

US-China Mutual Support, The Pandemic Response, And Systems (And Further Thoughts)

By Kevin A. Sensenig

Draft 1.03

2020 April 15

US-China Mutual Support, The Pandemic Response, And Systems

The United States and China should enter a period of mutual support to recognize each others' strengths, to helpful practical and theoretical critique of their systems, and to mutual benefit.

This extends to the current COVID-19 pandemic response.

The United States is now blaming China and WHO for the entirety, or at least the scale of things. This tendency to blame others rather than just the above is part of the American political fabric, and sadly so – it does not lead to mutual recognition among societies or ways of thinking, nor dialogue, and ends up weakening or compromising all sides, ultimately, and distracting from function – and perhaps destroys the truth, even accuracy and completeness.

China has, in its state media (People Daily and Xinhua), repeatedly used mature, dialogical language in talking about relation and projects with other nations. This must of course be reflected on the ground, and it would be interesting to hear what its partners have to say.

The US discourse has often been political, divisive, and now targets China as a nation and as a Communist nation. There are exceptions, in the quality of thought, even if from one standpoint or another.

If we can offer helpful criticism, we should do so. With respect to WHO, if it needs to be improved or best practices made better, then so be it. Positives and function and strength should be reinforced. I would not destroy what is positive or constructive.

At first, say in the February press briefing by President Trump, Trump did a couple of things that were notable. First, he pointed to his team, and expressed the fact that it was a team, and an expert team, and that he wanted them to be leading this effort, along with himself. Second, he contradicted the punitive nature of a reporter's question and said that he had just spent an hour and a half with President Xi on the phone, discussing the situation and the situation in China, and that President Xi was working very very hard. This is all positive.

Then the White House established the Coronavirus Task Force. Notable and agile. The federal government started early to work with governors and states and local governments to identify and address the issue.

We started social distancing and passed the several federal relief packages.

US-China Mutual Support, The Pandemic Response, And Systems (And Further Thoughts)

Page 1 of 7

I think that where the US got caught flat-footed is that it had not set up structural, widespread testing-on-symptom along with isolate-on-testing-positive early enough. We had done this sort of thing for a few people up front at first detection of a problem, as they returned to the US from overseas. But it was not deployed in society at large, in a systemic, structural way. I suspect this has led to long-term problems that are larger scale than we think is warranted. Thus the blame of China and WHO.

I think though that there is an oversight in the US, that requires something akin to DHS for internal natural disasters, at the structural-and-deployment level, and is parallel (for civilian purposes) to the national guard and the military. We were caught flat-footed with respect to Hurricane Katrina in 2005, and we're caught flat-footed again with respect to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. I suspect that we should have something like the National Internal Response Team – trained as in the national guard or military – that is set to respond to natural disasters such as hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, pandemics, and other imaginable scenarios; and provide food, medical processes and equipment, and infrastructure. FEMA would integrate with this, or be re-structured with directorship, but it has to be a new concept put into effect.

Then we need to study who knew what about COVID-19 when, how (in dispassionate observation) information was shared domestically and internationally (including China, WHO, Asia, Africa, and Europe), and who was and who else could have been responsible for leading what type of response (doing a careful analysis of our actual internal response) – in the context of the idea of a National Internal Response Team.

We have systems-and-structure in place in the military. We need such a systems-and-structure available to the federal government for internal responses, integrated with the states, that would be adept and expert at various types of natural disaster events.

President Trump has the dynamicism to lead such an effort. I feel it is a mistake to take the lead now to blame others where we can offer constructive, mutually-beneficial suggestion and dialogue. We need to contemplate and act on internal systems as well as international efforts.

And China, even if there was some delay on COVID-19 (there are varying reports, on our side, and I recall reading early then consistent reporting on state media (China People Daily) on the matter), did step to the plate with a systems approach that was structural and I suspect, ultimately, responsive. I thought they were serious about it. I think we could learn from China on this. This was and is a tremendously difficult situation, and we should be realistic, analytical, and dispassionate.

In addition, I would note the reasons for certain implementations of Communism, and address them on their theoretical and practical results. We seem to have started an ideological war with China. China has encouraged mutual cooperation whereby each of us respects the other's system, and does not seek to change it. We can offer helpful critique, for both our own system and for others'. But we should not seek to target-and-destroy.

