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An Unfortunate But Necessary Introduction

*To ask questions was surely the main thing.*

-- Franz Kafka, *The Trial*[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) *--*

In the 1835, Alexis de Tocqueville posed this fatal question:

**“Is it possible that, after having destroyed feudalism and defeated kings, democracy will retreat before the bourgeoisie and the rich? Will democracy stop now that it has become so strong and its adversaries so weak?”**[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1)

Today, we have the fatal answer.

Contrary to popular belief around the world, America never had a democracy. Rather, its government was a **политей** or polity, i.e., a hybrid of oligarchy and democracy moderated by a large middle class. A polity tends toward more democracy.

The polity -- the best form of government according to Aristotle -- died in 2008-2009.

R.I.P.?

Billions of freebee dollars handed over to America’s mega-wealthy demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that we now have an oligarchy with democratic accessories -- hat, wallet, gloves.

They say to be forewarned is to be forearmed. Not in this case. Aristotle’s 2,000-year-old warning that a polity is killed by encroachments made by the rich went completely unheeded.

The end of the American polity is why *No, We Can’t.*

Our inability to make necessary changes is singularly revealing…

We cling to values from an America that no longer exists. And the distance between us and the present is about to expand logarithmically. The most significant change in world history is waiting around the corner.

In the meantime, to make it to the end of the day, Americans inhabit an *as-if* world:

You act *as if* a polity, democracy (whatever) were still in place -- *as if* your government represents you and you control what it does. *As-if* the Constitution is enforced. *As if* a caring human community prevails and not an impersonal cash nexus. *As if* life is short, sports are long. *As if* all debts are credits. *As if* socio-economic classes don’t exist. *As if* a sense of responsibility, honesty and fair play will get you somewhere. *As if* things will get better. *As if* somebody up there likes you.

I say you have a case of *as-iffness* -- perhaps terminal -- because when in bed and staring at the ceiling, you know not one of those *as-if* things is real. You also know something is terribly wrong with America, but you don’t know what. Exhausted, you deep-six your *as if* split in a file in the bottom drawer of a cabinet somewhere downstairs -- *brain washing*, turn over, try to sleep.

We do not do so here…

In our post polity world, brain washing has been overtaken, overruled. Events are now more important than people. To the oligarchy that governs America, *orthopraxis* matters more than *orthodoxy*.[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) To wit:

I lived in Russia. Contrary to everything you ever read or heard, the government could have cared less about what went on inside a citizen’s head *as long as* he took out the flag when the fearless leader’s car drove by. Only when the flag stayed in the pocket were there problems.

Welcome to the real Soviet world -- not the one you projected onto them.

The upshot of your paralyzed and paralyzing *as-if,* orthopraxis-ruled world: until the American economy crashes -- and it will -- you will not do what needs to be done. None of the suggestions made here will be seriously discussed, much less implemented.

For the time being, The Third American Revolution is perfectly content to ask questions. To demand explanations. To delay, postpone.

To wait.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1)Franz Kafka, *The Trial*, translated from German by Willa and Edwin Muir, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1948, p. 144.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) (« Pense-t-on qu’après avoir détruit la féodalité et vaincu les rois, la démocratie reculera devant les bourgeois et les riches ? S’arrêtera-t-elle maintenant qu’elle est devenue si forte et ses adversaires si faibles ? ») Alexis de Tocqueville, De La Démocratie en Amérique I, in Œuvres, Volume II, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1992, pp. 6, 7. (« Introduction »).

