

Debate with a Psychotic on “Democracy” (2004)

This “debate” was featured for a time on my old website. It developed came immediately after I posted an essay on Gen. A. Pinochet in 2004. As I predicted, the scum will ooze out of the woodwork and, in the name of democracy, creativity and individualism, merely repeat the academic/media combine’s slogans about “democracy.” Without dwelling on the irony of American life, I will present the debate. I have paraphrased by interlocutor, largely because she had very poor grammar, and, as usual for American women, simply used expletives whenever she was on the losing side. I am making her arguments stronger by restating them in form, but not in substance. This woman, who will remain nameless, is, unsurprisingly, an affirmative-action graduate student at Tufts University. I will repeat the dialogue in the format of question and answer. I have not altered the substance of her arguments one iota. Her statements are in italics

How can you romanticize the torturer of millions? Pinochet was a murderer, created by the CIA to stop communism in Latin America.

Pinochet did not kill millions. According to all sources, the military was involved in the killing of just over 2,000 people in nearly 20 years. Most of these were Marxist revolutionaries that would have turned Chile into one large concentration camp in the name of equality. And so what if the CIA supported him at first (they condemned him later): what is better—foreign meddling in Chile, or the real millions that would have been murdered under Marxism? This sort of behavior of typical of communism wherever it goes.

We cannot have any sort of social progress without democracy. Without the people, nothing happens. With the people, there will be peace.

This is the typical vague sloganeering I would expect from someone at Tufts. It is typical of what is left of a graduate education in America. There are too many colleges and too many people with PhDs out there. Have you considered actually being a productive member of society and learn a trade? I would like to know: Was Great Britain a democracy when she conquered half the world and murdered millions of Irish? At the time of the development of British “democracy” the English tortured orphan kids to death in their factories and as “chimney sweeps.” The Irish, by the thousands, were literally enslaved during the Ulster Settlement. The English, Masonic ruling class justified this in the name of progress and “civilization.”

You’re a fool. Is it that you hate the people, or that they frighten you?

Actually, both. Americans are a brainwashed group of zombies who will do or believe anything so long as the cheap goods from China keep rolling in. Americans are the perfect raw material for Tavistock-type social experimentation: while repeating slogans from *Time* magazine, they believe they’re being individualists. They believe that the only two political options that are “reasonable” are Fox News or CNN. They condemn “conspiracy theorists,” but believe in a huge, intricate conspiracy of 19 “Arabs” (most of whom are still alive) to hijack planes, and with minimal flight training, expertly fly them into the Trade Towers—all to permit Israel perfect cover to destroy their co-religionists in Iraq, Afghanistan and Gaza. It’s OK to believe that Putin is the creator of a huge conspiracy to destroy his opposition (all 9 of them), right? Yes, they scare me.

You're a sick, insecure little man. Do the murders of the military dictators you love turn you on somehow?

Well, I'm 6 feet, and can bench-press 300 pounds. But this is completely beside the point. Americans believe what they believe because either it is easy, or it satisfies some psychological need. This is the foundation of democracy. I teach a History of Political Theory course regularly, and Mill comes up, of course. Mill's argument was that free speech is justified because this is the only way that the truth can be really known and tested—the so-called “marketplace of ideas” myth. Of course, the only problem with Mill's theory is that it assumes that human beings are merely calculating machines, attracted to logic and its conclusions for their own sake. Wouldn't it be more reasonable to make the claim that the problem with “democracy” is that voters and lobbyists merely work for what is in their own interests, rather than in truth abstractly? Did Mill make a simple error here?

The whole point of democratic systems is to represent interests and the psychological states of the people; of whatever kind.

So you reject Mill? Either people pursue truth or their own wills. Usually, these two things are distinct. If democrats were really serious about “representation” they would be advocating the only real way that interests can be represented, that is, to empower localities and neighborhoods to run their own affairs in economic policy and social ideas. Ethnic groups and religious groups should be autonomous entities. Here, a family can really make a difference. On the local level, we largely know each other and can make decisions based on local conditions. If democrats were serious about representation, they would be demanding a democratized workplace, where corporate decisions are made by labor, on the basis of local conditions.

