

The Golden Triangle

And the Staged Fight Between Capitalism and Communism

When I was growing up, as the saying goes, history was taught through the lens of empires and states. An empire was a state exerting its power and influence over other states. A rising empire was a state whose power, influence, and territorial expanse grew with time. At some point it would begin to recede until it was replaced by another expanding state usually in the form of crisis such as war, famine, or pestilence.

Today, history is taught from a variety of perspectives and is no longer interpreted solely through a political and military lens. Social, economic, cultural, environmental, and global approaches now stand beside the older narrative of states and imperial warring. Even when the subject is still viewed politically and militarily, the state is not the only source of political force. Parties, religious institutions, firms, social movements, and international bodies also shape power and influence. Nor are the militaries of states used only to defend or expand the state. They have also become instruments of occupation, deterrence, alliance politics, policing, and domestic control. The rise-and-fall of empires remains a common introductory story, but it is no longer treated as the whole of history.

WHOSE HISTORY?

I find this trend to be most helpful in understanding the history of humanity as a whole, but it is unlikely well-received in 2026 while our nation is celebrating the 250th anniversary of the American state. This is understandable, because the American state has played an important role in the history and ethos of the American nation. America's philosophy of governance has contributed greatly to how we Americans think and interact with one another in our daily lives — what to a large extent holds America together.

Indeed, the state is a force in and of itself, and no matter how the history of humanity is conceived, sovereign states continue to exert an enormous amount of power and influence over their own citizens and/or subjects, as well as other states, and the people or peoples of other states. America — the USA, the American state — is, of course, no exception in this regard. In fact, unlike many other states, the American state exerts an

The Cabrini • Suite 603
909 Boren Avenue
First Hill • Seattle • Washington
United States of America (USA) 98104

Mobile: +1 (206) 291-8468
admin@nudge.online

extraordinary amount of power and influence in the affairs of other states. It is, indeed, a global power of enormous significance, if not an empire.

With the above in mind, the more modern way of studying history fits neatly into the globalist narrative. It serves those who would diminish the sovereign state in human affairs and use what remains of state power as an instrument of change and control. Whether this use of the state is considered nefarious or benevolent depends on one's vision of the future of humanity. The underlying structure, however, does not depend on the adjective.

WHOSE POLICY?

Globalism differs from imperialism. Imperialism is a sovereign state determining the fate of other sovereign nations. In contrast, globalism treats the state as a tool of policy enforcement. Whereupon the issue in question becomes "Whose policy?". Where there is an agent, there is a principal.

This essay does not pretend to hand the reader a list of names, as if anyone, but those in the know, had the minutes of their meetings. This said, we have good evidence for what these globally inclined individuals have in mind for the future of humanity. For, it is openly advertised in the forums and white papers of the World Economic Forum, the United Nations, the Trilateral Commission, and others.

None of these organizations speak of a system of real wealth extraction that has steadily evolved with an otherwise innocent face for more than three hundred years. Indeed, to think of globalism as anything more than a late form manifestation of the SENP System is difficult to ignore. In this regard, the principal in the aforementioned principal-agent paradigm is already known; it is those who write the rules (the state), create the credit (the bankers), and stand first in line for the rent (large corporations).

This version of political history is not what is advertised in the K-12 and undergraduate classroom. Our youth are taught about treaties, the League of Nations, and the United Nations. This said, a treaty does not a sovereign state make. The one-world government advertised by the globalists would be more than an assembly of sovereign states pursuing mutual ends. It would better resemble the top-down European Union in which the various peoples of Europe have little claim on the bodies that decide their fate. What is more, joining such a world government would raise the same question that was settled by the use of force when the Confederate States of America (Southern Confederacy) sought to secede from the American Union. And, we all know how that moment in history ended. Those who promote a one-world government without war are

The Cabrini • Suite 603
909 Boren Avenue
First Hill • Seattle • Washington
United States of America (USA) 98104

Mobile: +1 (206) 291-8468
admin@nudge.online

clearly disingenuous, as the disappearance of rival sovereign states does not disappear the fight over who holds the sword.

The promise of a world without war is attractive to the young. War is hideous, and few children will ever be able to understand why war is even waged. The simplest picture is one global state with a near monopoly of force. What that picture leaves out is the nature of the state and who decides by whom it is run —whether one of the nearly two hundred sovereigns now on the earth, or a single global state.

In the end, a change of classroom narrative so useful to a wealth-extracting system that has evolved for more than three hundred years need not be treated as a proven plot. A conspiracy may use a condition that it did not create. One need only ask where coincidence and conspiracy converge, and the reader can reach his own conclusion. Indeed, a one-world government would not abolish the SENP system; it would merely give it a permanent unifying residence.

Arguably the best form of state among those states typically called democratic republics is the one envisioned by our nation's founders — a federation of states, each a democratic republic in and of itself, confederated with three levels of sovereignty starting with the people. These levels include the citizenry of the state, each a sovereign entity in and of themselves; the various states and commonwealths that derive their power from the people; and finally the federation — namely, the United States Government (federal or national government) that derives its powers from the various sovereign states and the people. It was the US Constitution after which many of the current democratic republics of our world have been formed.

Of the 193 member states and Vatican and Palestine observers of the United Nations roughly 30 to 40 percent can be identified as democratic republics — not by name, but by their actual democratic and republican nature. This estimate does not include constitutional monarchies such as Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Netherlands, New Zealand, Japan, UK, Canada, Australia, Spain, and others with elected assemblies that have rule making authority.

