuries, production schedules would suffer."

This argument surely is ridiculous. Assume that a laborer who can produce a value of 15 is receiving a wage of 11. Other corporations will try to scout this laborer, perhaps by offering him a wage of 13. [\[1\]](#) It is not a surprise that all serious economists who discussed this topic came to a single conclusion. Wage is equivalent to marginal production of labor.

However, it may be unnecessary to make use of economics to refute the argument by Fresco and Marx because their argument is simply beyond all reasons. Let us consider the case of so-called minimal nation in which the nation hardly spends any resources. All final products produced by laborers must be sold to someone. If they are not purchased by the very laborers who take up the majority of population, who can purchase them? (In fact, the amount consumed by entrepreneurs is negligibly small.) Clearly, total amount of currency wage received by all laborers must be sufficient to buy almost all final products produced by all laborers. If not, competition between entrepreneurs to get rid of inventory will drop the price until all consumer goods are sold.

It is a fact that entrepreneurs are gaining enormous profit. However, they do not spend such profit in purchasing consumer goods. It is invested into the capital goods industry to help entrepreneurs produce more consumer goods in the future. This is exactly the most helpful thing for laborers, who are said to be exploited by entrepreneurs. This will produce greater quantity of consumer goods in the future, which will mostly be returned back to laborers. Entrepreneurs behave in this way because they anticipate follow-up profit. But at the same time, an entrepreneur acts like this in order to keep up with his competitors. You really can't survive long without doing so under free market system.

Capitalism is a system that serves for the general public more than any other systems in the history. As

expressed by classical economists, this point becomes extremely clear when we look at the situation from real perspective by removing the curtain of currency. Is there a reason we cannot reversely apply the logic of Fresco? If an alien that does not know what currency is sees earth today, he will soon realize that almost all resources and labors in the society are being used to make goods to be spent by the general public or to make production goods necessary for making goods to be spent by the general public. He will find out that managers - entrepreneurs - in charge of managing production of each industry are placing utmost efforts to satisfy the general public, and for some reason, that those who fail to satisfy the taste of the public suffer pain and are sometimes driven out. On the contrary, managers successful in satisfying the taste of the public will enjoy great honor. He would not understand why many people claim to be experiencing a so-called exploitation.

At last, like the modern Marxists, Fresco concludes that laborers today are living with greater quality of life compared to the past because "survival wage" has increased, for one reason or another: "Even the highly educated and affluent who live in expensive homes and drive expensive cars have to appear at a place of work if they wish to maintain their standard of living. All of us, even top executives, are slaves of the monetary system. Most of us lack a meaningful existence." However, it would be a waste of time to get into further details on the gibberish of Fresco about this topic. (Readers who wish to learn about the actual changes that would occur in the market economy when productivity of labor is increased by technological development should look at 10-10~12.)

The reason I mentioned about the theory of exploitation first here is to turn our attention to how some arguments commonly accepted by the so-called critical people can be helplessly wrong. This is not limited to the theory of exploitation. We have already seen in 3-10~16, 9-136~139, Appendix A, and frankly throughout the entire body that things emphasized by Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph using expressions like "A fundamental governing principle of market economics one you will not find in any textbook" without hesitation are fundamental errors. We verified in Chapter 4 that Fresco is trying to criticize the rule of law without even understanding its basic ground of reasoning, and Chapter 9 showed how the opinions of Fresco and Peter Joseph about scientific topics are distanced from opinions of actual scientists.

However, how many supporters of The Venus Project understood such discordance? How many of them clearly recognized the fact that the opinions of Jacque Fresco, Peter Joseph and psychiatrists casted by them are exactly opposite of the mainstream opinions in modern genetics? How Also, how many of them knew that boring speeches of Fresco about ideology and language have existed for over 100 years and that ancient and modern scholars such as Popper and Mises regarded them as treason against science and reason?

Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph's economics was completely covered long time ago by free market economists such as Adam Smith, Say, Bastia and Mises. Nonetheless, there were so many supporters of The Venus Project who were so critical as to gladly find and review refutation against such economists. How many supporters of The Venus Project treated everyone who does not accept The Venus Project as pitiful sheep brainwashed by the system, without even recognizing the existence of such economists, letting alone refuting them? Fresco accepts arguments by the most ridiculous money cranks that the fact that we could supply 90,000 airplanes by creation of currency and inflation instead of using tax during the Second World War demonstrates "lack of currency" and "abundance of resources". He even used this as an evidence to show that scarcity does not exist. Where were supporters of The Venus Project who could criticize such vulgar errors that cannot even be compared with the theory of exploitation?

Correct alternative can only come out of correct knowledge. However, we cannot obtain correct

knowledge without placing equivalent effort. Yet unfortunately, most supporters of The Venus Project do not know about economics and science well enough to discuss an alternative. (This does not mean that supporters of The Venus Project are totally ignorant. Someone ignorant about a field may have sufficient knowledge in another field.) Instead of investing their intellectual efforts to obtain correct knowledge, they trusted Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph as sufficiently wise and good people and unquestioningly accepted the most ridiculous arguments.