Of course, while screaming about democracy on the federal level, where only the rich and well-connected can make a difference, real, day to day affairs in the workplace or the neighborhood are ignored. But the notion is that this is deliberate; it is a part of democratic theory, rather than being an aberration. Basically, urban leftists do not want farmers deciding on agricultural policy in western Nebraska, largely because they would demand that you be strung up and whipped. This is the reason you girls hate guns—because it empowers these sort of people—people you hate: rural, Christian males. Stop talking about “interests” and “representation.” You believe in neither.

You're insane. I believe that All people should be deciding their own affairs, and not be subject to church or state.

What does the church have to do with anything? I think there is an agenda here you are not telling me. But this is also typical: democrats speak in abstractions. This is deliberate: abstractions are almost always a mask for a real interest. This is a major issue in Dostoevsky's writing. No one in the world is emotionally connected to the procedure of democracy, elections, etc. They, of course, care about outcomes. So, when the Radicals destroyed their opposition in Serbian elections a few years ago, the Regime merely canceled the elections.

When Montenegro consistently refused to separate from Serbia, the Regime demanded that the elections keep being held—largely financed from the U.S.—until the proper outcome was reached (and that barely). The U.S., though the Israeli/Big Oil puppet John McCain, condemned the presidential election in Belarus months before it actually occurred. In Georgia, when the separatists won their referendum recently, the Regime condemned the election and set its face against secession. This is democracy in reality; the theory is usually high-flown phrases with no

connection to actual events. Democracy is a bait-and-switch tactic for the wealthy to take over a society without Sally SUV realizing that she's a pretty little slave.

People are dying in wars to be able to vote. This is a central idea to being an American. To decide one's own fate. And, no, democracy is not just about the rich. It was never meant that way.

Which wars? I have never heard of a soldier rushing off into battle talking about "electoral procedures." In royal societies, people who normally would become politicians actually have to get jobs and to become productive. In royal societies, democracy is a real, tangible, non-abstract element. Why? This is because democracy was always the norm at the local level: i.e. the level where ordinary families can actually have an effect on things. In Russia by 1870, the peasantry, who made up 95% of the population ruled itself in the following ways: first, their courts were elective, and at the district level. Peasants judged other peasants, and the law was local custom, known by all. Local custom was simple, at the level of the peasantry. Nothing was in the indecipherable legalese, known well in democracies, which serves only to keep the legal caste perpetually in power capable of overruling any referendum or election through the non-elective modern courts.

Second, the *zemstva* were regional, locally based assemblies divided into noble (upper) and peasant (lower) houses. All were elective. Third, the commune was completely democratic, and agricultural affairs (i.e. nearly 100% of the peasant's life) was decided on a one-man-one-vote principle. So what if the monarchy was not elective? Could the average peasant have a say in their election anyway? Of course not. So who would have a say: the upper nobility and bourgeois. Oh—so that's why all revolutionary groups in Russia were taken almost exclusively from the upper and upper-middle classes and educated people. Is this difficult for you?

Insofar as the development of democracy is concerned: yes, it was about the wealthy. Let's simplify things for you: generally, in England, parts of Germany and Holland, a war broke out (hot, sometimes cold) between the bourgeois on the one side, and the church, monarchy and nobility, on the other. There is no understanding of the development of (federal) democratic institutions without understanding the classes who created them. The bourgeois had several weapons, and these became important in England during the Civil War, in Holland against the Spanish and the middle classes against the monarchy in France. These were money and abstraction.

Regardless, the upper classes who were self-consciously behind these movements were seeking to redress what they considered an imbalance: that they had money, but political power incommensurate with it. Read the manifestos of these revolutionary groups: they demanded power over taxation and security in their economic holdings. These manifestos were identical from Parliament in England, the early revolutionaries in France, and the noble demands made upon Anne of Courland in Russia (which were torn up by this woman, at the best of an 800 member assembly of lower nobles, peasants and clergy; this is why she brought in the Germans to rule after this affair).

