

Politics and the Political Process, articles written by Freydis

The Politics of a Reactionary America

19.09.01 Bush didn't first declare war the U\$ papers did, "the nation must prepare itself to fight its first war of the new century," written Tuesday, the very day of the attack by the Washington Post. Similarly the same day the New York Times main headline read "The War Against America". The ever violent and vociferous American media is now set to gain exactly what it asked for, but not without cost, "US TV networks are losing up to £75 million a day in advertising revenue as they broadcast 24- hour coverage of the disaster." America, under the brilliant benevolence of George W. Bush, is set to fight the first war of an already blemished 21st century. So much for moon colonies and world peace, eh?

Capitol Hill collectively puts a finger to the wind and declares in unison "window of opportunity!" Let's make new laws to placate our rabid electorate and commercial constituency. Bush's advisors realizing the same, whisper in his ear "war" and Bush shouts "this is war!" Military industrial groups already colluding with the same administration set to work with new contracts and renewed financial resolve. Meanwhile the domestic oil industry looks forward to supply disruptions and the unparalleled profit potential of sky-high prices. And in this case Iraq is useless to them being already out of the supply loop for the most part, hence the need for a new region to destabilize, like the oil wealth of central Asia. And yet the American military as of yet has no soldier or officer that speaks the principle language of the Taliban, Pushtu! I guess Bush and his Generals will just let the 2,000 pound laser-guided bombs do all the talking.

Arguably the most risible reactionary effort is the new policy to shoot down all commercial flights that don't respond to FAA tower requests. Not only does this look to me like a violation of the Posse Comitatus act, stipulating that the military cannot be used against its own citizens, but the physics make no sense either. I mean who came up with this one, really? If the plane is in the air and it's being used as a bomb then whether it hits its intended target or gets shot down and rains fiery death on some other part of the city seems almost irrelevant, it's going to kill somebody and the shoot-down policy only makes the government implicit accomplices to the terrorism in a twisted sort of way. Admittedly something should be done about hijacked airliners but this is not it!

Instead of sharpening the skills and number of intelligence workers the legislature is allowing more dirty tricks and meddling in sovereign nations that



started the whole cycle of violence in the first place. Instead of a defensive knowledge net they seem to want an offensive search and destroy machine. The changes in CIA policy are widely criticized by lawyers and concerned citizens alike, "However, many lawyers say state-backed killings would breach international law and send a signal that the US is abandoning its stance as a beacon for democracy and legal process." This should make us all safer I'm sure, and illegal too so that whole world court of justice thing will look even less like a hypocritical farce I'm doubly sure. Remember the Constitution, huh the what? C-o-n-s-t-i-t-u-t-i-o-n, oh that old moldy parchment thing right...

Meanwhile fortress America still has a few holes in its borders; like a sieve! The borders are less safe than ever before because the guards are now required to do rigorous searches of every vehicle with the same work hours but without any new hired help, making a mockery out of the procedure as the tired, overworked crews end up only miming the motions! But Americans *feel* safer so it must be fine.

Yeah well Americans will be feeling a lot poorer too after all this starts to kick into high. Why have so few questioned the costs associated with these plans? Economically it will turn out to be more costly to guard and protect every oil refinery, airport, power station and potential terrorist target than just establish a neighborhood watch program and clean up the mess after an attack! Seriously, the costs to the economy, meaning every consumer, are staggering. Who is paying for the security, the military missions, the loss of business to the airlines causing them to go bankrupt, destroy competition and jack up airfares? What of the cascading effect that higher fuel prices have on the entire economy? What about the costs incurred by the friction added to all trade from searches and lengthy waits at borders? This is setting up to be a very expensive New World Order. The American economy will not only go into deep recession due to these measures but will likely never recover. Bombs away America!

How Not to Lead in Crisis

13.09.01 Instead of standing on the White House lawn arms akimbo delivering defiant speeches to the wary nation Bush ducked from one Air Force base to another like a game of three card monte; Bush pulled a Putin. Because politics is symbolism what the leader does and portrays is usually more important than the logical reasons for or against such action. That's why Clinton could do dangerous, impulsive things and the public just couldn't get enough of him; I'm sure the Secret Service wondered if he was worth the trouble more than once. Putin was vacationing when the Kursk sank, he remained vacationing after it hit the news and became universally reviled by the Russians. Putin quickly learned from his mistake and eventually recovered. Bush made an even bigger mistake and it remains to be seen how much it will cost him politically.