Supporters of The Venus Project might think that since arguments made by economists are so obviously wrong, it is a waste of time to read such arguments. However, we cannot learn about their arguments without reading them. Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph might argue that they rebutted free market economics, but they are actually repeating errors that were refuted long before. Study the actual free market economy instead of the version distorted by collectivists. Someone will be astonished by how things being argued by Jacque Fresco as new things have existed for long and how precisely they were rebutted. You can also read the opinions of modern geneticists about human nature at a bookstore. From Edward Wilson who tried to apply the method of natural science to sociology before Fresco and published famous books like *Consilience* to Richard Dawkins famous for *The Selfish Gene* (though there are exceptions such as Gould and Lewontin), who can deny the fact that most scientists are hostile to the opinion of Fresco about human nature?

I would like to take this opportunity to send a word of gratitude to a supporter of The Venus Project who told me that "Building a better society is not about to win or to lose, it's about to share and to work cooperatively." This writing would not have existed without his comment. Of course, the problem we are facing is not about to win or to lose. It is about whether we and our descendants will live in a much more abundant and liberal world than now or return back to the times of constraint and subordination. Somebody might say that this is a problem of living or dying. Nonetheless, the body concentrated too much on complete logical rebuttal of Jacque Fresco's ideas that it was relatively negligent about the truly important problem, which is to persuade and encourage supporters of The Venus Project so they can use their energy correctly.

The prospect of our civilization is not so bright. Under the economic crisis today, governments and central banks of each nation are selecting the very policies that created and extended the Great Depression in the past. This is likely to bring a greater crisis. An economic crisis accompanied by large-scale unemployment forecasted by Fresco may actually occur. The greater problem is that under today's intellectual atmosphere, such phenomena are always understood as internal flaws of the free market, despite the fact that they are created by failure of government policies. We know that unemployment in 1930s was not caused by mechanization and automation. Our experience in 1970s and 1980s provide counterevidence. But we cannot make a reference to the future history. The future crisis that we might encounter can be regarded by many collectivists including Jacque Fresco as evidence that their prophecy has come true. Even if their radical alternative will not be accepted, what would happen if such intellectual atmosphere continues and, as a result, anti-market policies are adopted?

We may really be standing at an important turning point in the history of mankind. There were times during which people could freely pursue studies and works in the field they want, leaving politics and economics only to those who are interested. However, the situation has changed so much that even I, who used to think so more than anyone else, am now willing to recommend everyone to study and think about the true cause of and proper solution to the economic crisis.

Supporters of The Venus Project are extremely positive in one aspect. That is, I believe that they recognize the fact that the problem we are facing is extremely important, and that they are ready to openly spend their time and effort to create a better society. Who would doubt that supporters of The

Venus Project have greater passion about the truth than anyone else and that they are placing greatest efforts to correctly understand the world today? If they were to stop unquestioningly trusting the arguments made by Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph, and to start using their energy and passion to accumulate knowledge and correctly understand the crisis we are facing now, who would deny the fact that they can play a key role in creating a better society by guiding the civilization moving in the wrong direction to a correct one?

You can easily find almost all books I mentioned and cited in the body and annotations on the internet as pdf files. *The Blank Slate* by Steven Pinker is the most perfect book on human nature, and it deserves to be read thoroughly despite the enormous contents. It is superior to all other books that discussed the same topic, both in terms of scope of discussion and preciseness. It not only provides massive evidence supporting opinions and arguments of different scientists but also introduces knowledge about the history of science on the topic of human nature. They are beyond imagination of supporters of The Venus Project. *End The Fed* by Ron Paul focuses on the biggest problem of our system today. All of those who have critical mind about the current system and think that an alternative is necessary to resolve repeatedly occurring economic crises must read this book.

The failure of the new economics by Henry Hazlitt is mainly about Keynesianism, but supporters of The Venus Project must read it. One might be startled if they notice that most of things we have thought about market economy are no more than mercantilist fallacies which were rebutted by classical economists. If you are looking for a detailed explanation applied to modern economic crisis, refer to *Meltdown* by Thomas E. Woods Jr, though it is not introduced in the body. Anyone who reads this book to the end won't have any doubt about the fact that financial bubbles were formed by artificial supporting policies by the government, not by spontaneous creation in the free market.

Books that were cited most often in the body were probably *The Road to Serfdom* by Hayek and *The Open Society and Its Enemies* by Karl Popper. They are the greatest criticisms on collectivism, and they are still maintaining their value decades after being published. Although significant portion of these books is composed of criticism on other collectivistic ideologies not applied to Jacque Fresco and The Venus Project, still another significant portion is effective for all collectivistic planned economies including The Venus Project. Readers might be surprised to find out how old the several slogans “ for instance, production for use instead of production for profit - and assumptions made by Jacque Fresco are. Look at *Human Action* by Ludwig von Mises for overall economics. This book explains the basic principles of economics, and at the same time effectively refutes many myths about currency and free market.