I've seen reports – and this seems to be evidenced on the ground – of tremendous wealth accumulation disparities, in America. This might only be natural, in a Capitalist sense, given that people with funds will invest for return and further accumulation – they're simply either being smart or idealize

accumulation of the material, or whatever else money represents (security, function, enjoyment, wealth); but it may be an innate demerit and detriment of Capitalism. There is not a natural funds fluidity among layers. I wonder if there's another type of free market, that retains and is itself this natural funds fluidity among layers, with built-in "natural" structural and flexi. Or, an alternate would be to look at a certain approach to Marxism. (I plan on giving this further scrutiny for myself, in the coming years, these two ideas a natural form free market and a certain basis interpretation to Marxism – and perhaps they complement each other, or intersect each other, or at least recognize respective strengths, each illuminating the other.) There do, I'm beginning to suspect, seem to be several inherent contradictions to Capitalism. And I'm not sure it's ultimately respectful of certain duration-type attitudes, or a discussion of distributive justice (economic justice, awareness-and-access (of various viewpoints) justice, type of existence (tribe, village, rural, town, city, race, nationality, enduring) justice, natural or ecosystem justice). There is much available, to tap into and recognize, and there are many who do this for themselves, or would like to – it just does not make it through the hierarchy, the political system, in some significant material ways. There are some dynamics to the free markets that are interesting, and productive. Perhaps they need to be set in context of a natural form free market, or something else.

I think we should be cognizant of the ecosystem, and that there are 45 million Americans at or below our own poverty line. I think the Republicans should turn this to their own language, and funds and means and so much more (including meaning-type resources and structures, yielding to feedback and diverse cultures) for resource, at the family, group, tribe, neighborhood, and individual level. Perhaps Opportunity Zones are just this sort of thing; it would not be a perennial dependency-level-only type of welfare idea, but something that supports as much as and more than welfare, but strikes much more deeply, and provides true structure, flexi, resource – and paths, resilience, duration, and dynamism.

A principle, from Luke 1:4, which reads, "And let your perseverance have its perfect result, that you be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing." (NASB). In the marsh, where is the lack?

Ecosystem.

Economics.

Government.

Justice.

Philosophy and Religion.

Society.

Self-actualization.

Additional Notes, Further Thoughts, And Systems – If I Were President Trump, Republicans, And Others...

I would suggest turning to the idea ‘discipline at the border’ to replace a language of caricaturing entire cultures as rapists, murderers, and criminals, or otherwise to be rejected. I would also acknowledge real need, and why people want to come to America. I would acknowledge what’s there, in total. I would be realistic – but also turn to celebrate diverse cultures from each of the continents. That is America.

I wouldn’t have at all singled out the four Democrats in the House as “Send them back”. I would work with their ideas.

I would suggest to grapple with socialism and communism using different language, and definitely not a-priori. I am not a Marxist, but there’s some interesting critique, and there are some things that appeal to me, in Marxist thought. If I had described Marxism, I would not have based it on philosophic materialism, and I would have treated religion differently, noting it for its depths and challenges, in its various expressions. This is a work in progress. If I were Marxist, I would be a Zen Buddhist Marxist. Which might answer, and enable me to probe even more deeply, with some of the Marxist critique. And this looks to Taoism, too.

The Democrats’ hierarchy is not usually socialist. You don’t have to be socialist to have a distributive justice ideal. Joe Biden speaks of China in only negative terms, on his website, that I saw, although I’ll have to look further. The height of the Vietnam War was under LBJ. Reagan took on Marxist revolutions and Liberation Theology in Latin America, and challenged the Soviet Union as “the evil empire”. Some Democrat grassroots appeals to me, but by the time certain things make it up the hierarchy, what is promoted is a Democrat idea, and doesn’t acknowledge, or is not fully functional – or the strictly political becomes the mode. Republicans should take note of some of this grassroots, and express some material recognition of situations. Various views of justice. Civil rights. Ecosystem (I saw a Republican bill under Boehner that was ecosystem – stuck in the Reid Senate; but President Trump doesn’t talk in these ways, and I don’t know what other leadership is promoting, but I don’t see mention of the ecosystem, and they don’t seem to be talking about it with Trump – I don’t follow all that closely, though). Economics: a different model of economics that retains significant aspects of what they have but reflects a careful appreciation for some of the Marxist critique (such as free trade vs. protectionism – and causes of recession; I need to revisit these to be able to share more; one of the things that causes recession according to TCM is that the bourgeoisie are always getting on to the next big thing, leaving entire working means and products in the dustbin of history, then that crashes the economy; and that society changes in such a way as to yield constant instability; my own view is that change and dynamicism are fine, and we should also respect culture and why we do things, and be open-hearted about it). The grassroots should make sure that diverse topics are brought to the fore, in the national debate, from the Democrats’ side, and some of this is being done. (Although there was some cause for concern, I thought the 5 month impeachment process was misguided and a significant distraction.)

I saw ObamaCare problematic as an inverted, hyper-complexified system to a rather straightforward need: health insurance for 20 million. I would have focused on a basic bill of health insurance rights and direct funding within the existing private market of health insurance for those who couldn’t afford

US-China Mutual Support, The Pandemic Response, And Systems (And Further Thoughts)

it. Some other things, perhaps additional Medicaid. I would not have introduced the level of complexity, interactions with the market, and regulatory structure. I would not like to see the same logic applied to the ecosystem, although there may have been some nice work done, under Obama, on that front.