The Bush administration pontificated to the American people, urging them to dutifully defy terrorism by going on with their daily lives. I'm sure many Americans could have done that, even without awareness of the attacks entirely except for the news. Only problem is Bush shut down the airports, grounded all the air travel for days, moved ships out of ports, closed major border choke-points and basically made *normal* life impossible! Indeed The Bush administration made life more difficult and disjointed than the terrorists could have ever hoped to do. American's must be left wondering, with friends like the Bush administration who needs enemies?

Boycott The U\$A Today!

18.06.01 For a few months with the 2000 election fiasco and related confusion it was easy to ignore the fact that America had been Bush-whacked yet again. I was having fun enjoying the fantasy that we didn't even have a President, or at least that without even a shred of mandate he would never be anything but an ineffectual symbol. Alas the rude intrusion of reality has taken over. President George W. Bush is as obnoxious as the grating screech of nails against a chalkboard. When he's not serving up Texas-style justice by executing people he's busy crushing toes like the big loud-mouthed stupid guy at parties, then ignoring environmental responsibilities or tearing up treaties to build vastly over budget pipe dream war-machines. Always staggering onward, Bush is never one to let the failures of the past get in the way of the failures of the future.

The 1972 ABM treaty has been a cornerstone of détente for decades but now with the National Missile Defense money-hole were expected to drop years of negotiations and diplomacy for a \$70 billion dollar sunk-investment without a single practical product to field, or even a plan to create one! Bush claims the North Korean government can't be trusted as an interlocutor but then turns around and sets up a new round of talks with the same interlocutor North Koreans. After touring Europe shaking hands with a few grinning politicians and laughing off widespread, violent multinational protests he proclaims it a "mission accomplished," and heads home! I thought Clinton had an abysmal foreign policy but Bush is coming very close to beating him at it in less than a year.

At least with Bill Clinton we expected mendacity and shortsighted policy blunder but this is ridiculous. What does it take to get rid of these idiots once and for all? I mean I vote against them, I've written to Congress, but what good does it do? Now Americans must endure a collective punishment meted out by a justifiably outraged world. Americans can't even go to a foreign country without risk of kidnap or assassination.

This just doesn't make sense, the U\$ is the number one economic power, California alone is larger than France in GDP, yet the country is plagued by an endless series



of fools in the front office who go around stomping on toes and bragging about it. Well I have a novel suggestion world, if you're listening: boycott American brands, products and corporations. Got it? I don't think America has a monopoly on anything but perhaps supercilious self-righteousness, so stop buying those American imports and buy local. And OPEC, please, boycott oil to the USA -- strangle your mortal enemy Israel by proxy! And if you need the money just sell more to China or convince Japan to dump their nuclear power plants and go oil! If Americans are unable or unwilling to clean their own house maybe a little prodding from the concerned planet will help. Thank you for your support... Oh and if the 'duwb' comes to your town you all know what to do.

Crisis & Response

19.02.01 The whole nature of contemporary crisis resolution centers on the transference of point problems (acute crisis) into chronic and long term annoyances. Omnipresent low level pollution and radiation hazards replace exploding pesticide plants and reactors on meltdown. Cause and effect all but vaporizes yet even though the immediate consequences are minimized the spatial range of hazard expands.

Likewise diffusing dangers temporarily doesn't mitigate their consequences so much as it merely makes them more palatable to the public conscience. And although these pseudo-solutions may allay panic it ironically increases dangers to the public by negating the one factor that actually stimulates policy change - the vivid, poignant, headline screaming catastrophe!

Sports & Politics

08.11.00 54 to 43, 97% of the voters in New York placed a vote for Lazio or Clinton, two horrendously putrid characters they had seemingly no reservations putting into one of the highest and most respected offices in the land. Hillary has more baggage than will fit in the overhead compartment, if you know what I mean, and Lazio is so shameless it just *appalling* to me that either one would get such a high percentage of the vote. Did you see the debates between them? They basically centered on who could stoop the lowest to kiss Jewish ass. Of all the other people on the ballot from green to socialist to write-in, the voters chose to side with either a Republican or Democrat. Look at the national election for President. At the moment the popular vote is at 48% to 48%. Certainly it's been an unusual presidential election featuring

the closest contest and the closest candidates in decades. In contests like this vote fraud becomes almost the deciding factor. With the elections all tallied by computers and the ease of which both ballots and computer systems can be tampered it's not just an idea it's a reality, the only question becomes to what extent? And recent evidence in California and Florida points to the fact that it may well be a sizable industry.

