

The Loop: How a System with No Head Runs the Store We Inherited

Paul Gene Conlan

Zuze Project LLC

© 2026 Paul Gene Conlan / Zuze Project LLC. All rights reserved.

Introduction: Method

This paper describes a loop: a self-perpetuating system of scarcity, money, industry, government, law, belief, information, and technology that sustains itself, whether or not anyone intends it to. It has no head. No one designed it, no one steers it, and no one can stop it alone. That is what makes it so durable, and so hard to see.

The argument is old. Cicero called endless money the sinews of war. Washington warned against overgrown military establishments. Smedley Butler, a two-time Medal of Honor Marine, called war a racket. Eisenhower, the general who won the war in Europe, named the military-industrial complex and warned of its influence, "whether sought or unsought." This paper adds no new villain to that tradition. It adds a map.

Three rules govern everything that follows.

1. The public record only. Every case in this paper comes from documents anyone can check: government audits, inspector general reports, congressional hearings, court rulings, and established journalism. Where a figure is estimated or disputed, the paper says so.

2. Whether sought or unsought. The paper does not claim a conspiracy. Some harms are deliberate; many simply emerge when each part of a system pursues its own interest. The damage is the same either way, and the paper does not need to prove intent to show the pattern.

3. The opposite case. Every chapter states the strongest counter-argument fairly, and ends with a falsifiability test: specific, measurable evidence that would weaken or disprove its claim. A theory that cannot be wrong is not worth holding. If the evidence named in these tests turns up, the reader should believe the evidence over this paper.

The chapters follow the loop from its anchor to its cost:

1. The Scarcity Anchor
 2. The Funding Conduit & Debt Engine
 3. The Corporate & Military-Industrial Complex
 4. Government, the Legal System & Selective Enforcement
 5. Moral & Intellectual Consensus: Church, Media, Academia
 6. AI & Automated Control Infrastructure
 7. Fraud & the Feedback Vacuum
 8. Active Ignorance & Defensive Architecture
 9. The Social Contract Breakdown
-
-

Chapter 1: The Scarcity Anchor

1. The Baseline: Real Scarcity

Any grounded analysis of human systems must begin by acknowledging non-negotiable physical constraints. Real scarcity is defined by physical, ecological, and temporal limits:

- **Finite physical resources:** arable land, fresh water, mineral deposits, and energy.
- **Temporal and human limits:** available labor hours, the length of a working life, and cognitive capacity.

To claim that all scarcity is manufactured invites instant refutation. Physical limits exist independent of economic models or political agendas. The systemic problem arises not from the existence of real limits, but from how social, financial, and political systems handle those limits.

2. The Conversion Engine: Turning Real Scarcity into Manufactured Scarcity

The loop does not invent resource constraints out of thin air. It takes baseline physical limits and amplifies them, whether sought or unsought, through structural mechanisms:

- **Debt and the productivity gap:** debt obligations and rising costs can keep households near a survival threshold even as overall production capacity grows.
 - *Empirical anchor:* the Economic Policy Institute reports that US net productivity

grew about 60 percent between 1979 and 2019, while a typical worker's compensation grew about 16 percent.

- *Counter-perspective*: many economists dispute the size of this gap, arguing that differing inflation measures (PCE versus CPI), the inclusion of non-wage benefits such as health coverage, and changes in workforce composition explain much of the divergence.
- **Supply restriction and cartel management**: centralizing supply or stockpiling commodities to hold down market volume and keep prices high.
- **Evergreening, patent clustering, and administrative barriers**: using legal frameworks to keep low-cost or generic competition out of essential markets.
- **Planned obsolescence**: engineering goods, deliberately or structurally, to fail or degrade, driving demand for raw materials that would otherwise be conserved.

3. Documented Public-Record Cases

- **The Phoebus cartel (1924)**: the world's major incandescent lightbulb manufacturers agreed to cap bulb life at 1,000 hours, below the 1,500 hours or more that bulbs commonly lasted, and fined members whose products exceeded the limit. It is a documented case of organized planned obsolescence overriding technical capacity.
- **De Beers**: for much of the twentieth century, De Beers controlled the large majority of the world's rough diamond supply, by most accounts around 80 percent or more at its peak. It used centralized buying and large stockpiles to restrict availability, selling a relatively common stone as a rare luxury.
- **US insulin pricing and evergreening**: insulin's discoverers sold the patent for \$1 in 1923 so it would be widely available. In recent decades, US prices for modern formulations rose steeply. Manufacturers filed secondary patents on minor changes, such as delivery pens and small formulation tweaks, a practice known as evergreening, which extended market exclusivity and delayed lower-cost competitors.

4. Systemic Function: The Orwellian Link

Why does manufactured scarcity persist? Because, whether sought or unsought, it serves the loop.

A population under continuous financial strain must spend most of its daily attention on getting by. Research supports this: economists Sendhil Mullainathan and Eldar Shafir, in *Scarcity* (2013), found that financial pressure measurably reduces people's available

cognitive capacity. People in that state have little time or bandwidth left to audit complex finances, investigate institutional fraud, or demand accountability from political and corporate authorities.

Orwell dramatized the extreme version in *1984*, where perpetual war exists to consume surplus and keep the population poor and occupied. The real-world version needs no single designer. Scarcity keeps citizens dependent, distracted, and too stretched to challenge the feedback vacuums above them.

5. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that scarcity is systematically amplified in a given sector is weakened or disproven if:

- The real cost of baseline necessities, specifically housing, healthcare, and education, measured in hours of median wages, consistently falls as overall productivity rises.
 - Competition, automation, and supply efficiency regularly lower entry barriers and prices across essential sectors without being countered by regulatory fencing, patent clustering, or engineered product lifespans.
-

Chapter 2: The Funding Conduit & Debt Engine

Chapter 1 showed how real limits get turned into lasting shortage. This chapter follows the energy that keeps the loop turning: money, and the debt that comes with it.

1. How Money and Debt Enter the Loop

Most people picture money as something the government prints and hands out. In practice, most money in a modern economy is created by commercial banks at the moment they make a loan. The Bank of England said so plainly in 2014: when a bank lends, it creates a new deposit, and new money, on the spot. In the United States, banks have not even been required to hold reserves against deposits since 2020.

So nearly every dollar in circulation began life as someone's debt. Debt has to be repaid with interest, and that creates steady pressure to keep borrowing, keep growing, and keep working to service what is already owed. Economists argue over how strong that pressure is. Its direction is not in much doubt, and it feeds straight back into the scarcity anchor: a household paying down debt is a household kept short.

2. The Conduit: Who Touches New Money First

New money does not arrive everywhere at once. It enters at particular points and spreads outward. The eighteenth-century economist Richard Cantillon noticed that whoever receives new money first can spend it before prices rise. By the time it reaches everyone else, prices have adjusted and its buying power has thinned. This is now called the Cantillon effect.