I arranged the books introduced above in an order most effective for supporters of The Venus Project to remove the delusions created by Fresco and Peter Joseph and to seek for the direction that we must truly pursue. If possible, please read the books mentioned above in the order as they are introduced. In addition, I selected some quotations from each book and included them on a separate page. Though they do not include all of important contents of each book, they should be sufficient to motivate any interested readers to read the books. Always remember; correct alternative is born from correct knowledge. However, we cannot acquire correct knowledge without making necessary efforts.

[Quotes from books.](#)

[1] The assumption that there are unemployed persons in all directions cannot change this conclusion. No entrepreneur will stand still when there are plenty of laborers who can product a value of 15 and only demands a wage of 11. Entrepreneurs will expand their business and only stop the expansion when

the market value of good they product becomes so low that it is exactly identical to wage. Laborers will then produce a value of 11 and receive a wage of 11. Wage and marginal production of labor become the same once again. (Realize the fact that laborers have not actually experienced any loss! Since price of goods has decreased, their net wage has increased.)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
[Contact me](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
[Contact me](#)

~ **Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project** ~

The Venus Flytrap

Does automation create unemployment?

Through his writings, video clips and The Venus Project website, Jacque Fresco forecasted several times that the current system will collapse soon. This collapse seems to be caused mainly by automation and "reduction of most of purchasing powers" caused by automation. However, is such forecast really appropriate? I have already handled this problem in Chapter 10 of the body. It is not.

10-09 Those who claim that automation will generate unemployment tend to forget the fact that automation increases production per hour of labor and leads to increased wage per hour. Once the value created by unit labor increases, competing entrepreneurs would try to employ as many laborers as possible and offer higher wages. Short-term effect of automation is increase, not decrease, in demand for labor. 10-10 Entrepreneurs are not interested in how many hours of labor they are to employ. They are interested in the value they can produce through labor. Wage determined in free market is proportional to productivity, not to labor time. If we can create the same value as we do by 8 hours of labor now in 4 hours someday, the price for 4 hours of labor will be identical to the price for 8 hours of labor now. 10-11 Thus, the essential question is as follows: Will we be willing to continue the same amount of labor under increased wage rate? Are we going to prefer working 8 hours to receive twice as much real wage than working 4 hours? Of course, we might choose the former until our savings reach particular level. However, we will end up reducing labor hours because the utility of added wage does not reach disutility of labor.

However, Chapter 10 in general focused on showing that problems pointed out by Jacque Fresco can be settled by simple measures, even if they actually existed in the market economy. The relationship between free market and automation was mentioned incompletely compared to its importance, which in

turn caused great confusion. Some people pointed out that the conclusion I reached in the body is different from the conclusion by free market economists, for instance, Austrian school economists about the same topic. In fact, the Austrian school came up with a different scenario. According to them, unemployment cannot be caused by automation because a different employment must be created somewhere else to replace the removed employment.

Why did they argue so? Let us first review the most fundamental assumption. When productivity is increased by a factor of 4 due to automation, clearly no unemployment will be created if everyone were to spend 4 times as much goods as they did in the past. Goods will simply be produced 4 times more and spent 4 times more. All the complex problems are generated because actual consumption will not increase as much as the increase of productivity by 4 times due to automation. Where do remaining goods go? They are saved. After introduction of automation system, entrepreneurs will gain additional profit by employing less number of laborers at first. Later on, laborers will gain additional income by receiving higher wage compared to the past. There is no problem if they were to spend all of these additional profits and incomes. All complicated problems occur only because they save these additional profits and incomes.

Thus, the problem raised by Fresco, in all essence, exactly identical to the more famous problem raised long ago by mercantilists. "If the propensity to consume were decreased and people preferred saving over consumption, will unemployment occur and economy come to collapse?" Of course, the answer is no. In the free market, saving draws the same amount of investment through reduction of interest rate. The number of workplaces reduced in the consumer goods industry will simply be offset by the number of workplaces increased in the capital goods industry.

Now only one question remains: "Is the opportunity for new investment really sufficient to absorb all employments reduced by automation?" The answer is as we already know. It is obviously yes. We have handled this problem already in Appendix A. The technological possibility we have that has not yet been materialized is limitless, but this possibility was not able to be materialized because of a fundamental contradiction in capitalism. It was not materialized because scarce production factors were serving to satisfy the current demand. Ironically, this conclusion becomes more unquestionable if the arguments of Fresco about technology were true. Think about the enormous utility promised by Fresco's plans. And at the same time, think about the gigantic investment they require. Scarcity of production factors is preventing realization of such possibilities today, and entrepreneurs would have promptly made investment, attracted by the enormous initial profit, if scarcity did not exist.