But still when we're dealing with 96% of the population choosing dumb or dumber, vote fraud is fairly incidental in the long run. Who out there really thinks that one of these carbon blobs is more qualified to be President than the other? Are they seeing some spark of intelligence in Bush's eye that I'm missing? Are they detecting some faint glimmer of righteousness in Gore's heart?

When picking a puppet in elections I keep hearing this same idea and it really pisses me off. People saying 'we'll he/she doesn't have a chance to win so I'm not voting for them.' This is such blatantly specious reasoning that it's futile to even argue with the proponents. If the candidate can win, why do they need your vote at all? Why not vote for a character that has qualifications and a platform that you can really agree with and support? Instead of some Party clone with a face-lift and a million dollar ad campaign? Shit, I want to vote some of these bastards down just for their obnoxious advertisements! "Oh but they can't win so I'm just *throwing* my vote away!" Uh yeah, okay...

Voters only pick from bin A or bin B because they vicariously attach to the candidate; winning is very important to voters and they don't want to pick a loser because they're so insecure they fear that to do so makes them a loser too! Likewise the reason for parties is the vicarious ego boost individuals get from participating in something bigger than themselves, they achieve greatness by attaching their fortunes to the greatness of this structure be it Party, sports team or Church. It's difficult to exaggerate the insecurity of the average mass-media consuming individual. The less personal worth and identity one has the greater the need for external associations and attachment to groups. The sports entertainment industry is huge because of this effect, the idea that *I* can be as big as Da Bears, Manchester United or what have you by being a fan because I'm with them.

But now we're getting closer to the real message. The electorate really acts like a horse with blinders on. The majority, again 96%, are unwilling to entertain any option besides the one that is delivered to them in a neat and officially stamped package courtesy of the media. If the candidate doesn't have that seal of approval, if the candidate doesn't have the official Party endorsement and feature in the debates on NBC or CBS, then they just aren't a *real* candidate. We're dealing with the masses, with emotion and feeling here, not with reason. To run on a third party platform, say as a Green or a Libertarian, is a waste of time or money unless you have the megabucks to literally buy-up national air time and drive your message right into the center of the TV-addled crowds' brains, just like Perot did. The duopoly Party system

is in bed with the media and neither one wants the system to change. This system of the political machine is an outcome, a reaction not an input. It reflects what the people are able to grasp and the information that they have been able to collect and interpret from mass-media outlets.

To change things for the better one should not waste the effort attempting to win through elections, it's like punching ghosts. Nor do you even need to change the political-election structure. What really matters is not which puppet gets to play dress up and pretend to be king of the world for four years but what policy issues the elected representatives are forced to deal with. In other words these faithful representatives that some of us elect are not the problem nearly as much as what issues, the limitations on the spectrum of ideas, that they and us are collectively forced to find solutions from. As long as that spectrum is limited to the likes of school vouchers and privatizing social security, ain't nuthin gonna get better friend.

And how do we fix that? Four words: persistence, propinquity, permeation and pervasiveness. The monopoly death-grip that the establishment media exert over the minds of the world has to be broken. Significant erosion has already occurred. The media moguls are running scared, desperately cycling through mergers and cutting convoluted deals to exchange 'content' and expand markets. But they can't win because they offer nothing but failure and death to all who listen and watch. Me, you and everyone else who wants a better future must tune them out and turn them off, get unplugged. Next, tune in to something that is edifying and broadens horizons, that expounds ideas and concepts outside the bounds of the traditional hackneyed pseudo-solutions. The first step leads to the second...

Always Remember: *Things are the way they are for a reason*

24.09.00 Monoculture, the youth culture, why are they 'good'? Because youth buy more or because they're more easily influenced and always want to be popular, a trait that is then exploited to market a rainbow of consumer goods?