Now, I am not making the argument that it is better to live in a democratic republic than it is to live in an absolute monarchy, for I have lived for extended periods in both and have found good and bad in each. Rather, I am arguing that a one-world government with the sovereign powers of a state would trample what is left of the three-tier sovereignty of the American state.

The Cabrini • Suite 603
909 Boren Avenue
First Hill • Seattle • Washington
United States of America (USA) 98104

Mobile: +1 (206) 291-8468
admin@nudge.online

In the world, as it is, a one-world government could only be created from the top down. The people who already govern the existing states — elected leaders, monarchs, party rulers, and other holders of power — would have to decide, first separately and then together, to transfer their sovereign rights to a single global authority. This would be an agreement among governments, not a project built from a global electorate; no other mechanism is available.

TAX, CREDIT, AND RENT

The state is necessarily parasitic: it has, at minimum, the power to tax. Accordingly, it lives on the wealth of others that it does not produce. Some such parasites wreck their host; others feed without destroying the host, because their own survival depends on it.

Generally speaking, the state's job is not to produce wealth; rather, it is to provide the political and legal context in which its citizens/subjects can produce it — namely, freedom from foreign invasion, infiltration, and subversion; defense of person and property; and the rights of each citizen or subject according to the laws of the state. This is true of monarchies, democratic republics, and many an authoritarian regime.

The parasitic nature of the state and the banking industry work hand-in-hand under the SENP system to extract wealth from the nation's producers. The state authorizes the banks, banks collect interest on purchasing power created out of nothing, and the state collects taxes and spends in deficit. In other words the state and banks levy and issue claims, respectively, against output they did not make. Simultaneously, they also provide the legal and payments framework that producers require in order to produce their wealth. Alas, service and extraction are both real, but they are not the same action; the one does not necessarily require the other.

The third element in the SENP System is the large corporations who are first in line to obtain cheap credit from the banks, and lobby the state's legislative assemblies and bureaucracy for important rent-producing privileges.

As a part of the SENP system large corporations extract wealth from other producers in a manner that is considerably different in kind from tax and money-creation. Through the SENP channels they collect rent in several forms including the acquisition of property. In the colonial era this acquisition was a grant of land from their king. In the modern era it is often a purchase on the open market, financed by cheap credit that the banking system has generated out of nothing.

The Cabrini • Suite 603
909 Boren Avenue
First Hill • Seattle • Washington
United States of America (USA) 98104

Mobile: +1 (206) 291-8468
admin@nudge.online

Other forms of corporate rent collection include the rules that keep smaller rivals out of a market, government licenses and patents used as gates rather than as tools of production, government contracts and subsidies written to fit the firm already on the inside, and privileged rescue operations such as “Too Big to Fail”. More recently, major firms have partnered with the banking industry and now extend credit as if they were banks under the state’s protection. Examples of these include Apple, IKEA, and Amazon.

In all of the aforementioned cases the extra income comes from the law, policy rules, and privileged contractual agreements. Rent seeking is, of course, not the whole of what these large corporations do. They also provide important goods and services. Just like the banks and government, however, the goods and services that these firms provide do not necessitate the rent-seeking in which they engage. That rent-seeking is what the banking industry and the state facilitate, and together they form the *Golden Triangle* (state, banks, and privileged firms).

THE FALSE FIGHT

Unfortunately, in today’s political discussion between Left and Right, the fight offered as communism versus capitalism is a false choice. The argument that matters is how each side uses the SENP system to its own advantage, and how voluntary exchange has been bent and undermined to serve the system: bent to conform to it, and undermined by the conformity.

Anyone on the political Right who praises capitalism and condemns communism, but does not name the SENP privilege, is not defending voluntary free markets. What they are defending is the preservation of a more than three-century-old system of privileged purchasing power and rent collection. Although their defense of voluntary free markets is honest as far as the marketplace is concerned, the marketplace is the venue of SENP exploitation, not its source. The honest portion of their argument does not reach the privilege that creates purchasing power out of nothing.

Anyone on the Left who answers with socialism or a Marxist attack on capitalism, and then treats private property as the crime, has also missed the true point of contention. The real issue is not whether people may own what they produce and the property that they use to produce it. Rather, it is how title to the property and credit are obtained under the SENP system. Denounce the privilege — i.e. taxing beyond what is needed for the legal and defense framework, the interest on money created out of nothing, and the corporate rents that follow from both — and the ordinary case for owning private

The Cabrini • Suite 603
909 Boren Avenue
First Hill • Seattle • Washington
United States of America (USA) 98104

Mobile: +1 (206) 291-8468
admin@nudge.online

property remains solid. Leave the privilege standing; however, and the quarrel over “capitalism” and “communism” will continue while the extraction increases.

The drift toward the Left begins when three mistakes are taken together, and private property is treated as the crime.

1. The form of property is confused with the way in which the title was obtained. Owning the tools, the shop, and the savings that one has earned is not the same as holding title stacked on created credit and political fences. Collapse the two — the title and how it was obtained — and every small holder begins to look like the Golden Triangle.
2. The state is offered as the remedy. Under the SENP system the state is already half the extraction; enlarging it without withdrawing the privilege only enhances the extraction.
3. The Left accepts the same false fight the Right offers — capitalism versus communism. As a consequence, it never has to address the privilege that creates purchasing power in the absence of contribution.

A person in the Middle does not have to choose between the system as advertised and a politics that dissolves title. Reject the *Golden Triangle*, and keep what you produce!

Roddy A. Stegemann
aveverum.substack.com

September 25, 2026

Modified: September 27, 2026

The Cabrini • Suite 603
909 Boren Avenue
First Hill • Seattle • Washington
United States of America (USA) 98104

Mobile: +1 (206) 291-8468
admin@nudge.online