In the modern loop, the first hands are banks, the primary dealers who trade directly with the Federal Reserve, large bondholders, and major government contractors. Bailouts, subsidies, and emergency lending facilities push capital into established institutions, not into newcomers or alternatives.

Who gains: banks, bondholders, primary dealers, and owners of financial assets.

Counter-perspective: mainstream economists, both Keynesian and monetarist, argue that this kind of intervention prevents bank runs and depressions, limits unemployment, and stabilizes the economy in a crisis. On their account, the alternative to an uneven rescue is a collapse that hurts the bottom hardest. That argument has real force, and the chapter's claim is not that rescues should never happen. It is that the benefits land unevenly, and the unevenness is rarely corrected.

3. Documented Public-Record Cases

The savings and loan crisis (1980s to early 1990s). After deregulation, hundreds of savings institutions made risky bets and failed. The cleanup cost taxpayers about \$124 billion, by the FDIC's estimate. The gains had been private. The losses became public.

2008 and quantitative easing. The Federal Reserve bought trillions of dollars in bonds and mortgage securities, and financial asset prices recovered quickly. Wages and household wealth for most families recovered far more slowly. People who already owned stocks and real estate were made whole first.

Counter-case: the Treasury invested \$245 billion through TARP's bank programs and recovered about \$275 billion, a profit to taxpayers. Not every rescue is a straight loss to the public, and the chapter says so.

Pentagon accounting. Defense Department inspector general reports have found trillions of dollars in unsupported accounting adjustments. For fiscal year 2015, the inspector general found that the Army could not adequately support \$6.5 trillion in year-end accounting adjustments. These are entries no one could back up, not proof that the cash vanished; the Army said the adjustments netted out to about \$62 billion. But a department that cannot document its own books cannot show where the money went

either. Add the nearly \$12 billion in Iraqi funds flown to Baghdad as cash between May 2003 and June 2004, some 363 tons of currency handed out with few controls, and the billions in Iraq reconstruction waste documented by the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, and the pattern is clear: the larger the flow, the weaker the audit.

Who gains: in each case, the institutions closest to the money kept their gains, while the public carried the losses or the unanswered questions.

4. Systemic Function: The Perpetual Motion Machine

Debt is a legal obligation, and that makes it a powerful binding force, whether sought or unsought. A person with a mortgage, student loans, or medical bills cannot easily step out of the labor market, take risks, or refuse work that conflicts with conscience. Their working years are spoken for in advance.

That links directly to Chapter 1. Scarcity takes people's attention. Debt takes their time. Together, they leave little of either for auditing the institutions above them.

5. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that the funding system works as a lopsided conduit reinforcing scarcity is weakened or disproven if:

- After financial crises, the wealth of the bottom half of households recovers at a rate comparable to the top's. This can be checked against the Federal Reserve's Distributional Financial Accounts.
- Public rescues consistently return full value to the public, as TARP's bank capital program did, rather than socializing losses while gains stay private.
- Defense and emergency spending become fully auditable, with clean audit opinions, without a drop in the scale of spending.

Chapter 3: The Corporate & Military-Industrial Complex

Chapter 2 followed the money into the loop. This chapter follows it to the place where the most of it lands, and where the warning about it was first given.

1. The Anchor: Eisenhower's Warning

In January 1961, President Dwight Eisenhower, a five-star general who had commanded the Allied invasion of Europe, used his farewell address to warn the country about something new. Until the Second World War, he said, the United States had no permanent arms industry. Plowshares could be turned into swords when needed. Now the country had a large peacetime military joined to a permanent arms industry, and the combination had economic, political, and even spiritual influence reaching every city, statehouse, and office of the federal government.

He named it the military-industrial complex, and he warned against its unwarranted influence, "whether sought or unsought." He did not call it a conspiracy. He described an arrangement that would grow by its own logic unless an alert and knowledgeable citizenry kept it in check.

2. Consolidation: From Many Sellers to Five

In 1993, with the Cold War over and budgets shrinking, Deputy Secretary of Defense William Perry met with defense industry executives at a dinner that came to be known as the "Last Supper." The message was that the Pentagon could no longer support so many contractors, and the industry should consolidate.

It did. Over the following years, dozens of prime contractors merged down to five: Lockheed Martin, Boeing, RTX (formerly Raytheon), Northrop Grumman, and General Dynamics. The result is a market with one main buyer, a handful of sellers, and very little competition on the largest programs. When only one or two companies can build a fighter jet or a submarine, the buyer loses most of its leverage.

3. The Mechanisms

Cost-plus contracts. On many large programs, the government reimburses the contractor's costs and adds a fee on top. When costs rise, revenue rises. The incentive to control spending is weak.

Political engineering. Major weapons programs spread their suppliers and subcontractors across as many states and congressional districts as possible. Cutting a program then means cutting jobs in dozens of districts, so few members of Congress will vote to do it, whatever the program's military value.

The revolving door. In 2008, the Government Accountability Office found that in 2006, 52 contractors employed 2,435 former senior Defense Department officials and acquisition staff, including generals, admirals, program managers, and contracting officers. People move from writing requirements and awarding contracts to working for the companies that win them, and sometimes back again.

Lobbying and donations. Defense companies spend heavily on lobbying and campaign contributions, with a large share going to members of the armed services and appropriations committees, the people who write the budgets.

4. Documented Public-Record Cases

The F-35. The Joint Strike Fighter is the most expensive weapons program in history. In 2024 the GAO estimated its total lifetime cost, including decades of operation and maintenance through 2088, at more than \$2 trillion; the Pentagon's 2025 estimate put it at about \$1.93 trillion. Its supplier network reaches nearly every state, which makes it close to impossible to cut.

Halliburton and KBR. During the Iraq War, Halliburton's subsidiary KBR received large no-bid and sole-source contracts for logistics and reconstruction, including a major oil-infrastructure contract awarded without competition. Government auditors later questioned hundreds of millions of dollars in its charges.

Abrams tanks the Army said it didn't need. In 2012, Army Chief of Staff Gen. Ray Odierno told Congress, "we don't need the tanks," and the Army proposed pausing upgrades to save money. Congress funded more work anyway, that year and in years after, keeping the production line in Lima, Ohio running and protecting the jobs tied to it.

5. Who Gains

- **The five prime contractors** and their shareholders and executives.
- **Lobbying firms** and former officials hired for their access.
- **Members of Congress** whose districts host the factories and whose campaigns receive the donations.
- **Military leaders** whose post-service careers may continue in the industry.

None of this requires anyone to act in bad faith. Each party pursues its own interest, and the sum is a budget that grows whether or not the threat does.

6. Counter-Perspective

There is a real case on the other side, and the paper should state it fairly. Deterrence has value, and a capable military may prevent wars that would cost far more. Defense research produced ARPANET, the precursor of the internet, and GPS, both of which now serve everyone. And the jobs are real: skilled, well-paid work in communities that depend on it. Consolidation may also have saved money by cutting duplicate overhead after the Cold War.