Think of the interface between media, supported by advertising revenue, and the multi-national corporations that provide that revenue. Both parties need each other - corporations need a positive image and a broad consumer base while media needs corporate sponsorship. To borrow Hollywood lingo: two bad guys in bed together. Neither party wishes to offend the other which is why we see in our media so little real criticism of corporate policy and why global free-market capitalism is ceaselessly portrayed as being unfailingly positive. Both parties gain from monoculture and the destruction of community, environment, and all identity separate from the consumerist cookie cutter mold.

But the relationship is tenuous for if media is too critical of corporate policy they will

reciprocate by pulling their advertising dollars and going to another network, or using their share-holding power to fire and replace unfriendly media big shots and executives. MNCs are not stupid, they know the power of media and they have done much to avoid being burned by loose cannons, example GE which owns NBC and its horde of affiliates, or AOL absorbing TimeWarner with its incredible plethora of media interests. But that just demonstrates that it's nearly impossible to discern the difference between media and corporate interests, they're literally the same entities anymore.

Media powers are no fools either, they know this and try their utmost to appease business interests. But if certain corporate cannons go too far they can use their ethnic media monopoly to destroy that corporate image in no time.

Between these two ogres, government nearly seems a friendly giant! And I doubt that it deserves all the invective of right-wing interests. Government power has waned steadily for decades, what antitrust and charter controls government legally possess they're too fearful to use. Electorates need jobs and politicians need votes! Not only that but they need campaign donations even more, and who has the biggest wallets? Of course, and campaign finance reform? A rich man will sooner give up his wealth.

All Wrong

Our modern power triumvirate has conveniently formed an alliance in mutually propitious endeavors, the fiendish result: them versus the rest of the planet. This is an important concept to understand because any attempts to change things must take in to account all three elements of the triumvirate. Right-wing rebels want to take down government, left-wing rebels want to take down corporations, moderates want to take down media or at least control it's outpourings of unpleasantness i.e. violence and sex. **Ding!*, times up, that's your final answer? Oh so sorry, you all lose the final round for tournament of revolutionaries.*

And this is a quandary of no small significance, it's one that plagues even myself - how to align politically in a world that deals with atomised issues when our problems can only be understood and solved in totality? Political ideologies are slowly evolving towards the realization that collective crisis can no longer be rectified using trite reductionist paradigms. It calls for a radical realignment, a new vision. But how to convey this complexity to an electorate as misinformed as they are uninformed?

Rewind and Repeat

They can understand personal experiences but when confronted with the new and the unknown they go retrograde, they're reactionary because that's often all they know. Yet counterrevolution is both foolish and impractical, the world isn't the same as yesterday, nor can it or should it be. We need new answers not the old concepts

repackaged, because they only guarantee failure, a repeat of the present. Our collective modes of survival need to become organic not artificial. We must match our culture to the environment, fit into our surroundings not the other way around. It makes more sense to deal with the present problems with clear and immediate action. Future issues can best be dealt with when they arrive.

Know thine Enemy



All anger needs to be directed in order to have any positive benefit. That anger and resentment should logically be directed at those who have gained from the suffering of others. All those in an establishment leadership position today, secondly any proponent for the established order, and thirdly the lackeys and passive participators of the Empire. Remember that even honest men become dishonest when inside the machine of corporate and political power. CEOs are slaves to the profit motive, the President a slave to the moneyed interests. They're responsible for stealing our future, our wealth our reasons to live; the only reason they can't steal is the only one left - the one to resolve to rub them out. Reject the corporate sponsored suicide, the poison of artificial foodstuffs, plastic culture mental and material exploitation. The answer is a new outlook. Time to meet Kali.

Deleterious Lifestyles

10.06.00 The idea that drug users only harm themselves and should therefore be left alone or even have their practices legalized rests on some thin assumptions. Case in point is the emergence of what appears to be a new illness, possibly a mutation of an existing disease, that affects intravenous heroin users. The UK has been ground zero for this, however *so far* cases have been limited to those drug abusers and not the general population. This illness has 30 documented kills in the UK with no response to administered antibiotics at all.