Exactly because of the reason why we have a long way to go, labor is still one of the most scarce production factors, let alone being abundant. If we can save it through automation, there would be no greater blessing than that to the future of free market economy. (This is the reason we need to doubt interference policies by the government rather than automation in relation to unemployment.) If you know this fact, it is not difficult to understand why the Austrian school economists treated the argument that unemployment will be caused by automation as beneath notice.

Of course in Chapter 10, I assumed a slightly different situation. I assumed that all laborers are completely satisfied with the current standard of living and therefore will not increase spending despite an increase in currency wage. Also, more importantly, I assumed that entrepreneurs did not have any room for new investment and therefore will not use savings as loans to expand their business. It is not a surprise that most of Austrian economists did not discuss such case, because it is clearly not the present state. However, I did not develop a new theory. All of my conclusions are naturally born from the fundamental laws of economics that 'wage is identical to marginal production of labor' and 'human beings only work when marginal utility of wage is greater than marginal utility of leisure'. (The fact

that nobody has ever calculated $579+45+3703$ does not turn calculation of this addition into a new thing.)

Mechanization and automation have increased marginal production of labor to the extreme. This is self-evident, even in theory. The more capital is allocated to unit labor, the greater marginal production of labor becomes. Let's assume that 200 laborers were needed for a production line in the past and now it only requires 2 laborers in charge of inspection and management on the automated device. What's increased is not marginal production of capital. (In fact, it actually has a tendency to decrease.) It is marginal production of labor.

Wage is the same as marginal production of labor. Thus, mechanization and automation, as they always have been, will increase the wage rate of laborers for unit labor. Think about this. Laborers can now receive the same level of real wage by working 1/4 as hard as they did in the past. In this case, are they really willing to work the same amount as they did? We already assumed that laborers are sufficiently satisfied with the existing real wage. If there is nothing to buy by making more money, why would they endure tedious labor?

Of course if laborers do not have sufficient savings or psychological satisfaction of increasing their saving by doing more labor is greater than enjoying leisure time, they will continue doing labor. I acknowledged in the body that such tendency, if there cannot exist an investment to offset the increased saving, can bring temporary recession. [1] But why was this temporary recession created? It was created because we began by assuming that automation simultaneously occurs in all areas of production. In reality, automation is progressed at a different rate in each area of production. The construction industry is not automated at the same time as the clothing manufacture industry. The clothing manufacture industry is not automated at the same time as the agricultural industry.

It would be educational to think about what would happen if automation were to only occur in one industry. Production, which became easier by automation, will greatly reduce relative price of goods produced by the industry against other goods. As a result, value produced by the small number of laborers who still remain in the industry is, despite the fact that physical amount of goods actually produced has become much larger, is expected not to change much compared to the past. However, a change occurs to overall laborers. Reduced price of a good will increase the quality of life for all laborers, and if all laborers were to be satisfied with their standards of saving and living, they are going to reduce labor time and increase leisure instead of increasing consumption or saving. As a result, new employment (with actual employment reduced) enough to absorb the persons unemployed by automation in an industry is created in another area.

Let's summarize. In general, increase in productivity and inevitably followed increase in wage rate seem to draw one of the following three outcomes. First, the public uses the increased wage on spending. In this case, increase in wage rate directly contributes to improving the standard of living for people. Western laborers today are definitely enjoying material comfort and stability at the level never imagined as possible 100 years ago.

Second, the public saves the increased wage. Increase in saving will reduce interest rate. In the end, under the condition of even lower interest rate, savings by the public will be borrowed by entrepreneurs to help them attempt new technological possibilities that could not be attempted in the past due to lack of capital investment. It will further increase future productivity, and in turn helps create greater investments in the future. In the market economy, productivity did not simply develop linearly. It often increased exponentially (or even faster), and this explains the reason well.

Third, the public enjoys more leisure time by reducing labor time while maintaining wage rate. "Better

supplied with the amenities of life as he is, he sooner reaches the point at which he looks upon any further increment in the disutility of labor as an evil which is no longer outweighed by the expected further increment in labor's mediate gratification. He is eager to shorten the hours of daily work and to spare his wife and children the toil and trouble of gainful employment. It is not labor legislation and labor-union pressure that have shortened hours of work and withdrawn married women and children from the factories; it is capitalism, which has made the wage earner so prosperous that he is able to buy more leisure time for himself and his dependents. The nineteenth century's labor legislation by and large achieved nothing more than to provide a legal ratification for changes which the interplay of the market factors had brought about previously."

Of course, these three factors occur simultaneously in reality. When productivity is increased by mechanization or automation, a part of the increased productivity contributes to improving the standard of living for the public, some are used for future investments, and some are used to help the public enjoy more leisure time. The ratio of each is always determined by the decision of the public - whether to spend it now, save it for the future, or simply enjoy leisure. In theory, clarity of this does not leave any room for nonsense of collectivists to step in. The market spends as much as the public wants to spend, accumulates as much as they want, and rests as much as they want.