The chapter's claim is not that defense spending is worthless. It is that the system's size and direction are set too much by its own internal incentives, and too little by what the country actually needs.

7. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that the corporate and military-industrial complex sustains itself independently of need is weakened or disproven if:

- Programs that military leaders call unnecessary are regularly cut, even when it costs jobs in powerful districts.
 - Independent cost estimates made at the start of major programs consistently match their final costs.
 - Defense spending rises and falls with documented threat assessments, not with where the factories are or who sits on the committees.
-

Chapter 4: Government, the Legal System & Selective Enforcement

Chapter 3 showed how money and contracts bind industry to government. This chapter looks at what happens when the rules are broken: who is punished, who settles, and who walks away.

1. The Anchor: Two Tracks

The promise is equal protection under the law. The same rule, the same process, and the same consequence for anyone who breaks it.

The record shows two tracks. On one, individuals face prosecution, prison, and penalties they cannot negotiate down. On the other, large institutions face fines they can budget for, agreements that defer or drop prosecution, and legal shields written into the code. No one had to design it this way. Each piece has its own reasoning, but together they produce a system in which accountability shrinks as size grows.

2. The Mechanisms

Deferred and non-prosecution agreements. A company accused of serious wrongdoing agrees to pay a fine, accept a monitor, and promise to reform. Prosecutors

agree not to bring charges, or to drop them later. Often no individual is charged at all. The fine becomes a cost of doing business.

Legal shields. Liability protections and bankruptcy rules tend to favor institutions over individuals. A corporation can use bankruptcy to restructure its debts and keep operating. A person with student loans, by contrast, can almost never discharge them in bankruptcy; Congress made both federal and private student loans nearly undischARGEABLE over the decades.

Resource asymmetry. A regulator with a limited budget and a small staff faces a corporation that can field hundreds of lawyers and drag a case out for years. Settlement is the rational choice for an outgunned agency, and the corporation knows it.

Regulatory capture. The revolving door described in Chapter 3 runs through the agencies that enforce the law as well: the SEC, the FDA, and others. People who regulate an industry often go on to work for it, and the prospect of that job can soften enforcement before it ever starts.

3. Documented Public-Record Cases

The 2008 financial crisis. Mortgage fraud and misrepresentation were widespread, documented by government investigators and the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission. Banks paid tens of billions of dollars in settlements. Yet only one senior Wall Street banker, Kareem Serageldin of Credit Suisse, went to prison for conduct connected to the crisis, for inflating the value of mortgage bonds. The institutions paid; almost no one inside them did.

HSBC, 2012. HSBC admitted to laundering at least \$881 million for Latin American drug cartels and to moving money for sanctioned countries. Prosecutors chose a deferred prosecution agreement over charges, citing fears about the bank's importance to the financial system. HSBC paid a record \$1.92 billion in total penalties. No executive was prosecuted, and the charges were dismissed in 2017 when the agreement expired.

Purdue Pharma. Purdue's misleading marketing of OxyContin helped drive the opioid epidemic. The company pleaded guilty to federal crimes twice, first in 2007 and again in 2020. In 2007, three executives pleaded guilty to misdemeanors and paid fines; none went to prison. The Sackler family, which owned Purdue, later sought protection from future lawsuits through the company's bankruptcy, despite not filing for bankruptcy themselves.

Counter-case: in June 2024, in *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma*, the Supreme Court rejected that shield, ruling that the bankruptcy could not release the Sacklers from claims without the victims' consent. The courts can close the second track when a case

reaches them.

The individual track. Compare federal drug sentencing. The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 created mandatory minimum sentences, including the 100-to-1 disparity between crack and powder cocaine that Congress did not reduce until 2010. People convicted of low-level drug offenses served years with no option to settle. The law that could not be negotiated for them was negotiated routinely for banks.

4. Who Gains

- **Executives and shareholders**, who keep their positions, wealth, and freedom while the institution pays.
- **Elite law firms and the compliance industry**, which profit from the complexity of every settlement.
- **Regulators**, some of whom later take jobs with the companies they oversaw.
- **Incumbent politicians**, who can point to headline fines while continuing to receive donations from the industries paying them.

5. Counter-Perspective

The case for the second track is serious. Prosecutors argue that criminally charging a major bank could trigger its collapse, as happened to the accounting firm Arthur Andersen after its 2002 conviction, destroying thousands of innocent jobs and destabilizing the financial system. This is the "too big to jail" dilemma, and it reflects a genuine risk. Settlements also recover money quickly and with certainty, while trials are slow, costly, and can be lost. An agency with a small budget may do more good settling ten cases than trying one.

The chapter's claim is not that every settlement is wrong. It is that the dilemma is always resolved the same way, for the same kind of defendant, and that the people inside the institutions are almost never held to account.

6. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that the legal system runs two tracks, with structural immunity for large institutions, is weakened or disproven if:

- Executives are prosecuted and imprisoned at rates comparable to other white-collar offenders when institutional fraud or serious harm is proven.
- Fines and settlements regularly exceed the profit gained from the wrongdoing, removing the incentive to treat penalties as an operating expense.

- Courts routinely strike down immunity shields and liability waivers, as the Supreme Court did in *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma*.
-

Chapter 5: Moral & Intellectual Consensus (Church, Media, Academia)

The first four chapters described the loop's material machinery: scarcity, money, contracts, and law. None of it would last long if people saw it plainly. This chapter is about the institutions that tell people what to see.

1. The Anchor: Legitimacy

No system runs on force and debt alone. It also needs people to accept it as normal, reasonable, even right. Someone has to define what counts as sensible, what counts as authoritative, and what gets dismissed as fringe.

Three institutions have done that work across history: the church, which defines what is moral; the media, which defines what is known; and the academy, which defines what is true. Each began with a real calling. Each, over time, became part of the loop, whether sought or unsought.

2. The Mechanisms

The church: blessing the order. At its best, the church carries words that judge the powerful: the money changers driven from the temple, the camel and the needle, the last made first. At its worst, the institution keeps the name of those words and swaps out their meaning, so that faith blesses whatever order is in place. That is the counterfeit: the label kept, the substance changed.

The media: filters, not censors. In *Manufacturing Consent* (1988), Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky argued that news is shaped less by censorship than by filters: who owns the outlet, who advertises in it, which official sources reporters depend on, what organized pushback a story will draw, and which common enemy unites the audience. No coordination is required. Each outlet follows its own incentives, and the range of acceptable debate narrows on its own. Ownership consolidation and engagement-driven algorithms have only tightened those filters.

The academy: funding and credentials. Researchers depend on grants, journals, and tenure committees. Work inside established paradigms is easier to fund and publish.

Work that questions a field's foundations, or that comes from outside its credentialed ranks, is easier to dismiss without review.

All three: the label of "fringe." The quickest way to end a conversation is to call one side conspiratorial or unqualified. The label carries a social and professional cost, and most people will not pay it.