Illegal immigration is likewise an issue of self-preservation and disease prevention, albeit so warped in the public's mind it's now about 'human rights' not public safety. Sickness and disease is rife amongst illegal immigrants into the U\$, EU any of the western nations. Immigration can be economically and even culturally advantageous but only if it is carefully regulated, incoming peoples checked and quarantined if necessary. I mean, hell - you can't bring any animals or plants into most countries from overseas or at least without a long quarantine, yet countless TB patients walk across the borders of the U\$ every week.

It's a profound breakdown in social organization when de-facto actions are the only ones which accomplish the desired goal. If one attempts to do things legally and

within the properly proscribed boundaries and to wait for permission then nothing will ever happen. It seems that the only time anything gets done anymore is outside the channels of official oversight. To immigrate legally into the U\$ today is a challenge even the pioneers of old would have second thoughts at attempting. If you don't have a wad of cash to put up as collateral or a U\$ citizen to marry, you might as well not even try. Yet anyone willing to brave the desert or swim the muddy Rio-Grande (in most spots all you need is an inner-tube) can walk in get a job and a menial lifestyle.

Thank an errant, Kafkaesque bureaucracy hopelessly broken down. Logic is lawlessness, common sense illegal. Official sanction the word of gospel and leadership mouthpieces for rent to highest bidder. Meet the new paradigm: better to protect one than the many.

Building 21st Century Politics from the remnants of old – some things never change

28.04.00 & 31.08.09 It must be unambiguously understood that Nazism, the "NAZI" party, or more correctly the NSDAP, was purely a counter-revolutionary and reactionary movement against Communism. Germany after WWI was the frontline for Communist political agit-prop work. It would undoubtedly have turned into a Communist state on a greater scale than even the USSR if not for the competition of the NSDAP. Indeed just read Mein Kampf, over half the book is about the parties efforts to counter Communist political inroads, from bashing heads in beer halls to rip-off red banners inciting Communists. To apply any mystical motives or powers to the Nazis is simply ridiculous. Go back and read Rauschnings 1939 book The Revolution of Nihilism. Hitler and his associates were not politicians they weren't even aristocrats with a foggy idea of how the established order functioned. The only thing especially unique about the NSDAP was that they were comprised of average people that gained political power, democratically.

The problem with categorizing the NSDAP within the framework of historical politics is that they never progressed beyond the limitations of being a reactionary movement. True some members went off on tangents and set up pet projects but consistency was lacking. Nazism is about being anti-Communist. *If communism didn't exist Nazism wouldn't either.* Nazism opposed the tenets of Communism but more importantly they opposed the *proponents* of Communism. Those key leaders were nearly all Jews, Rosa Luxembourge is a perfect example but she certainly wasn't acting alone. Because of this Nazism became an "anti-Semitic" movement. This obscured the fundamental simplicity, nay the banality of Nazism. The German Jews weren't any more aggressive than anywhere else, the Germans aren't any more "anti-Semitic" than other people, they aren't more political or activist either. It's the fact that Germans knew who was behind the Communist movement desperately attempting to overthrow their nation and turn it into a bad copy of the Soviet Union!

They did no more than what any American of the same period would have done.

Politics is more about popular myths than substance, which is why lying works so well. They say 'military intelligence' is an oxymoron but no more than 'political science'. This is also why it doesn't really matter who you elect they pretty much all end up operating with the same amount of competency. I mean, Minnesota's Jesse Ventura may be a bigmouth or even a nut but he can't do any worse than President Gerald Ford or Jimmy Carter. The really hazardous politicians are the ones that are smart enough to cause a lot of trouble but not bright enough to grasp any consequences like Bill Clinton or Janet Reno.

So where does politics go from here? Opportunism seems to be the keyword, but single issues and divisive 'us vs. them' are probably even more important to party success. If politics is just whatever it takes to win then maybe we should start to question what we're fighting for, and what we think we're winning from the process.

When National Security Met Free Trade

02.01.00 American investors aren't the only ones reaping the rewards of stellar stock market gains in the U\$. Foreign investors, especially big players with big bucks, have been making killings too. U\$ bonds have long been a favorite, but the returns on those can't even come close to the equity markets. China, rocketing to the top of the unpopularity charts, is the first name to pop up on this list. But truthfully anyone can invest on Wall Street even if you're a rogue nation like North Korea or Libya because it's simple to set up front companies and special off-shore bank accounts to funnel the profits – just ask the Russians. But don't get the wrong idea it's not Joe and Jane Wong making any money here it's the institutions, the government investments that have the volume power to get involved and make significant gains.

