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# Article summary:

1. The article examines the idea that human societies were engaged in cosmic systems of governmentality even before they instituted anything like a political state of their own.

2. It looks at examples from Chewong and Inuit societies to illustrate how they are coercively ruled by a host of cosmic authorities, themselves of human character and metahuman powers.

3. The article argues that something like the state is the general condition of humankind, usually called “religion”.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article provides an interesting perspective on the idea that human societies were engaged in cosmic systems of governmentality even before they instituted anything like a political state of their own. It draws on examples from Chewong and Inuit societies to illustrate how they are coercively ruled by a host of cosmic authorities, themselves of human character and metahuman powers. However, there are some potential issues with the trustworthiness and reliability of this article.

First, it is not clear if the author has considered counterarguments or alternative perspectives on this topic. While he does mention Carl Schmitt’s assertion that the significant concepts of the modern state are “secularized theological concepts” (2005: 36), he does not explore any other possible explanations for why humans may have developed these systems before creating political states. Additionally, while he cites Hocart’s work as evidence for his argument, it is not clear if he has considered any other sources or evidence to support his claims.

Second, it is also unclear if the author has taken into account any potential biases or partiality in his analysis. He does not provide any insight into his own personal beliefs or opinions about this topic which could potentially influence his interpretation and analysis of the data presented in this article. Furthermore, he does not provide any information about who funded or sponsored this research which could also be a source of bias or partiality in his reporting.

Finally, it is important to note that while this article provides an interesting perspective on cosmic systems of governmentality, it does not present both sides equally nor does it explore all possible risks associated with such systems. As such, readers should take caution when interpreting its findings and conclusions as they may be incomplete or one-sided due to these omissions.

# Topics for further research:

* Cosmic systems of governmentality risks
* Alternative explanations for cosmic systems of governmentality
* Carl Schmitt’s secularized theological concepts
* Potential biases in cosmic systems of governmentality research
* Sponsors of cosmic systems of governmentality research
* Counterarguments to cosmic systems of governmentality
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