One day, we will only need to work 30 minutes a day to maintain our living. But since human desire is unlimited, people will begin to find new demands as life gets easier. Perhaps we might end up wishing to have a CNC machine at home in the future. However, anything - unless prohibited by law - will be produced as long as there is demand, and the result of this will be beyond our imagination, as well as Jacque Fresco's imagination. The vision provided by the free economy surpasses the vision of Jacque Fresco. However, there is no reason for us to overcome something like 'economic and social collapse' in order to gain such future.

[1] Maybe even this acknowledgement is wrong. If there were no opportunity for investment at all, no entrepreneurial loan would have occurred. Interest rate would drop almost to 0. Is there a reason to increase saving when you can borrow money without interest in emergency?

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
[Contact me](#)

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
[Contact me](#)

~ Ten reasons why we have to reject The Venus Project ~

The Venus Flytrap

Index

1 About the argument that economics is an ideology because it is self-referent: We can argue based on the same logic that modern physics is self-referent and therefore is an ideology. See [1-32~34](#). Also refer to Note [\[5\]](#). See [1-35~42](#) for the reason why such arguments can't be supported.

2 About a sounder standard for distinguishing between science and ideology: See [1-25~31](#), [1-43~44](#). As soon as we apply a sounder standard, The Venus Project is not just an ideology but the most dogmatic ideology. See [1-51~54](#).

3 About the surprising similarity between methodology of The Venus Project and methodology of pseudo-science: See [1-62~65](#). [1-21~24](#) points out the tremendous gap between such methodology and methodology that developed modern science. Especially for similarity between Christianity and The Venus Project, see [1-86~89](#). Also refer to [9-58~61](#).

4 About the argument that environmental adjustment and education should replace law and punishment: Law and punishment exist exactly to prevent it. See [2-20~32](#) for consequence of the system trying to intervene in personality of individuals.

5 About the thought that religions are undesirable since they are divided and The Venus Project is desirable because it pursues unification: Almost all religions started out with the pursuit of unification. The lesson learned from the history of religious division and conflict is exactly opposite to Jacque Fresco's belief. Collectivistic attempt for unification can never permanently unify ideas. See [2-42](#). [6-30~32](#) and [7-25~28](#) describe a form of division brought forth by The Venus Project.

â”” Affix 1: If supporters of The Venus Project wish to consistently apply their perspective, they must acknowledge the fact that The Venus Project is no long The Venus Project when it becomes divided, as divided religions are not religions. When a faction incompatible with The Venus Project that argues for different technological solutions arises during transition period of The Venus Project, they would have to go for abolition of the entire experiment instead of supporting a side. Only a few supporters of The Venus Project recognize this.

6 About spoiling of ideology in collectivistic societies: See [2-40~47](#). Refer to the description in [7-25~50](#).

7 About the argument that resources on earth are abundant enough to satisfy everyone's demand: It is mysterious as to on what grounds Jacque Fresco believes in this. He did not even conduct the most basic survey of resources and demands on earth. See [3-07~09](#).

8 About the argument that electric vehicles are not being commercialized because oil companies have patent on core technology: Electric vehicles are simply not being commercialized because we do not have economic feasibility for producing them yet. See [3-36~39](#).

â”” Affix 1: Many oil companies are also energy companies, especially for large corporations like Exxon Mobil. If an oil company purchased a patent for batteries, it is probably to expand its business. If electric vehicles actually become marketable, companies will try to directly produce and sell

batteries instead of trying to increase sales of oil by doing nothing. This clearly gives them greater profit.

9 About geothermal energy: Peter Joseph either completely misunderstood or intentionally distorted the point of MIT report on geothermal energy. There is no room for defense. See [3-22~27](#).

10 About reliability of information provided by Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph when they talk about technology or science: For now, MIT report on geothermal energy is the one and only academic data they cited and indicated the source. In most cases, they do not reveal sources of information they cite in order to avoid verification. This is distant from engineer's behavior on technology and science. See [3-53](#).

â”” Affix 1: Peter Joseph seems to not even read the report he is trying to cite. He mixed up the amount of geothermal energy in the United States with the amount of geothermal energy in the world. See Note [\[18\]](#). This mistake is so ridiculous that we can completely distrust everything Jacque Fresco and Peter Joseph say about technology.

11 About the wide-spread error that quality of life will be immediately improved after the revolution if The Venus Project is realistic: See [3-67~70](#). Unfortunately, many people support The Venus Project because of such delusion. See [3-72~73](#) and [6-30~32](#) for probably consequence of this. Also refer to [Appendix D](#).

12 About the dictatorial provisional government to manage The Venus Project in transition period: Unlike the belief of some supporters of The Venus Project, according to The Venus Project website, there is a government in The Venus Project system during transition period. This government will make all important decisions on transportation, urban planning and production. See [4-08](#) and Note [\[22\]](#).

â”” Affix 1: In fact, generation of dictatorship in planned economy is inevitable. Refer to the discussions below. Especially see the discussions on ruling by technocrats and rule of law.