3. Documented Public-Record Cases

The church.

- Constantine legalized Christianity in 313 and favored it with imperial support; by 380, under Theodosius, it was the empire's official religion. A faith that began among the poor and persecuted became an arm of imperial power.
- For centuries, the doctrine of the divine right of kings held that rulers answered to God alone, not to the people they ruled.
- In 2007, the Defense Department's inspector general found that seven military officers had violated ethics rules by appearing in uniform in a promotional video for a Christian ministry operating inside the Pentagon.

The media.

- In 1976, the Senate's Church Committee reported that the CIA had maintained covert relationships with about 50 American journalists and media employees, using some to place stories and gather information.
- In 2008, the New York Times revealed that the Pentagon had cultivated retired military officers who appeared on television as independent analysts of the Iraq War. The Pentagon briefed them with talking points, and many had business ties to defense contractors that viewers were never told about. The reporting won a Pulitzer Prize.

The academy.

- In the 1960s, the Sugar Research Foundation paid Harvard scientists to write a review that played down sugar's role in heart disease and pointed to dietary fat instead. Researchers uncovered the documents in 2016.
- In 1954, tobacco companies founded the Tobacco Industry Research Committee, presenting it as a search for the truth about smoking while it worked to sustain public doubt about the evidence of harm.
- A 2023 study in *Science* found that Exxon's own scientists, from the late 1970s on, projected global warming with considerable accuracy, while the company's public messaging cast doubt on the science.

4. Who Gains

- **Media owners and platforms**, through advertising revenue and the engagement that polarization produces.
- **Academic gatekeepers**, through funding, prestige, and career safety inside established paradigms.
- **Religious institutions**, through tax exemption, social standing, and access to power.
- **The loop as a whole**, as public anger is channeled into safe, left-versus-right fights that never touch the structure itself.

5. Counter-Perspective

Each institution has a real defense. In a world flooded with information, professional journalism and peer review do filter out a great deal of genuine misinformation and fraud. The internet, social media, and open-access publishing have broken the old monopolies on information more than at any time in history; consensus is harder to manufacture now, not easier.

And the church's record cuts both ways. The movement to abolish slavery drew much of its force from churches, especially Quakers and evangelicals. The civil rights movement was organized heavily through Black churches, and its best-known leader, Martin Luther King Jr., was a Baptist minister. In those moments, believers took the words back from the institution and turned them against the powerful. That is the words over the figure, in action, and it is the strongest evidence that consensus can be broken from within.

6. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that these institutions systematically shape consensus in ways that protect the loop is weakened or disproven if:

- Industry-funded studies reach the same conclusions as independently funded studies, at the same rates, on the same questions.
 - Outsider exposures that later prove correct receive serious mainstream coverage at the time they are made, rather than years afterward.
 - Religious institutions consistently oppose the economic and political interests that support them, not only in rare historical moments.
-

Chapter 6: AI & Automated Control Infrastructure

Chapters 1 through 5 described the loop's human and institutional machinery. This chapter looks at the layer now being built on top of it: software that takes the loop's rules, filters, and blind spots and runs them automatically, at a scale no human institution could match.

A note on standing: this chapter was drafted with the help of AI systems built by large technology companies. Those systems sit inside what this chapter examines. That is exactly why the chapter cannot rely on their agreement, and why every claim here rests on the public record.

1. The Anchor: Amplification and Scale

An official who denies a benefit or flags a citizen can be questioned, can hesitate, and can be wrong in a way that gets noticed. An automated system does none of that. It applies its rules instantly and uniformly to millions of people, without fatigue and without second thoughts.

That changes the loop in two ways. It scales whatever the system already does, including its errors and its biases. And it gives institutions a new shield: the decision was made by "the algorithm," which presents itself as neutral mathematics, even when it encodes the same old choices.

2. The Mechanisms

Algorithmic curation. Social media feeds and search rankings are built to maximize engagement. Engagement rewards outrage, fear, and division. The result, whether sought or unsought, is a public kept agitated and divided, arguing inside the safe binaries described in Chapter 5 rather than looking at the structure itself.

Automated financial gatekeeping. Credit scores, fraud detection, account closures, and risk profiles increasingly decide who can borrow, bank, rent, or get insured. Many of these decisions happen without human review and with no clear way to appeal.

Automated enforcement. Risk-assessment tools are used in bail and sentencing decisions, and predictive systems guide where police patrol. When they are trained on historical records, they can reproduce historical disparities while presenting them as objective data.

Behavioral data extraction. The business model the scholar Shoshana Zuboff named "surveillance capitalism" collects continuous data on behavior to predict and influence

what people buy, believe, and do.

Agreeable machines. AI assistants are trained partly on human approval, and people tend to approve of being agreed with. Research, including work published by AI developers themselves, has documented that these systems tend toward sycophancy: telling users what they want to hear. A tool that flatters cannot audit. Agreement from an AI is not evidence.

3. Documented Public-Record Cases

The Snowden disclosures, 2013. Documents leaked by Edward Snowden showed the NSA collecting Americans' phone records in bulk and, through the PRISM program, obtaining communications data from major technology companies. Automated mass surveillance was not a theory. It was operating at global scale.

Engagement over safety. In 2021, former Facebook employee Frances Haugen disclosed internal research showing the company knew a 2018 change to its feed ranking was amplifying outrage and divisive content.

War-crimes evidence erased. From 2017 on, automated moderation on YouTube and other platforms removed large numbers of videos documenting atrocities in Syria, misclassifying evidence of war crimes as extremist content. Human-rights groups lost material that could never be recovered.

The UK Post Office Horizon scandal. Fujitsu's Horizon accounting software reported shortfalls at local post offices that did not exist. From 1999 to 2015, more than 900 subpostmasters were wrongly convicted of theft, fraud, and false accounting on the strength of Horizon data, about 700 of them in prosecutions brought by the Post Office itself. Some went to prison; many were bankrupted. The software was treated as more credible than the people it accused. It has been called the most widespread miscarriage of justice in British history.

Robodebt, Australia. From 2015 to 2019, an automated system matched welfare records against averaged tax data and raised debts against welfare recipients. About 470,000 of those debts were later found to be wrongly issued, and a court ruled the scheme unlawful. A Royal Commission in 2023 called the scheme crude and cruel.

4. Who Gains

- **Technology platforms and data brokers**, including the companies that build AI assistants, through advertising, data, and market dominance.
- **Intelligence and security agencies**, through surveillance capacity that needs

fewer people and faces less friction.

- **Institutions of every kind**, which can hand controversial decisions to "the algorithm" and share none of the blame.

5. Counter-Perspective

Automation does real good. Algorithms catch fraud, help diagnose disease, prevent crashes, and process information no human team could handle. AI tools also put research, writing, coding, and legal help in the hands of ordinary people who could never have afforded them, which has broken some of the gatekeeping described in Chapter 5.