Both Democrats and Republicans fall into politicization of things – from political commentary to news reports to leadership – and seek advantage for their party as the first priority. This results in less-than-functional as the model. I'm a Republican, but if I were the White House I'd make sure to promote what the White House and federal government is doing – and perhaps those from the States – that is functional and excellent. Promote your own ideas and efforts, but make sure it's primarily those types of things, and not so often to strike out (yet again) at the Democratic Party. Yet, debate is necessary. It's about the balance, and how things are substantively dealt with.

I suggest promoting the First Step Act further. Dynamite work, from what I've read. (I should know more.) This is something that President Trump pushed for, and it's welcome. Really smart, and we'll see how it works out. We can pivot to other parts of society, from there, and learn in the meantime. We don't have to be a strictly punitive society, and can work with the individual and society with a sense of mutual justice and equability at the same time as realism. Thanks!

I need to know more about Opportunity Zones. Thanks!

I wouldn't have cut SNAP. The federal savings isn't worth it compared to the benefit people feel, who don't have that much.

I would encourage an idea 'intelligent ecosystem thought'. Put the environment and the ecosystem in flexi and dynamic terms. We're part of the ecosystem. So is everything else on the planet.

I am decisively pro-life myself. Womb-baby. The natural life cycle of the generational. I do support a cautious pro-life stance for society. Perhaps, though, with a balance of the state's right to inform of and provide options, and cultural shifts. Probably not through stiff penalties.

I think Republicans can continue to look to family values, but should note where a 'nuclear family' becomes problematic given less than ideal internal structures and supports for the children. This has implications in society. I would also look to desire as being a driver, in America – and realize that if one steps aside from that, perhaps one sees other, deeper dynamics to life. Taoism and other religions might suggest this, and it's what I've realized.

I support a strong military, and especially in the original freedom-for-each-person 'Spirit Of 1776' (snare drum!), but I feel that it is and has been often used in attack in counterproductive ways, at least going back to the Vietnam War. I support the fact that President Trump has so far avoided starting a war, and war at all (aside from ISIS; and military support for Yemen, I'm not sure of the domain there). Our invasion of Libya in 2011 was to introduce extreme instability to a nation of stability; and I suspect it was exactly a wrong move, and a disaster (Qaddafi had some real thought, and maybe he didn't allow enough natural diverse expression, dunno). Trump got us out of Syria nicely, for the most part, and I hope the Kurds and Turkey are satisfied, and Iraq. I wouldn't have taken out the Iranian general, and I'm glad Trump has avoided war with Iran.

US-China Mutual Support, The Pandemic Response, And Systems (And Further Thoughts)

I would look to long-term peaceable relations with DPRK, with each nation able to strongly and ably defend itself. I think that DPRK works with theory as Communists, and (I suspect) has developed the system to such a degree that we can get to know them and their attitude and fact quite nicely – without interfering, but mutual support again. I would get to know, as President Trump and the Republicans, and our society, its leadership and its people, and its means and society, and somehow make that long term. This is to the advantage of both our positions, and our mutual engagement as nations: I suspect that DPRK is that well thought out and lived. We could have a real ally, acknowledging and respecting both our similarities and differences.

I think that we use the penalties of economic sanctions too frequently, and that this in effect harms the “we the people” of other nations. It is coercive, and we should be restrained in this. Thomas Paine suggested using commerce to get to know foreign nations (Common Sense, ch. 3), and perhaps we could emphasize this aspect.

This all is my own view toward further systems and insight: structured, flexi, dynamic, and aware. And real inquiry and leadership.

All the best to President Trump and the White House and the Republicans – and the Democrats – and some of the ideals of the Democrats, especially on the grassroots level, of diversity. Some of this is respected in this or that person at the national level. And when Republicans and Democrats work with ideas that are fluidly and structurally functional, together, that is the best.

Ultimately, An Unhelpful Approach

<https://thefederalist.com/2020/04/15/timeline-proves-who-helped-china-make-covid-19-pandemic-worse/>

Thanks to the White House for pointing out this article. I was aware of the Federalist, but haven't consulted it for years. This type of argument in this article – in being a thorough argument and step-by-step – is necessary, as it is specifics and reason. I disagree strongly, however, with its conclusions, and think it does not strike a realistic balance. Challenges can be noted, but also the benefits of strong US-China relations, and mutual support as we sort through this. I don't think the blame nature is at all helpful. I'll have to visit the Federalist more for at least reason, carefully and dynamically structured – and facts assertions that can be researched, then arguments and conclusions contrasted with others.