13 About the argument that computer can replace the government: This argument cannot be supported. Computer is not helpful in resolving the most important problems to be faced by resource-based economy during transition period. See [4-13~17](#).

â”” Affix 1: This argument is not only wrong in resource-based economy during transition period but also in completed resource-based economy. See [4-29](#) and Note [\[32\]](#). The truth is that no planned economy can be sustained without a government as long as the most efficient method of production continues to change. Programs must be modified on a monthly, or perhaps daily, basis with consideration on the rate of technological development, and the government with the authority to manage such programs will become as gigantic as a mountain.

â”” Affix 2: In fact, even under the assumption that technological conditions will not change, it is still doubtful whether Fresco's plan can succeed. Computer algorithm was unable to beat human beings in Chess until 1997, and it still fails to surpass human beings in Go. As of now, there is no such algorithm to which we can comfortably leave all duties of the government of the planned economy.

14 About general importance of problems in transition period when dealing with alternative economic system: Supporters of The Venus Project regard discussion on transition period as trivial. The truth is that it is not just important but most important. See [4-09~11](#). Failure of communism experiment gives a lesson. Completed communism has never failed. It simply was never accomplished. Looking back, discussion on it was meaningless. See [4-71](#).

â”” Affix 1: Jacque Fresco's plan about transition period can be briefly summarized, once flashy rhetoric is removed. All decision rights are temporarily delegated to the provisional government in order to consciously manage the process of radical change. (A delegation is a delegation. What the hell does temporal delegation mean!) See [4-66](#) for impossibility of such plan.

15 About the argument that there is no need for politics or democracy to intervene in social design since it belongs to the field of technology and science like making an airplane: This is one of arguments most often cited by enthusiastic supporters of The Venus Project and the most glaring fallacy of Jacque Fresco. See [4-16~23](#). Especially see [4-20](#).

16 About the argument that The Venus Project is fundamentally different from communism because scientists and engineers replace politicians: This argument cannot be justified. Planned economy always meant dictatorship by professional technocrats. See [4-31~36](#) or [4-54](#) about the reason why dictatorship is destined to occur in planned economy.

17 About general impossibility of monitoring on the planners in planned economy: In planned economy, there is no method for the general public without technological capability to monitor economic planners. See [4-55~56](#). Explanation in [14-14](#) is shorter but stronger.

â”” Affix 1: The role of government in market economy is to make economic subjects to comply with given rules. We can elect politicians through voting and believe that we can monitor the government because they do not require special technological ability. See the discussion on the rule of law below about more specific meaning of this.

18 About the rule of law: See [4-59~62](#). Jacque Fresco has completely misunderstood this concept and performed incorrect criticism. His complete ignorance about this topic is unbelievable. See Note [\[30\]](#). Also refer to [4-46~48](#).

19 About the argument that the planners have no motivation to become corrupted without private properties: Refutation on this argument was shortly mentioned in [4-30](#), but it deserves to be stressed out. It is not even difficult for the planners of transition period with great power to secretly create privileges or even succeed them as hereditary. Actually, it is more difficult to prevent it. All of Fresco's attacks on politicians are better applied to his own system. See [8-54](#).

20 About the problem of choice: We must be able to choose what to sacrifice and what not when we cannot enjoy all things in their best quality. A system without money does not permit this choice. Liberal choice by individuals is only allowed between substitutes with identical quality. See [5-17~19](#).

21 About freedom of press and internet: In Fresco's system, the planners of the provisional government will completely control cultural and leisure contents. See [5-43~50](#) for the risk and possible consequence of this. Freedom of internet is also expected to be removed. See [5-51~53](#).

22 About impossibility of economic calculation in planned economy: See [6-15~25](#). Though this is one of the most important criticisms on economic planning, the main text did not go into details. See *Socialism* by Mises for a deeper discussion on this problem. Also see *Human Action* by the same author, especially Chapter 26.

â”” Affix 1: Some people have been arguing that this problem was resolved by competitive socialism or market socialism model of Oscar Lange. Lange's system, if the planners are virtuous enough, seems to reach equilibrium under static condition. However, it is still doubtful whether it can be applied to quickly-changing dynamic economy brought forth by revolution. Hayek's criticism is still effective.

â”” Affix 2: In fact, Lange's theory is educational in the exactly opposite meaning as what supporters of The Venus Project believe. It showed that there must be something similar to market price in planned economy, and no trial and error method can be applied without it. Lange's theory was the only theory supporting planned economy that was as controversially successful. Economic calculation theory to be applied to Fresco's system without money and price does not even exist now.

23 About the discussion on 'new earth': Jacque Fresco threw out a wrong question, and he provided an answer out of place. See [6-44~51](#). See [6-52](#) for a sounder question.

24 About the consequence of failure of The Venus Project experiment: Many supporters of The

Venus Project treated The Venus Project experiment as a gamble in which we have nothing to lose by failing. See [7-06~10](#) for danger of such thought. See [7-13~60](#) about the specific catastrophe to be caused by failure of the experiment.