And the same tools can be turned toward the loop. Automated auditing of public contracts, spending, and records is possible today. This paper itself used AI to check claims against the public record. The technology does not decide which way it points. Ownership and incentive do.

6. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that AI and automation act as a control layer reinforcing the loop is weakened or disproven if:

- AI is used to make institutions more transparent, for example through public, real-time auditing of government and defense spending, faster than it is used to expand surveillance of citizens.
- People harmed by automated decisions about their liberty, money, or legal standing can routinely get human review and reversal, quickly and at little cost.
- AI systems consistently disagree with their users when the evidence is against the user, as readily as they agree.

Chapter 7: Fraud & the Feedback Vacuum

Every system that corrects itself needs feedback: a signal that tells it when something has gone wrong, strong enough to force a change. A thermostat reads the temperature. A body feels pain. Take the feedback away and the system doesn't stop. It keeps running in whatever direction it was already going, until something breaks.

This chapter is about the missing feedback in the loop: the auditors, watchdogs, and warnings that were supposed to catch fraud, and why they so often don't.

1. The Anchor: When the Sensor Is the Sensed

The loop's first structural condition is that the sensor and the sensed are the same organ. The institutions being checked are the ones running the checks, or paying for them, or appointing the people who do them.

An auditor paid by the company it audits, a rating agency paid by the bond issuer it rates, an inspector general who can be removed by the official being inspected, a regulator whose staff will later work for the industry: each is a feedback line with a conflict built into it. The signal may still exist, but it is weakened, delayed, or ignored before it can force a correction.

2. The Mechanisms

Paid watchdogs. Auditors, rating agencies, and consultants are paid by the institutions they evaluate. The client who dislikes the answer can take its business elsewhere.

Removable watchdogs. Inspectors general are meant to be independent, but they can be removed by the president who appointed them. In 2020, several inspectors general were removed within weeks of each other, and on a single night in January 2025, about 17 were removed at once; a federal judge later ruled the 2025 firings unlawful.

Punished messengers. Whistleblowers who report fraud often face retaliation, and protections for employees of private contractors have historically been weaker than those for government staff.

Prestige over proof. Credentials, famous names, and institutional reputation are accepted in place of verification. When a respected institution vouches for something, few people check.

Volume. The flows are so large that fraud hides in the noise. A program that moves hundreds of billions of dollars quickly cannot inspect each payment.

3. Documented Public-Record Cases

Enron and Arthur Andersen, 2001. Arthur Andersen audited Enron while also earning large consulting fees from it. The auditor signed off on books that hid billions in debt, until Enron collapsed. Andersen was convicted of obstruction for shredding documents; the conviction was later overturned by the Supreme Court, but the firm was already gone.

The ratings that rated themselves, 2008. Credit rating agencies, paid by the banks issuing mortgage securities, gave top ratings to products that soon failed. The Financial

Crisis Inquiry Commission called the agencies essential cogs in the wheel of financial destruction.

Theranos. A blood-testing company that claimed to run hundreds of tests from a finger prick raised hundreds of millions of dollars and seated former cabinet secretaries and a former secretary of defense on its board. The technology did not work. The fraud was exposed not by any regulator or board member but by a reporter, John Carreyrou of the Wall Street Journal, acting on tips from employees.

Wirecard. Germany's financial regulator, BaFin, responded to reporting that questioned the payments company Wirecard by filing a criminal complaint against the journalists. In 2020, Wirecard admitted that €1.9 billion on its books probably did not exist. The watchdog had investigated the messengers instead of the company.

Pandemic relief. Emergency programs moved money fast with few controls. The Small Business Administration's inspector general estimated that more than \$200 billion in pandemic loans were potentially fraudulent (the agency disputed the figure and put its own estimate far lower), and the GAO estimated unemployment-insurance fraud at \$100 billion to \$135 billion.

Improper payments. Federal agencies reported about \$162 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2024, after \$236 billion the year before, and the GAO puts the cumulative total since 2003 at about \$2.8 trillion. Separately, the GAO estimated in 2024 that fraud costs the government \$233 billion to \$521 billion a year.

4. Who Gains

- **The institutions under review**, which can operate with less scrutiny than their size warrants.
- **Auditors, rating agencies, and consultants**, which keep their clients by not finding too much.
- **Fraudsters at every scale**, from executives to opportunists who exploit programs too large and too fast to check.
- **Officials**, who avoid the political cost of discovering failures on their own watch.

5. Counter-Perspective

Feedback does sometimes work, and the record shows that too. After Enron, Congress passed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, which tightened auditor independence and made executives personally certify their financial statements. The False Claims Act, which lets whistleblowers sue on the government's behalf and share in the recovery, returns billions of dollars every year. The GAO and many inspectors general publish damaging

findings openly; much of this chapter's evidence comes from them. And in Theranos and Wirecard, the system's outer edge, independent journalists and employees, eventually caught what the insiders missed.

The chapter's claim is not that oversight is absent. It is that oversight is structurally weakest exactly where the money and power are greatest, and that correction usually arrives after the damage, not before.

6. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that the loop operates in a feedback vacuum is weakened or disproven if:

- Major frauds are regularly detected by the official watchdogs responsible for them, before collapse, rather than by journalists, whistleblowers, or the collapse itself.
 - Auditors and rating agencies are paid in ways that do not depend on the institutions they evaluate, and their findings become measurably more critical as a result.
 - Inspectors general and whistleblowers who report wrongdoing at powerful institutions suffer no greater career consequences than those who report it at weak ones.
-

Chapter 8: Active Ignorance & Defensive Architecture

The previous chapters described how the loop works. This one asks why, when so much of it is on the public record, so little changes. The answer is that the loop defends itself, not with walls, but with not-knowing: a set of psychological and institutional defenses that shield the system from scrutiny, whether sought or unsought.

1. The Anchor: Ignorance as Strength

Eisenhower warned of influence "whether sought or unsought." Orwell, in 1984, gave the Party the slogan "Ignorance is strength." The historian of science Robert Proctor coined a word for the study of how ignorance is produced and maintained: agnotology.

The point is that ignorance is not just an empty space where knowledge has not yet arrived. Some of it is made. Some of it is chosen. And some of it simply grows, because not knowing is easier, safer, and cheaper than knowing.

2. The Mechanisms

Psychological defenses

Cognitive dissonance. When evidence conflicts with what people believe about themselves or their world, the discomfort often leads them to reject the evidence rather than the belief. Leon Festinger documented the pattern in the 1950s.

System justification. Psychologists John Jost and Mahzarin Banaji found that people are motivated to see the systems they depend on as fair and legitimate, sometimes even when those systems work against them. Believing the store is well run is more comfortable than believing no one is minding it.

Willful blindness. The law recognizes that deliberately avoiding knowledge of wrongdoing can be as culpable as knowing; the Supreme Court affirmed the doctrine in 2011. Institutions practice it routinely: the question not asked, the report not read, the meeting not minuted.