Undeniably as well as ironically the U\$ equity bubble is directly sponsoring avowed enemies of the United States. The U\$ economic system is founded on open and fair trade but very few other governments out there play by those generous rules. Taking advantage of American naiveté and fairness is all too easy for concerted foes. So then really, what good is free trade if it only ends up (literally) as ammunition for your enemies?

With domestic enterprises stumbling over themselves to dissolve every border and eliminate every tariff they're unwittingly opening themselves up to reprisals. In other words the monomaniacal desire for open and fair trade so characteristic of American business-politics is not shared by the rest of the world. I would recommend proceeding with extreme caution and only when one could be sure the other party actually reciprocates with more than mere words. But when does money ever wait

up for reason?!

And you know I hear capitalist's sell cheap rope...

America Would be Better off as a Confederacy

14.12.99 The critical founders of the United States of America seemed to have a monomaniacal obsession with the Republic, the naive and simplistic beauty of a centrally organized political system and a convenient delegation of powers. I can understand the original fear that the country would fall apart, but I don't agree that would have been the chaotic, disastrous outcome proclaimed by the catastrophists. By the point of the Civil War the country was solid enough that foreign interference was not a serious issue. The enemies were essentially domestic in nature. Indeed the actual choice of unity seems far worse than any separation could have possible caused.

The problem of the republic system was amply demonstrated by Lincoln, his Republican Party and the special interest groups, namely the abolitionists. The lust for power was so great that an idiotic blood-fest of a war became preferable to ceding authority in a confederacy. I believe in principle that any group that wants independence from a controlling body, as in the case of the South, should be allowed to have it. A healthy and productive relationship just cannot be kept by force. Especially when the second party is getting screwed economically and politically as in the case of the South. Basically their low-density population mitigated their clout in the House and tipped power in the favor of the North.

Now I may be a little biased because of where I live (and I *don't* mean I live in the south), but I have some respect for State government. At least State governments are fiscally responsible (usually prevented from deficit spending by amendments), responsive to their constituencies, and the link between government and voter infrastructure spending is tight. Not only that but the beauty of the State government is that if one makes mistakes, they pay for it, people will move to a state that has its act together.

The federal system is the opposite - inefficient, unresponsive to 50 states and the nearly 300 million voices, and totally out of control fiscally speaking. And no one can move away without leaving the system entirely when the feds make mistakes! Washington D.C. is another planet and anyone who has spent time working for a federal agency can attest to the dysfunctional nature of the Federal bureaucratic system. But you *do* get decent pay and good benefits, so why make waves, right?

Power can be a dangerous thing, especially when powerful people are allowed to aggregate their authorities at the expense of others. What I mean is that the Federal government, especially the Executive branch, has been stomping on States rights for decades, the 10th amendment has been taking a beating for some time. But this shouldn't be surprising given the present importance attributed to the national government. This significance is based purely on cash payments whether for disaster relief or representative pork. Beyond that, modern America is increasingly assuming the nature of a Caesarship, a dictatorship through popularity, and a popular demagogue, the President. Once again what people want is not necessarily what's best for them all.

Unfortunately few States really consider leaving the union today (and true only Texas can do so legally) although most are currently on very solid financial footing. Americans that want change have to work on a level that is both practical and will achieve results. Today it seems that this is only realistic at the State level. But the good thing about that is that a well-run State government needs less from the Feds, and although they will be taxed more heavily the incentive to quit the Federal scam will be that much greater. Also the fact that many states are working on their own direct trade agreements with foreign countries is encouraging. Eventually people will realize that in order to be responsive to the voters the power has to be close to the voters.

A Radically Simple Solution To Our Legal-Political Crisis

29.11.99 I propose a holiday from laws, a real no-rules, anything goes day for everyone of all ages and free from any prosecution before, during or after the Holiday. Neither shall any profit or property be taxed on this day, nor crime be punished. We shall call it Law-Free Day. Perhaps this would ameliorate our collective unease, the pent up angst that pervades our culture and manifests as love of violence, crude behavior, obscenity, perversion and vulgarity? Laws can be your best friend or worst enemy.