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1)

***“The goal of modern propaganda is not to modify thoughts but to incite an action*. This must be accomplished with the maximum of efficiency and economy...**

**In order for propaganda to be effective, it must create a short-circuit disconnecting thought and decision. Propaganda’s intervention thus is designed to take place on an unconscious level.**

**If the classic vision, today outdated, of propaganda was to define it as the adhesion of a person to an *orthodoxy*, modern propaganda seeks to obtain an *orthopraxy*, an action that in itself, and not because of the value judgments of the actor, carries the actor to the goal that the actor does not think about, that is not for him a conscious and voluntary goal, but is indeed one for the propaganda administrator. It is he who knows what objective is targeted…We live in a time when, in an involuntary and systematic manner, action and thought are divided.”**

[*Le but de la propagande moderne n’est plus de modifier des idées, mais de provoquer une action*. [...] Il faut l’obtenir avec le maximum d’efficacité et le maximum d’économie. [...]

Pour que la propagande ait son efficacité, elle doit sans cesse [...] procéder à un court-circuit de la pensée et de la décision. L’intervention de la propagande devra donc se situer au niveau de l’inconscient. [...]

[S]i la vision classique, dépassée, de la propagande, consiste à la définir comme une adhésion de l’homme à une *orthodoxie*, la propagande moderne, véritable, cherche au contraire à obtenir une *orthopraxie*, une action qui en soi-même, et non pas à cause de jugements de valeur de la personne qui agit, porte l’exactitude et la justesse par rapport à telle fin que ne se propose pas l’individu, qui n’est pas pour lui un objectif conscient et volontaire à atteindre, mais qui est considéré par l’opérateur de la propagande. C’est lui qui sait quel objectif doit être visé [...], et c’est lui qui manœuvre l’instrument qui obtiendra de l’homme cette action juste. [...] Nous vivons dans un temps où, de façon à la fois involontaire et systématique, action et pensée sont divisées.]

Jacques Ellul, *Propagandes*, Économica, Paris, 1990, pp. 36, 37, 38, 39.

CHAPTER 1. The “Despotism of An Oligarchy.”

 *I think that nations, like men,*

 *almost always show,*

 *from a very young age,*

 *the traits of their destiny.*

-- Alexis de Tocqueville[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) --

**“Want to see your name in Newsweek? Time?”**

I put that question to the news director of a big city TV station for which I was conducting public opinion polls.

**“How about the New York Times, Los Angeles Times and Washington Post? While we’re at it: ABC, NBC, CBS, CNN? Did I leave out a rash of radio stations? They will be talking about you. All of them.”**

The director gave me a nonplused look. I dislike the word nonplused; however, like 7-UP The *Uncola*, it covers the case at hand.

He chain-lit another *ciggy-boo*:

**“Well, Thomas, you know that we in the media work every day with famous people, interviews and so forth, so the fame game is personally of no interest to me. Frankly, I could care less. All that really matters in life is providing for one’s family, doing a good job, helping the community and having the personal satisfaction that goes with it; tell me more.”**

Presidential election campaigns were cranking up. Our first survey was a week away. I looked the news director in his martini-colored eye:

**“All you have to do** **is let me include the following question** i**n the poll**:

**‘Do you think Supreme Court Judges should be:**

**1. Appointed for life assuming good behavior, as is presently the case?**

**2. Appointed for a term, say 14 years, as are Federal Reserve Board members? Or**

**3. Elected?’”**

The idea was to start a national dialogue. Let candidates take positions. Let editorialists editorialize. Let parents, professors and guys at water coolers pontificate. Let university grants be granted.

The news director was taken back.

“**Ah … humph … I gotta take it upstairs.”**

To my knowledge, the Supreme Court Judge question has never been asked. I think I know the answer. So did somebody upstairs. Which is why I wasn’t allowed to ask it.

No national dialogue then or now. Why?

The answer is as suppressed as it is incorrigible. In America we no longer have a polity --the democracy/oligarchy hybrid built by our Founding Fathers -- much less a democracy. In 2008-2009, the Second American Revolution occurred. Billions of public dollars replaced the polity with an oligarchy.

If you want to revive the polity, you must revive its democratic component. To revive its democratic component, you must weaken the oligarchy; such is the correlation of forces. Any Third American Revolution that does not realize that weakening is a revolution born in a coffin.