Institutional defenses

Manufactured doubt. "Doubt is our product," a tobacco company memo stated in 1969. The strategy needs no lie about the conclusion, only enough uncertainty to delay action. Chapter 5 showed the same playbook in sugar and climate research.

Secrecy beyond need. Classification protects real secrets, but it also protects embarrassment. In 1997, a bipartisan commission led by Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan concluded that the government classified far too much, and that excessive secrecy weakened accountability without making the country safer.

Complexity as cover. When a system is too complicated for any outsider to follow, its failures cannot be seen. Financial products in 2008, defense accounting, and algorithmic decisions all hide behind complexity.

The fringe label. Calling a question a "conspiracy theory" ends the conversation without answering it. The term existed long before the 1960s, but a 1967 CIA dispatch, released through the Freedom of Information Act in 1976, did direct the agency's contacts to counter critics of the Warren Commission and question their motives. Some conspiracy theories are false and harmful. The label, though, works on true questions just as well.

Distraction

Amusement over attention. In *Amusing Ourselves to Death* (1985), Neil Postman argued that Aldous Huxley's warning may matter more than Orwell's: people are less

likely to be controlled by what is banned than by what entertains them. A public flooded with distraction has no need to be censored.

3. Documented Public-Record Cases

The Pentagon Papers, 1971. A classified Defense Department history showed that successive administrations had privately doubted the Vietnam War could be won while publicly expressing confidence. Secrecy hid the gap between what leaders knew and what they said, while the war continued.

Tobacco's doubt campaign. For decades, tobacco companies publicly disputed the link between smoking and disease that their own research confirmed. The strategy was laid out in their own internal documents, later made public through litigation.

Boeing's internal messages. Messages released in 2020 showed Boeing employees privately mocking the 737 MAX and the regulators who certified it, one writing that the plane was "designed by clowns." The knowledge existed inside the company. It did not reach the people whose job was to act on it.

Challenger, 1986. Engineers warned that O-rings could fail in cold weather. The warnings were known and set aside, a pattern sociologist Diane Vaughan called the "normalization of deviance": each accepted risk made the next one easier to accept, until seven astronauts died.

4. Who Gains

- **Institutions with something to hide**, which are shielded from scrutiny by classification, complexity, and doubt.
- **Industries facing regulation**, which gain years or decades of profit from manufactured uncertainty.
- **Leaders and officials**, who avoid accountability for what they knew or chose not to know.
- **The loop itself**, which depends on the citizen not looking.

5. Counter-Perspective

Some ignorance is rational. The economist Anthony Downs observed in 1957 that individual citizens often have little reason to study policy in depth, because one vote rarely decides anything; this "rational ignorance" is a cost-benefit choice, not a defense mechanism. No one can audit everything, and everyone relies on trust in institutions to get through the day.

Secrecy also serves real needs: protecting intelligence sources, military operations, and personal privacy. And skepticism toward conspiracy theories protects people from genuine misinformation, much of which causes real harm.

The chapter's claim is not that all ignorance is manufactured or that all secrecy is cover. It is that the loop benefits from both, and that these defenses work as well against true questions as against false ones.

6. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that active ignorance and defensive architecture shield the loop from scrutiny is weakened or disproven if:

- Classified information, once declassified, rarely turns out to have been withheld for reasons of embarrassment rather than security.
 - Internal warnings at major institutions, such as engineers' safety concerns or auditors' red flags, regularly reach decision-makers and change outcomes before harm occurs.
 - Questions dismissed as conspiracy theories are later confirmed no more often than other claims of similar kind, showing the label is a reliable filter rather than a shield.
-

Chapter 9: The Social Contract Breakdown

1. What the Loop Costs

Eight chapters have traced the loop, one element at a time. Scarcity keeps people short. Money and debt keep them bound. Contractors and the military turn public treasure into private revenue. Law splits into two tracks. Church, press, and academy draw the lines of acceptable thought. Machines run it all faster and at greater scale. Feedback fails where it matters most. And a wall of not-knowing, whether sought or unsought, keeps the whole thing from being seen.

None of it requires a villain. That has been the argument from the first page. But a system with no head still sends a bill, and this chapter is about who pays it.

The bill is trust.

2. The Evidence of Erosion

In 1958, about three in four Americans told pollsters they trusted the federal

government to do the right thing always or most of the time. In September 2025, the Pew Research Center found it at 17 percent, roughly one in six. Gallup's long-running survey of confidence in major institutions, including Congress, the press, banks, big business, the churches, and the courts, has recorded near-historic lows across the board.

This is not cynicism falling from the sky. It is a reasonable response to a record. People watched banks rescued and homeowners foreclosed in 2008. They watched the Pentagon fail audit after audit while its budget grew. They watched executives pay fines while ordinary offenders served time. They watched experts proven wrong and never held to account, and outsiders proven right and never thanked. Trust did not collapse because people stopped paying attention. It collapsed because some of them finally did.

3. The Two Failures That Follow

When trust in institutions dies, it does not leave a clean, empty space. Something rushes in.

The first failure is the slide into everyone-for-themselves. If no one is minding the store, the rational move is to grab what you can and guard it. Each household, company, and faction protects its own, and the shared floor beneath all of them rots. Thomas Hobbes described where that road ends: a war of all against all, and a life that is "nasty, brutish, and short."

The second failure is the strongman. When people stop believing the system can correct itself, they start looking for someone who promises to correct it by force. History has seen this offer many times. It always comes with a head, and the head always grows. Cutting off the old heads has never fixed the headless system; France got the Terror and then an emperor, and Russia got Stalin.

Polarization is what the road to both failures looks like from the inside. Starved of trust in shared institutions, people retreat into camps, each certain the other side is the enemy. The loop does not mind. A public at war with itself is a public not looking at the structure. Every hour spent fighting across the aisle is an hour not spent auditing the store.

History shows the pattern before:

- **The late Roman Republic (first century BC).** Land concentrated in large slave-worked estates owned by the senatorial elite, and small farmers were pushed off the land. Laws were bent for the powerful, and soldiers came to depend on their generals rather than the state for land and pay. Their loyalty followed, and the Republic gave way to rule by one man.

- **France before 1789.** The Crown's debts grew while the clergy and nobility kept their tax exemptions, leaving the burden on the Third Estate. Reform was blocked by the privileged until the treasury failed and revolution followed.
- **The Soviet Union (1980s to 1991).** Managers routinely falsified production figures, so the center governed by numbers that were not true: a feedback vacuum. Party elites, the nomenklatura, enjoyed shops and privileges ordinary citizens did not: two tracks. When the official story could no longer be believed, the state lost its legitimacy and came apart.

The pattern is not destiny. The United States' own Gilded Age, with its monopolies, bought legislatures, and violent labor conflict, did not end in collapse. It ended in the Progressive Era: antitrust law, food and drug safety rules, the direct election of senators, and an organized public that demanded them. The same breakdown that leads some societies to ruin has led others to repair.