Interestingly, the British parliament, in demanding security in their economic holdings, began to speak in the name of a new abstraction: "the people." The rhetorical reference to "the people" began in modern times with the British parliament making economic demands against Charles. Parliament, incidentally, was the stronghold of the proto-capitalists, the Puritans and the middle classes. It was entirely economic. The English revolutionaries did not hide this. Puritanism, which some call a version of "Christianity," (it's not) was solely a reaction against Charles and

the church of England. Puritanism sanctioned, conveniently, the amassing of great wealth, and their rejection of all Christian feasts made sure their labor would be enslaved 365 days a year—where, prior to that, Christian holidays (both Anglican and Catholic) permitted over 100 holidays a year (and often, banquets at the nobility's expense). The only reason why Protestantism won in Germany, Holland and England (the main three areas of capitalist development and carnality) was that it sanctioned capitalism, the slave work ethic and industry. It permitted usury, while the rest of Christendom did not (though Luther is an exception in this regard): in other words, Protestantism sanctioned the rise of the middle classes. This is the reason for its existence. It is not a religion: it is an economic doctrine and a demented justification for Puritan genocide in Ireland. Anyone who calls Protestantism “Christian” is a heretic. But it is inseparable from “democracy” like it or not.

[Here's where our hormonal woman starts to curse and swear at me] *You're a pseudo-historian. How much is Fox News giving you?*

It's funny you should mention that. You realize that the very existence of Fox news is a scam. Pat Buchanan frightened the Regime. The System then demanded the “right” be remade, and thus, Fox News was born. Fox then deals solely with killing Arabs and defending Israel. I recently saw a Fox special extolling women involved in the porn industry, as an example of the “free market” and the “American dream.” In other words, after the Buchanan campaigns of 1992 and 1996, the System completely redrew the boundaries of “reasonable” debate. Fox represents the “right” strictly interventionist in foreign policy (to fight Arab terror for Israel), capitalist in economics, and liberal on social policy.

CNN and every other media outlet represent the “left”: interventionist in foreign policy (to fight nationalism), capitalist in economics, and liberal on social policy. These are your options in the arsenal of democracy. Anyone who votes legitimizes this one party rule; anyone who has cable TV legitimizes this rule (and if you have children, you are an abuser as well); anyone who actually partakes in their plastic, stage-managed debates legitimizes this rule. But Americans are masters of self-delusion and the dramatization of self-interest.

[More cursing] *You are a nutty conspiracy theorist. Who is controlling this? No one, that's who!*

I use the term “Regime” as a highly technical one. The Regime refers to the interplay and intermingling of power, both private and “public.” Major sources of social control: corporate America, media, government and academia, all have several interests in common (though hold them for different reasons)—the creation of a New World Order (to use Bush's phrase). This Order is one where the globe is one large plantation of identity-less labor, working for the lowest possible wage (i.e. the prevailing wage once “nations” are eliminated and the entire global population make up one labor pool). Therefore these things need to be eliminated: nationalism, religion (except for Billy Graham Protestantism), family, basic morality, local farming communities, self-sufficient organizations, high educational standards (except in technical fields), in other words, all things that might serve as a springboard for revolt.

Revolt cannot happen without a strong sense of identity from which to fight. No place to stand: no revolt. No revolt can occur without a sense of self different from your rulers. Now—what does this create? It creates a family of interests: the “right” demands a New World Order so as to ensconce capitalism as the “end of history.” Global free trade, by definition, requires the destruction of nationhood. The “left” needs it for it will destroy nationalism and religious fundamentalism. Global groups will then legislate for all peoples according to the demands of

the Regime. And yes, the Regime is demanding “global democracy.” Can you imagine: 5 billion people all voting. How much is one vote worth? Can you see through this? How stupid are you? But whose controlling it. Well, in an age of zombieism, the Regime is “coming out” more and more, knowing full well there will be no “consequences” for their actions (yes, I know the code words). I have made it a mission of this journal to deal not merely with ideas, but, importantly, the financial basis for ideas.