â”” Affix 1: Some supporters argued that catastrophe will be prevented by the future mankind, even if the new system fails. I doubt whether this argument can be seriously accepted. Refer to [Appendix D](#).

25 About the argument that we must test all testable systems: This is same as arguing that we should try all drugs we can eat. The problem is that failure of an experiment leads to loss of ability to conduct another experiment. Refer to [7-66~70](#) with the previous discussion. See the discussion below for a sounder experimental method.

26 About the proper experimental program to be employed by social engineering: Chapter 8 of the main text is about this topic. Especially see [8-13~23](#) for control of variables.

â”” Affix 1: The point of Chapter 8 is that The Venus Project is a utopian engineering, not a utopianism. Whether The Venus Project actually pursues perfect society is entirely unrelated to whether it is a utopian engineering. See Note [\[52\]](#). Refer to [8-05~08](#) for accurate definition of utopian engineering.

â”” Affix 2: However, it is doubtful whether the argument that The Venus Project is a utopianism can easily be rejected. Dictionary definition of utopia does not require absolute perfectness. Its definition according to Wikipedia is as follows: A utopia is a community or society possessing highly desirable or perfect qualities. Anyway, The Venus Project is so unrealistic that the term utopianism is well suited. See [3-03~59](#).

27 About the thought that we will automatically learn how to change our system to create an environment to turn human beings virtuous, only if we know the environment in which human beings become virtuous: This has never really been seriously questioned, but it should be classified as one of the most critical prejudices we have. See [9-09~15](#). Especially for untenable error of Fresco, see [9-20~22](#). See [9-24~42](#) for correct scientific approach to this problem.

28 About human nature: The argument that human beings are born to be selfish is not an argument made by some people who do not know science. It is an established theory of modern genetics and socio-biology. Studies cited by Fresco are studies with lack of scientific strictness conducted by old humanities scholars such as Margaret Mead. See [9-46~53](#) for opinions on this topic by scientists.

â”” Affix 1: Some supporters of The Venus Project argued that simply opinions recently formed by scientists are wrong. According to them, views of old humanities scholars are closer to the truth. See [9-54~61](#) about how such position is radically disconnected from the initial position of Jacque Fresco.

â”” Affix 2: Some supporters of The Venus Project argued that socio-biology is not a proper science. However, what allows them to believe so without studying anything about it? It is nothing but the fact that socio-biology cannot coexist with their idea. Its meaning is significant. Their system is not a system in which science can verify idea. Idea will determine what proper sciences are and what are not. This is a general characteristic of collectivistic system. See [2-48~50](#).

29 About the argument that The Venus Project can be successful if human nature is sufficiently virtuous: The Venus Project will fail not only by our most evil nature but also by humanistic nature that we regard as precious. See [9-97~108](#). Also refer to [7-39~46](#).

30 About the argument that global energy production could have been fully replaced by renewable method if money placed into relief loan was invested in a productive cause, such as energy business: Peter Joseph sometimes shows surprising level of ignorance about economics. See [9-136~139](#) for the catastrophe that would occur when this measure is actually taken. [11-09~12](#) explains the reason why such catastrophe must occur from a more material perspective.

31 About planned obsolescence: This is an entirely incorrect argument originated from misunderstanding about market mechanism. See [9-132~135](#). Especially see [9-133~134](#) about the

conspiracy theory on incandescent lamp.

32 About classification between an economy based on resources and an economy based on money: These terms are marked cases of 'ruling value syntax' defined by Jacque Fresco himself. As a classification, this is completely worthless compared to the classification of planned economy and market economy. See [9-141~165](#).

â”” Affix 1: The term base was always used in the most idiotic way. The argument that The Venus Project should not be compared with communist experiment based on money and politics because it is based on technology and resource is nothing but a play of words. One of the following two things must occur, no matter how the term base is interpreted. 1. Communism is also based on technology and resource. 2. Communism in reality is not based on technology and resource. However, there is a great possibility that The Venus Project in reality can follow this path.

â”” Affix 2: The only way to make Jacque Fresco's classification of economic systems plausible is to use classification between economy using money and economy not using money. There are two advantages to this method. 1. Since economy using money includes all economies that use money regardless of range of use, it much more accurately refers to targets Fresco is trying to point out. 2. It does not cause unnecessary errors since it does not needlessly mention resource.

33 About much better alternatives we already have over The Venus Project: See [10-13~24](#) about solution to unemployment problem that can be caused by mechanization. See [10-47~48](#) about measures we can take when scarcity of a specific good is completely removed. See [10-49~52](#) about measures we can take for sustainable management of resources on earth. See [10-57~63](#) about solutions to miscellaneous problems pointed out by Jacque Fresco.