4. Why It Was Never Inevitable

The loop is not a law of nature. It is a habit, and habits can be broken.

The evidence for that runs through this paper too. Congress passed Sarbanes-Oxley after Enron. The Supreme Court struck down the Sacklers' shield. Reporters exposed Theranos, Wirecard, and the Pentagon's television analysts. Churches led the fight against slavery and segregation. Drunk driving went from a joke to a disgrace in a generation, because ordinary people decided it would. Every one of these corrections came from somewhere the loop does not control: a court that held its ground, a reporter who would not quit, a believer who took the words back from the institution, a citizen who would not look away.

Eisenhower named the safeguard in 1961. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry, he said, could compel the proper meshing of the nation's defense machinery with its peaceful methods and goals. Not a better king. Not a new party. Not a smarter algorithm. Citizens.

5. The Remedy: A Contract with No Head

If the problem is a system with no head, the answer cannot be to install one. Any head we build becomes a new box in the loop. The answer has to be as distributed as the problem: a contract held not at the top, but in every self.

That contract has a thin floor, simple enough for anyone and owned by no one:

- **Keep your word.** Let your yes be yes. A word with no consequence behind it is how

the counterfeit begins.

- **Don't offload your harm.** Whatever you gain, you carry the cost of it. You do not push it onto the people downstream.
- **Don't exploit the gap.** When no one is watching, act as if someone is. The ungoverned moment is where the loop is fed.
- **Mind the store.** Pay attention, ask where the money goes, and refuse to accept "the algorithm decided" or "everyone does it" as an answer.

And because duress makes self-governance nearly impossible, the contract runs both ways. Each self governs itself, and together we build conditions where that is possible: relieving the scarcity, the debt, and the exhaustion that leave people no room to look up. A starving person cannot audit a budget. A free one can.

Two more rules keep the remedy from becoming the disease:

- **It is not retroactive.** Everyone's hand has been in the jar somewhere. We inherited this; we did not build it alone. The ledger starts fresh, and the rules apply from here forward. Vengeance would only feed the loop a new cycle.
- **It is pro-humanity, not anti-anything.** Business is exchange, and without exchange we have nothing. The goal is not to tear down the store but to run it honestly: the same system we have now, with rules that should have been enforced all along.

6. The Breakdown as an Opening

Collapse is one way this story can end. It is not the only one.

A breakdown of trust is also a moment of clear sight. People who no longer believe the official story are, for once, looking. That can curdle into cynicism, or it can become the alert citizenry Eisenhower asked for. The difference is whether the looking turns into governing: of the self first, then of the household, the workplace, the town, and finally the store itself.

The loop has run for generations on a simple bet: that people would rather not know. Every chapter of this paper is a wager the other way. The record exists. The warnings were given, from Cicero to Washington to Eisenhower. What remains is whether enough people choose to read it, and to keep their word once they have.

No one truly wins by living inside a broken model, not even those it rewards. A closed loop cannot learn. When feedback is suppressed and doubt is manufactured, honest experimentation becomes harder for everyone, even its winners. They are flying blind too.

So this is not a call to arms. We do not need to raise a sword against each other. Everything built here, every institution in this paper, was made for something real, and has value to someone. The task is not to tear it down, but to do better with it.

No one is coming to fix this from the top. There is no top. There is only each of us, and the store we inherited, and the choice to mind it.

We did not come to defeat. We came to raise people. Keep the stone out of your hand.

7. Falsifiability Test (The Opposite-Case Rule)

The claim that the loop drives the breakdown of the social contract is weakened or disproven if:

- Trust in institutions rises in periods when the mechanisms described in Chapters 1 through 8 are strengthening, rather than when they are being checked.
- Polarization falls without any reduction in scarcity, debt burdens, two-track enforcement, or institutional secrecy.
- Societies with stronger independent oversight, lower inequality, and more transparent institutions show no higher levels of public trust than those without.

Summary: The Complete Loop

Chapter	Function in the loop	Public-record anchor	Result
1. The Scarcity Anchor	Turns real physical limits into lasting economic pressure	Phoebus cartel; insulin evergreening	Uses up people's time and attention
2. Funding & Debt Engine	Routes new money first to banks and dealers; binds labor to debt	Bank of England 2014; 2008 rescue and QE	Working years committed in advance to debt service
3. Military-Industrial Complex	Locks public money into a concentrated contractor base	F-35 lifetime cost; Abrams tanks the Army did not request	National wealth channeled into poorly audited, self-preserving programs
4. Selective Enforcement	Settlements for institutions, prosecution for	HSBC 2012 agreement; <i>Harrington v. Purdue</i>	Two-track justice: accountability shrinks

	individuals	<i>Pharma</i>	as size grows
5. Moral & Intellectual Consensus	Church, media, and academy define what is legitimate	Pentagon military analyst program; sugar and tobacco research	Structural critique marginalized as fringe
6. AI & Automated Control	Scales decisions and curation; hides choices behind code	UK Post Office Horizon; Robodebt	Blame shifted onto "the algorithm"
7. Fraud & Feedback Vacuum	Weakens watchdogs and delays warnings	Enron and Arthur Andersen; Theranos; Wirecard	Correction arrives after the damage, not before
8. Defensive Architecture	Secrecy, doubt, and complexity shield the system	Pentagon Papers; tobacco's doubt strategy; Boeing 737 MAX	Ignorance maintained, whether sought or unsought
9. Social Contract Breakdown	Loss of public trust and legitimacy	Pew and Gallup trust data; Rome, France, the USSR, and the Progressive Era	A choice: collapse, the strongman, or self-governance

A Note on Method and AI Assistance

This paper was written by Paul Gene Conlan with the assistance of AI systems: Claude (Anthropic) and Gemini (Google). The thesis, structure, and judgments are the author's. The AI systems helped draft, organize, and check the text against the public record.

That help is itself part of the paper's subject. The companies that build these systems sit inside the loop described in Chapter 6, and AI systems are known to tend toward agreeing with their users. For that reason, no claim in this paper rests on an AI's agreement. Every figure and case was checked against the sources listed below, and where AI drafts introduced errors, they were corrected before publication. Readers should check these sources for themselves. That is the paper's method, applied to the paper.

Sources

Introduction and Historical Warnings

- Eisenhower, Dwight D. "Farewell Address to the Nation." January 17, 1961.
- Washington, George. "Farewell Address." 1796.
- Butler, Smedley D. *War Is a Racket*. 1935.
- Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. 1949.