Ideas do not drop from the sky, they are based (to the extent they are mainstream) on economic interests. If one looks into the financial organizations behind the control of media, academia and government, a telling sense of who is casting the shadows on the cave wall is clear. Groups such as the Worldwatch Institute and Greenpeace are funded by the Rockefeller Foundation Open immigration is funded largely by Carnegie, they created the “Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund,” for example. The gay movement is funded largely by Coca-Cola, Time Warner, Viacom and Xerox. The “pride fest” in San Francisco has a list of corporate sponsors as long as your arm. The pro-abortion movement is largely Warren Buffet and George Soros’ thing (though Planned Parenthood was created root and branch by the Rockefeller Foundation). The legalization of grass is completely the creation of Soros (he created NORML, for example). Capitalism has long been cultivating the image of being “conservative.” But capitalism was born in the Enlightenment, and was self-consciously and loudly revolutionary.

The media image is a lie; corporate America is left-radical in its political orientation (with the exception of Big Oil, which is purely neocon)— want proof? Contact the Capitol Research Center— they publish “Patterns of Corporate Philanthropy” (a yearly journal) showing the various left/radical organizations corporate America contributes to, amounting to billions of dollars a month. (Cf. www.capitalresearch.org)

And I just can’t resist: George Soros’ “Democracy Alliance”: To join the Democracy Alliance, there is one requirement: You must be rich. Members, who are called “partners,” pay an initial \$25,000 fee and \$30,000 in yearly dues. They also must pledge to give at least \$200,000 annually to groups that Democracy Alliance endorses. Partners meet two times a year in committees to decide on grants, which focus on four areas: media, ideas, leadership, and civic engagement. Recommendations are then made to the DA board, which passes them on to all DA partners. The Alliance discourages partners from discussing DA affairs with the media and it requires its grant recipients to sign nondisclosure agreements. This is your democracy, like it or not. Now, here’s the list of groups that were either created by Soros, or are funded/controlled by him:

Emily’s List, Sierra Club, America Votes, Center for Community Change, Air America (this is a media outfit that controls comedian Al Franken), USAction, ACORN, Data Warehouse (this is a leftist research firm), NORML, Hilary Clinton for President, MoveOn.org. Who controls this group, other than Soros: well, here’s a partial list: Rob Reiner, Herb Sandler, Davidi Gilo (he’s a billionaire software geek who supports Marxist causes), Ann S. Bowers (Intel), Mark Buell (Espirit), Tim Gill (Inventor of Quark software), Simon Rosenberg, Norman Lear (many don’t know that he financed and controlled the “academic” Jesus Seminar designed to “prove” that Christ was not God), Anne Bartley (Rockefeller in-law, and controls Rockefeller money in America: proving that Soros/Rockefeller work as a team in supporting Marxist causes), Bob Johnson (Soros stooge), Rob Glaser (RealNetworks, they make Real Player), and Albert Yates (former president of Colorado State).

OK, now what does this prove: It proves that the left is a completely corporate affair. It proves

that big money foundations work together. It proves that academia, media/entertainment, capitalism and Soros form a team, which work together to Leninize America. It just so happens that it is also Soros who is spreading the rumors about the Burmese government junta being “brutal.” They are not. Soros has an interest in monopolizing the Asian heroin trade, once he’s secured legal drug use in America. The military government in Burma is the only thing fighting heroin in Asia, as the CIA is neck deep in it. The British government claims that 80% of the heroin that enters the country if from Afghanistan, and is coming from the regions under the control of the “Northern Alliance” who itself was created, armed, and led by the CIA. Does it take a genius?

Of course, Soros was beating the drums against the Taliban, who are not brutal or “evil,” but because these guys won their “drug war” in about 24 hours—they used flame throwers to destroy the poppy fields, and then began to pay farmers to grow actually useful crops. Soros went through the roof—and so the Taliban were transformed from an ally of U.S. oil interests into the face of “e-vill.” (Manic laughter in the background; tympani banging). Funny, even the pop-culture admits that over the last 10 years, heroin, rather than cocaine, has become te drug of choice for the elite. Of course, all of this in the name of democracy and equality. The problem is that this is nothing new; democracy has always been a plaything of this class, and its creation. The broader point is, however, that the Regime is in charge, not parliaments or presidents. The Regime disburses the money that make an idea mainstream, and withholds money that make an idea prevalent on this website. All is private. There is no “public authority;” such a notion is a prejudice of the middle classes.