â”” Affix 1: In fact, most of problems proposed by Fresco are hollow. For instance, see [10-41~46](#). Even the argument that unemployment is inevitably caused by mechanization is erroneous. See [10-09~12](#). The essence of the main text is that we do not have to accept his alternative even if all problems proposed by Fresco do exist.

â”” Affix 2: The main text did not deal with all problems of market economy. However, it is clear that any problem, as long as a moderate and progressive solution exists, cannot be a reason to select an incurable alternative like The Venus Project. Creationists always bite on the evolution theory rather than the theory of creation. The technique of clouding the issue is also used by supporters of The Venus Project. Criticism on the evolution theory does not justify the creation theory.

34 About the thought that The Venus Project is realistic if it is technologically possible: This argument was handled in details in [Appendix A](#). The truth is that we cannot discuss practicality of something without economic consideration. See [11-05~09](#).

35 About tunnel-type magnetic levitation train connecting the oceans: This is one of the hollowest plans proposed by Jacque Fresco. See [11-13~25](#).

36 About the conspiracy theory on the Federal Reserve System: It is not a fact that the Federal Reserve System is earning profit through interest. Sound criticism mainly consists of different aspects. See [Appendix C](#).

37 About current economic crisis: The Gaussian curve theory by Jacque Fresco is clearly useless in explaining the present economic crisis. See [12-11~13](#). See [12-03~10](#) about a more convincing explanation on the present economic crisis written from the view of free marketeer.

38 About the argument that people with improved consciousness won't neglect the system when it fails: This argument was completely confuted in [Appendix D](#). See [14-01~20](#). [14-22](#) discloses irrational thoughts lying behind.

â”” Affix 1: The fact that supporters of this argument did not realize that the same logic could be applied to the Russian Revolution in 1917 is educational. See [14-02~04](#). Of course, communistic

society in reality was different from the society pursued by The Venus Project. However, society pursued by communism was at least similar to the society pursued by The Venus Project. Supporters of The Venus Project were confused because they neglected this. In fact, it is logically clear that only the latter can offer fair comparison.

39 About urban planning of The Venus Project: This is not just hollow but innovatively foolish. See [Appendix E](#).

40 About other important issues: See [8-54~56](#) about the argument that democracy cannot function because of lobbying. (The main text neglected possibility of lobbying taking part in laws. If a codified law betrays opinions of the majority of voters, we can always reveal and criticize it.) See [2-55~58](#), [4-52](#), [7-07](#) and Note [\[45\]](#) about the argument that only technology can improve quality of life. Note [\[46\]](#) asks a short but important question about prejudice. Lastly about the Gaussian curve, see [9-166~173](#).

Go to [Table of Contents](#)
[Contact me](#)

On Attltb youtube channel

[The Venus Project Rebutted] Ten reasons why we have to reject the venus project.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MJm85DtAewk>

Youtube channel video description: **Published on Jun 22, 2013**

This is my rebuttal about the venus project.

Link1: <http://attltb.hosting.bizfree.kr/tvf/eng/cont.htm>

Link2: <http://attltb.mireene.com/tvf/eng/cont.htm>

Download Link: <http://attltb.mireene.com/tvf/tvfeng.zip>

I know there are so many points in this writing. So, for debate, I prepared an index page.

Index page Link1: <http://attltb.hosting.bizfree.kr/tvf/eng/idx.htm>

Index page Link2: <http://attltb.mireene.com/tvf/eng/idx.htm>

Some of my arguments can be wrong or based on a misunderstanding about the project. But most of them would be correct. So please read it earnestly. I know some of my points were made by other people already. But I swear. Some of them are completely new things.

Especially, I hope you read the 29th subject of the index page (About the argument that The Venus Project can be successful if human nature is sufficiently virtuous.)

27th doesn't look very important at a glance. But it's new and almost as important as 29th subject. (About the thought that we will automatically learn how to change our system to create an environment to turn human beings virtuous, only if we know the environment in which human beings become virtuous.)

But if you really want to rebut me, you also have to rebut 9th, 15th, 16th, 20th, 21st, 25th, 26th, 28th, 33th and especially 28th and 34th, too.

Saying about the main text, 9th chapter is the most long chapter. But if you have to read at least only one chapter, it would be 3th and 9th. The reason why so many people believe TVP is they are believing Fresco's pseudoscience. Unfortunately, Fresco's alleged scientific methodology is scientifically wrong.

In fact, chapter 4 is important, too. And also maybe Appendix A. Frankly speaking, I hope you read the whole text. I swear again, If you read my rebuttal entirely, at least some part of your opinion would change.

PS. In fact, my english skill is not very good. I wrote the draft with Korean, and translated it to English. I have been helped by many people, but the translation would not perfect. If you find some grammar error in the text, please tell me.

Also, I'm not very good at English, especially speaking/listening English. So if you made another video which is related to this one, please use the subtitles, or just send me subtitles.

PS2: Sorry, Sonic debug glitch fans. This is not about a glitch. This is about the most dangerous, and stupid movement I ever seen. It's called The Venus Project.