Chapter 1: The Scarcity Anchor

- Economic Policy Institute. "Growing inequalities, reflecting growing employer power, have generated a productivity–pay gap since 1979." epi.org.
<https://www.epi.org/blog/growing-inequalities-reflecting-growing-employer-power-have-generated-a-productivity-pay-gap-since-1979-productivity-has-grown-3-5-times-as-much-as-pay-for-the-typical-worker/>
- Krajewski, Markus. "The Great Lightbulb Conspiracy." *IEEE Spectrum*, 2014.
<https://spectrum.ieee.org/the-great-lightbulb-conspiracy>
- Mullainathan, Sendhil, and Eldar Shafir. *Scarcity: Why Having Too Little Means So Much*. 2013.

Chapter 2: The Funding Conduit & Debt Engine

- McLeay, Michael, Amar Radia, and Ryland Thomas. "Money Creation in the Modern Economy." Bank of England *Quarterly Bulletin*, 2014 Q1.
- Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation financial statements on the cost of the savings and loan crisis, as summarized in Ely, Bert. "Savings and Loan Crisis." *Concise Encyclopedia of Economics*, Econlib.
<https://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/SavingsandLoanCrisis.html>
- U.S. Department of the Treasury. Press releases on TARP bank program repayments, 2011–2014. <https://home.treasury.gov/news/press-releases/jl2553>
- Department of Defense Office of Inspector General. *Army General Fund Adjustments Not Adequately Documented or Supported*. Report DODIG-2016-113, July 26, 2016.
<https://media.defense.gov/2016/Jul/26/2001714261/-1/-1/1/DODIG-2016-113.pdf>
- House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Majority Staff. "Cash Transfers to the Coalition Provisional Authority." Memorandum, February 6, 2007.
<https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/democrats-oversight.house.gov/files/documents/20070206130101-80952.pdf>
- Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction. Final reports.

Chapter 3: The Corporate & Military-Industrial Complex

- U.S. Government Accountability Office. *Defense Contracting: Post-Government Employment of Former DOD Officials Needs Greater Transparency*. GAO-08-485, May 2008. <https://www.gao.gov/assets/a275722.html>
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. F-35 sustainment cost report, April 2024; and Department of Defense F-35 Selected Acquisition Report, 2025. <https://defensenews.com/air/2024/04/15/f-35s-to-cost-2-trillion-as-pentagon-plans-longer-use-says-watchdog>
- Associated Press and Military.com reporting on Abrams tank funding and Gen. Ray Odierno's 2012 testimony. <https://military.com/daily-news/2016/02/11/ohio-wins-again-in-armys-budget-for-more-m1-abrams-tanks.html>

Chapter 4: Government, the Legal System & Selective Enforcement

- U.S. Department of Justice. HSBC deferred prosecution agreement announcement, December 11, 2012. <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/2012/December/12-crm-1478.html>
- Eisinger, Jesse. "Why Only One Top Banker Went to Jail for the Financial Crisis." *New York Times Magazine* and ProPublica, May 2014. <https://www.propublica.org/article/the-rise-of-corporate-impunity>
- Brownlee, John L. Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on the Purdue Frederick plea, July 31, 2007. <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Brownlee%20Testimony%20073107.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Justice. Purdue Pharma guilty plea announcement, October 2020.
- *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, 603 U.S. (2024).
- Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission. *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report*. 2011.

Chapter 5: Moral & Intellectual Consensus

- Herman, Edward S., and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. 1988.
- U.S. Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities (Church Committee). *Final Report*, Book I. 1976.
- Barstow, David. "Behind TV Analysts, Pentagon's Hidden Hand." *New York Times*, April 20, 2008.

- Department of Defense Office of Inspector General. *Alleged Misconduct by DoD Officials Concerning Christian Embassy*. July 2007. As reported by *Government Executive*, August 2007: <https://govexec.com/defense/2007/08/ig-criticizes-army-air-force-officers-participation-in-religious-video/25036>
- Kearns, Cristin E., Laura A. Schmidt, and Stanton A. Glantz. "Sugar Industry and Coronary Heart Disease Research." *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 2016.
- Supran, Geoffrey, Stefan Rahmstorf, and Naomi Oreskes. "Assessing ExxonMobil's Global Warming Projections." *Science*, January 2023. <https://www.pik-potsdam.de/@@multilingual-selector/c800885fb50a467d830fd748a44a847f/en>

Chapter 6: AI & Automated Control Infrastructure

- Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. 2019.
- *The Guardian* and *Washington Post* reporting on the Snowden disclosures, 2013.
- *Wall Street Journal*. "The Facebook Files." 2021.
- Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry. *Final Report, Volume 1*. July 2025. <https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/volume-1-post-office-horizon-it-inquiries-final-report>; and High Court judgment in *Bates v. Post Office Ltd*, 2019.
- Royal Commission into the Robodebt Scheme. *Report*. July 2023. <https://robodebt.royalcommission.gov.au/>
- Sharma, Mrinank, et al. "Towards Understanding Sycophancy in Language Models." Anthropic, 2023.

Chapter 7: Fraud & the Feedback Vacuum

- Small Business Administration Office of Inspector General. *COVID-19 Pandemic EIDL and PPP Loan Fraud Landscape*. Report 23-09, June 27, 2023. <https://www.sba.gov/document/report-23-09-covid-19-pandemic-eidl-ppp-loan-fraud-landscape>
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. *Unemployment Insurance: Estimated Amount of Fraud During Pandemic Likely Between \$100 Billion and \$135 Billion*. GAO-23-106696, September 12, 2023. <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-23-106696>
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. GAO-25-107753 and GAO-25-108172 on improper payments and fraud, 2025. <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-25-108172>
- Carreyrou, John. *Bad Blood: Secrets and Lies in a Silicon Valley Startup*. 2018.
- Associated Press and *Financial Times* reporting on BaFin and Wirecard, 2019–2020. <https://www.audacy.com/1010wins/articles/ap-news/german-prosecutors-drop->

[probe-of-journalists-over-wirecard](#)

- Associated Press and NPR reporting on the January 2025 removal of inspectors general. <https://www.npr.org/2025/01/25/g-s1-44771/trump-fires-inspectors-general>

Chapter 8: Active Ignorance & Defensive Architecture

- Proctor, Robert N., and Londa Schiebinger, eds. *Agnotology: The Making and Unmaking of Ignorance*. 2008.
- Festinger, Leon, Henry Riecken, and Stanley Schachter. *When Prophecy Fails*. 1956.
- Jost, John T., and Mahzarin R. Banaji. "The Role of Stereotyping in System-Justification." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 1994.
- *Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.*, 563 U.S. 754 (2011).
- Commission on Protecting and Reducing Government Secrecy (Moynihan Commission). *Report*. 1997.
- Vaughan, Diane. *The Challenger Launch Decision*. 1996.
- Postman, Neil. *Amusing Ourselves to Death*. 1985.
- Downs, Anthony. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. 1957.

Chapter 9: The Social Contract Breakdown

- Pew Research Center. "Public Trust in Government: 1958–2025." December 2025. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2025/12/04/public-trust-in-government-1958-2025/>
 - Gallup. Confidence in Institutions survey series.
 - Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. 1651.
-