Let’s look at the Rockefellers. They finance/control the following institutions:

The Trilateral Commission, the Center for Pubic Policy Research, Center for Public Integrity, Worldwatch Institute, UN Foundation, the Civil Society Institute (this is their link to anti-Russian/Putin groups), Greenpeace, The Brookings Institution, The Center for International Environmental Law, the American Jewish Committee (this is their connection with AOL/Time Warner, for the AJC is a Bronfman concern, and they control AOL/Time Warner), Human Rights watch (here’s another link: these are the guys who invented the stories of “Serbian atrocities” in Bosnia), Friends of the Earth, and The Union of Concerned Scientists (these are the guys that invented the “global warming” theory). Now, that was just the Rockefeller Brother Fund.

Now, let’s look at the Rockefeller Foundation. They finance/control the following organizations:

The Center for Science in the Public Interest, Interfaith Worker Justice (do I need to say anything?), the Urban Institute, The Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund, The NAACP (but I thought this was a black organization?), Human Rights Watch, The Brookings Institute, The American Library Association (these guys led the way to rewrite English to be more “inclusive”), Planned Parenthood (abortion is a purely corporate, middle class affair), the ACLU, the AFL-CIO (but I thought this was a workers union?), Amnesty International, Children’s Defense Fund, and the National Council of La Raza (i.e. “the Race”—Rockefeller is supporting Mexican nationalism!!!!).

Let’s go to the Carnegie’s. These are the groups that this family finances/controls:

The National Council of La Raza, Common Cause (but I thought this was Ralph Nader?), The National Association of Secondary School Principals (does this tell you anything?), People for the American Way (link to Normal Lear, the “Jesus Seminar” and entertainments), Earth Day

network (but I thought that all that stuff was just a bunch of hippies?), the NAACP, Human Rights Watch, Rock the Vote (but I thought this was MTV?), The National Association for Bilingual Education, Democracy 21 Legal Education Fund (whatever that is), The American Bar Association, ACLU, and The League of Women Voters.

Let's go to the Ford Foundation. these are the groups that this family finances/controls: The Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council on La Raza, the National Organization for Women (feminism is corporate—deal with it), Interfaith Worker Justice, Alan Guttmacher Institute (this is a front for Planned Parenthood. Abortion is corporate—deal with it), Government Accountability Project (the Fords are into irony), Earth Day Network, the NAACP, Gay, Lesbian and Straight Networks (queerism is corporate—deal with it), the ACLU, Ms Foundation for Women, the AFL-CIO (but I thought this was a LABOR, union!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!), Oxfam, the UN Foundation, The Economic Policy Institute, Rock the Vote, Feminist Majority Foundation (I have now listed all major feminist groups here, this proves that feminism is the creation of corporate America), The National Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty, the American Bar Association, the America Friends Service Committee (the Quakers!!! I knew I'd find a Protestant link in here somewhere), Planned Parenthood of America, Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, New America Foundation, (get this) The Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (now, please, tell me, what is corporate America's interest in financing these guys????!!!!!! It's a pro-porn, pro-abortion, pro homo, pro-“sexual freedom” outfit, see their website at www.siecus.org, but it is not for the weak hearted; these are also the perverts behind sex-ed in schools), Friends of the Earth, The National Humane Society, and Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (irony here too). . .

I can't take anymore. All the above information is taken from official documents published from the above foundations. Nothing here is secret. All can be accessed at www.capitalresearch.org, which maintains a library of elite giving).

What have I proven? I have proven, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that democracy is a fraud and should be abolished. That American politics is controlled by a handful of corporate foundations. That all American political ideas have their root in corporate America. That feminism, Mexican nationalism and racism, abortion, the “civil rights” agenda, environmentalism, and homosexuality are controlled, mobilized and manipulated by corporate America. I have proven that nothing is as it seems, and that America is built on a lie. I dare anyone to debate me on the nature of corporate giving, or on the fact that corporate America is behind the left in its entirety. The debate is over; it is time for action.

[the dopey college girl suddenly drops out of the debate. I have yet to hear from her. What an idiot.]