Geography plays a critical role in the formation of laws, and it is to geography that we must look to find answers. Ever wonder why the suburbs have witnessed such explosive growth over the past 20 years? If you've spent any time in a large city you won't. Cities are both outdated economically and regressive socially, creating more problems than they solve. Cities were never more than a construct of necessity and perhaps deluded idealism, never of driven desire for efficiency through density. Few really prefer to live in an 600sq-ft apartment next to a rail line and a below the airport flight path, with countless neighbors above, below and next door. Fortunately technological improvements have divorced labor from industrial locations. Now people can work at home and live in the suburbs even own a house, car and property.

But the phenomenon of cities is still worth study if for no other reason than to learn what not to do. Functional, prosperous cities require a unique human quality – the ability to peacefully coexist in densely cramped quarters. Indeed any factor be it ethnic, religious, racial or class-based will magnify conflict and destroy vital cohesion. Witness ‘white-flight’, like Californians moving to Oregon or the general trend of fleeing the cities for the suburbs. After that the suburbs divide up into class-based regions, you know the big houses on the hill and the trailer parks on the edge of town. Human nature doesn’t naturally congregate into tenement complexes and fight for room on public transportation. It occurs out of economic necessity and at the same time contrary forces of human nature secretly desire to blow it all apart. In order to function cities must be oppressive and heavily legislated zones, just think of Singapore or the parking regulations in New York City.

But density living comes with a price. That price is repressed hostility, which become manifest in unpredictable and unusual ways. Perversion, drugs, crime etc. ‘Psychos’ and serial killers appear out of nowhere and wreak havoc in a heavily regimented and poorly protected populace. People wonder how such craziness can occur and what would drive someone to do such things. It’s nothing years of psychological torture can’t complicate. Studies have shown that mice for example when forced to live in dense quarters become homosexual, violent, and exhibit anti-social behavior. The exact same effects occur in human populations but cities still ‘work’ because we have qualities that mice don’t, namely fear of authority and a sense of strategic well being. In other words we can sacrifice immediate desires for long range goals be it a career or merely a warm place to sleep for the night. Psychological needs, just like physical, are often sacrificed for long term survival. By assuming the benefits of social life we must also forego many of the benefits that would otherwise be ours through solitary life – freedom, time and pleasures.

We go along with civilizations rules for survival, not because we really want to be oppressed. By living in cities humans gain certain protections and guarantees that would otherwise not be available but at the same time give up many freedoms as well. These security and welfare guarantees are codified by laws and enforced by government authorities. Instead we must go through a complex maze of legality and trials, often with little hope it will mean justice.

Archaic law centered on compensation for loss of property or life. In other words if someone killed your calf you would be entitle to equal repayment for the value of that animal from the offending party. And if they couldn’t pay you could either make them earn the money through work or less pleasant means... But really what is the normal human reaction to a serious loss of life or property? You want to revenge against the offending party. And if you can’t carry out the deed then your family will. This is the essence of archaic justice (revenge). In our civilization murder is never allowed (rare cases occur as in self defense); retribution is a nebulous concept that leaves the offended without reward and the offender without judgment. Guilt and punishment have been transferred from individual to society. Now it’s believed that

the offenders are not depriving individuals they are depriving society. Serving time in a prison doesn't make anyone happy because the deprived party is gaining nothing; no personal justice is being done! Merely a reactionary response is being implemented, devoid of purpose and ineffectually preventative.

So should everyone have the right to equal archaic justice? If you mess with me or my family, we will kill you! That model is well applied in some regions of the world. It does work in a way, but it makes complex social structures difficult to maintain. The relation between population size and effectiveness of clan-justice is inescapable. Small groups can effectively use the Old Testament ideology, but in large populations where no one knows anyone else it becomes tricky. This takes us back to my original idea, Law-Free day. What would happen in say the USA if such a concept were implemented? Would we not have an orgy of clan-justice? A direct and swift retribution of personal wrongdoing. I know I can think of a few people worthy of such reward, and I suppose any normal person could think of a few themselves. So is civilization worth the sacrifice? Why not nullify the laws and treat your enemies the way they've treated you?

