

Occam and the Deep State

Nobody asked but ...

Occam's Razor is often mischaracterized, chiefly through use of its alternate handle, the Law of Parsimony. Too many people confuse parsimony with thrift and frugality. Some will state Occam's Razor to be such that the truth calls for the simplest answer which fits all of the facts. That is apt, but it often leads one down the path of sparseness. A proper analysis, using the Razor, can be quite complex. The analysis only needs to dispense with superfluity to qualify. Occam can also be interpreted to require fullness. It is the necessary and sufficient answer which fits all of the facts.

This is why even the most seasoned adherents to Occam have not penetrated the deep state. We don't know all of the facts — the deep state keeps it that way. When does one have all the facts on the deep state?

I suggest here another kind of razor — one which takes into account the likelihoods. If A has the power to do B, and B is desired by A, then why wouldn't A do B? If B is the most likely outcome of A's observable drive to power, then what mare's nest can explain not-B?

Here's an example, if powermonger A can get away with sexual harassment (B), and A is surrounded by attractive objects of his or her desires, why on the green Earth would A refrain from B? This B is particularly likely when A is a power-hungry, rationalizing narcissist?

All that is necessary for a deep state (and philandering is part of a deep state), is that the state be populated by people who have striven for positions of control in that deep state.

— Kilgore Forelle