

The Corporation
7th in a series
© 2010
by Michael Keehn
mhkeehn@gmail.com

In our view of corporations, we need to ask, “*can the product be made sustainable?*” That is, can a product be made from a resource that will not diminish or will replenish as used? As we ponder this question, we need to look at the energy required to produce the product. If the energy is electrical, then non-renewable coal, oil and nuclear fission is involved in the production process.

I remember the large lumber mill beside my parents property when I grew up. The mill used steam from five large boilers to power its operations. Those boilers were heated with unused lumber and tailings from the sawmill. And so, its source of power, coming from the trees, was renewable.

If a product cannot be made from a resource and energy source which diminish to eventual extinction or will not replenish as used, then to continue is to operate as a plunderer of the planet, which begs the question, “should we be making the product?”

War is a huge source of corporate commerce. When the United States began bombing Iraqi forces back in 1991, a barrel of oil quickly went from \$13 to \$40. A 307% increase, which brings big profits to corporations and corporate government. Corporate government is then justified in raising our taxes to cover the increased cost of oil, diesel, gasoline, jet fuel, etc. The corporate oil world could hardly wait for the bombs to begin raining down on Iraqi people. In such devastation there is opportunity for big corporate profits to fill the pockets of the elite.

The NAG factor: In 1998, Western International Media, Century City, and Lieberman Research Worldwide, conducted a study on *nagging*. In this study parents were asked to keep a diary in which they would make an entry every time their children *nagged* them for a product. The parents were asked to record *when, where & why*.

This study was not done to help parents cope with the nagging of their children, it was done so that corporations could educate children how to more effectively *nag* their parents for the products the corporation offered. Put into practice, the result has been that between 20% and 40% of purchases would not have been made if the children were not nagging their parents.

The industry spends \$12,000,000,000 (12-billion) a year on brainwashing our children. Two parents probably cannot mount an effective offense to a 12-billion dollar campaign unless they strictly control the television, showing the children movies from their DVD-player with no advertising. Which is probably a very workable plan. Why heck, maybe children would actually go outside and play, get exercise, use their imagination, invent games, even have some fun if the television cable is disconnected.

If we envision today's children as tomorrow's adult consumer, the benefit to corporations can be easily seen. If television advertising builds a relationship with the children today, it will be an even better relationship when the children become adult consumers. Maybe this is why so many in our population can only think about shopping.

The corporation, as our society's dominant institution, supplies its members with a *social role* to occupy. Institutions who have great power and are vibrant will generally extol the *social role they create* as a list of virtues. This is visible in any institution having power over great numbers of people and shapes those people. For example, churches & schools. In the case of the corporation, it provides us with a *social role* as *the good consumer*. It is the goal of the corporation to turn ordinary people into *mindless consumers*, buying products they really do not want, nor need. In this it is necessary to create a list of wants and a philosophy of futility. The *consumer* must be focused on the most insignificant things in life, for example *fashionable consumption*. For the mindless consumer his psyche becomes, "how many created wants can I satisfy?"

What happens if we should someday wake up and discover that every relationship with have with other people is *commercial*? Well, if we in the United States do wake up, we will find this is exactly what has occurred. Our marriage is licensed, which means our relationship with our spouse is commercial. We have, through the birth certification and social security account, made our children the commercial responsibility of the government, therefore our relationship with our children is also commercial. The relationship with our employer is commercial. If we are a member of a club, the club is a commercial activity and licensed, therefore our relationship with it is commercial.

Try and think of a relationship that is not governed by commercial. You say that a relationship with our tennis partner is non-commercial. We both have Social Security accounts, creating a *commercial nexus* via the federal government. The public tennis courts are controlled by commercial law. Traveling to the courts in a car or on bicycles is a commercial activity. Do something that causes our tennis partner harm, like injure his eye with a tennis ball, and we may well find our self in commercial obligation.

You say your relationship with the church is not commercial? The church is a 501 (c) (3) tax exempt corporation, and you are a (commercial) member. The school you say? The school is a government institution driven by the ADA (Average Daily Attendance). It's as commercial as it comes. Given the mission of public education, it's highly unlikely that we understand the commercial nature of our relationships, but commercial they are. As a United States citizen, we are a *franchise* of the corporation of 1871. Everything and every relationship we have, is commercial. That is how we are controlled. Can our civilization survive when only commercial relationships exist? Most marriages do not! Or on a lesser scale, can our civilization be healthy when our every relationship is so narrowly defined?

More to come so stay tuned.