Well to start with total freedom is not as good as it sounds. As long as you can kill with impunity, so can everyone else. Eventually a stasis will emerge, one based on personal power and the revenge potential of family and friends. Life is likely to be shorter and more brutal than civilized life. The luxuries of intellectualism and academia will be difficult if not impossible to enjoy when food and survival are self-serve. It seems that total freedom is more than most can swallow. Perhaps civilization is as necessary as it is evil?

Cities are extreme examples of civilization and all its regulations and oppression combined. But why throw it all out when we can pick and choose what we want? We've already seen the appeal of suburban life; why not take it a step further? Why not create custom suburban enclaves for everyone, and everything. We've also seen how density and oppression are directly related. Why not create low-density neo-cities complete with indigenous (high-tech?) industry, commerce and residential? Likewise we know that similarity is desirable for social harmony and collective identity, why not include this element into the Suburban Life Zone (SLZ) as well? Now what we have is a form of de-industrialized, de-urbanized city-states complete with their own rules and lifestyles. Something approximating a county in size with probably one major commercial center and several diffuse industrial nodes at nexus' of transportation arteries. Residential and farm zones are equidistantly scattered throughout.

Indeed it is also well documented that the larger the structure a government tries to control, the less effective and efficient it becomes; compare the Soviet centrally planned farm economy to a county co-op. Likewise fewer laws and greater freedom make for happier citizens. The only reason we need so many laws now is the fact that our country is so large and encompasses so many people of various ethnic,

religious and cultural backgrounds – all with different ideas of right and wrong. Reductionist logic dictates that the fewer people in the system, and the more homogeneous they are, the fewer regulations will be necessary. Offenders can much more easily be identified and dealt with at a community level.

Through the private ownership of property average people can lay claim to the strategic destiny of their family and community. Likewise it makes good sense to avoid foreign ownership of local property because foreigners may not share the same goals or ideals as the indigenous inhabitants. The owner who lives on his land will never intentionally destroy it environmentally, or otherwise pollute it for obvious reasons. Foreign owners are not restricted by this dictum, polluting and exploiting for maximum profit. Likewise international trade regulations and traditional laissez faire economics clearly violate this order. Consequently labor and environmental abuses are rampant. Multinationals don't care what the working conditions are in some dumpy country on the other side of the planet, but they'd be *forced* to care if the factory was next door to the corporate headquarters, in this case located in the same SLZ.

The greatest impediment to the creation of such a system is the present imperialistic world order, which desires the exact opposite, unified global economy and polity. What I propose is the antipode of what Multi-National corporations, banking, industrial and plutocratic elites want. These greedy and corrupt men crave the power and money that come with controlling vast populations; they will never willingly cede power to the people in the form of local law making, or in any other way. The Suburban-Life-Zone however, will promote a ununified and cohesive population, stable prosperity, decentralized self-rule and private land ownership for anyone and everyone. And up to a point this is perfectly practical. Certainly in the USA land is abundant enough for everyone to have their own city and then some. Unfortunately growth inevitably means conflict over land. But so be it! This is the story of all human history. Conflict is inevitable. I would rather be forced to fight for my freedom than be forced to accept subjugation in a temporarily peaceful world order.

Technology, human nature and history are all in my favor. All that remains is the will and persistence to see the idea to fruition.

Money - The Disease of Capitalism

08.03.99 Isn't it funny that the more money involved in any government project the more significant the amount of corruption? Oddly enough the less funded projects actually accomplish more than the budget busters. Look at NASA today with its cheap space probes and compare that Lyndon Johnson's social programs.

Russia is in the grip of a major scandal involving the Central Bank and dirty deals. And in true Russian style everything that might implicate them has now been labeled as a 'State Secret'. Of course any sensible person would realize that a nation based on the law of kleptocracy isn't the best place to invest money but hey, were dealing with the IMF and Clinton administration here.

So all those billions of IMF dollars ended up in the Swiss bank accounts of crooks. I have to say that the 'New World Order' is one heck of a poorly run organization. And if all these under-the-table deals are part of the plan then they must not have much real authority after all. Or just the authority that any common criminal has.

Money is the most infectious disease around. Everyone that touches it gets sick. The more money the more sick!

No situation is so terrible that a committee of officials cannot make it worse.

Within a corrupt
and dishonest
establishment, the
worst elements, and
the most venal
people, rise to the
top.