To weaken the oligarchy, you must start at its head. Which poses a problem:

Where is the head?

The White House? Congress? The Pentagon? Washington lobbyists? Hollywood? Bill Gates’ place? Wall Street? Wal-Mart? The C.I.A.? George Soros’ limo? All of the above?

None of the above.

Thomas Jefferson found the head: the Supreme Court.

In a letter which no doubt has made many a Supreme Court Judge feel his breakfast start to warm, Jefferson declared:

**“You seem to consider the Judges the ultimate arbiters of all Constitutional questions; a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy … The Constitution has erected no such tribunal …”**[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1)

Jefferson was referring to the Supreme Court case, Marbury v. Madison (1803), in which the Court cavalierly assigned itself the power to decide if laws are constitutional. Cavalierly, because the Constitution, as Jefferson observed, gave the Court no such power.

Here’s what the Constitution (Article III, Section 1) says:

**“The judicial Power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their offices during good Behaviour…”**

The one and only limit, good behavior, is supposed to insulate the Court from dirty, terrible, nasty, corrupt, evil, mean, deplorable, despicable, awful politics. Well…

(i) As everybody knows, Supreme Court judges are nominated by the president and approved by the senate. Translation into English: selection of judges by *elected officials* = political appointees.

(ii) *DURING good behaviour*. You read it right. The one and only limit means there are no limits. Lifetime jobs, then.

In case you doubt the lifetime status, only one Supreme Court Judge, Samuel Chase, has ever been impeached. The Senate acquitted him, and he stayed on the job until his death in 1811.

As for those inferior Courts, did the Constitution name them only too well? Fewer than 10 federal judges in over 200 years have been kicked out. Talk about to good to be true...

Political appointees on the federal payroll whom you can’t get rid of: there you have it. It should come as no surprise that all too many Supreme Court decisions resemble something the cat dragged in. You disagree? You think the Supreme Court represents you, the people? Read [Robert Dahl’s](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_A._Dahl) masterpiece, A Preface to Democratic Theory. It was written in 1956, when the polity still existed and you could say such things and keep your job. Better hurry -- before the book, like democracy, goes out of print.

Besides Dahl, I have the highest regard for [George Gallup](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Gallup) (1901-1984), founder of Gallup polls and author of a must-read book on survey research, The Sophisticated Poll Watcher’s Guide. In keeping with that respect, I call upon The Gallup Organization to continue their founder’s pioneering tradition. Go ahead, break the taboo -- pose the Supreme Court question I was forbidden to ask. Gallup, you can do it. The question is, will you?

On second thought, no, you cannot. Or if you ask it, you cannot release the results. Orchestrated threats in an avalanche of emails from a Twitter flash crowd; offhand remarks and helpful hints in notes passed under the table; your secretary’s stack of telephone messages with “concerned” inquiries from shareholders, subscribers, clients, friends, friends of friends...

Forget it, Gallup. Sorry I asked.

The Supreme Court’s unconstitutional power to decide if laws are constitutional has lived down to Jefferson’s expectations. We saw their unabashed, unabridged interference in the executive branch when the judges handed the presidency to George W. Bush Jr. For a new, more accurate twist on the fishy 2000 Florida vote, see Appendix 1.

The Supreme Court’s despotism also extends over the legislative branch. For an example of barefaced meddling, see the Court’s reapportionment decisions. P.S. Don’t omit cases which the Court refused to hear. We will present one in Chapters 7 and 8, which had dire consequences for democracy.

The Third American Revolution sums up this way the Supreme Court’s power grab: never before in the field of human endeavor have so few, done so little, for so much consequence.

In denouncing the Supreme Court’s action, Jefferson was the exception, not the rule. *All quiet on the Western Front.* The Eastern Front, too. Particularly disturbing in all this is the impotent silent acceptance of what went down. That silence -- the American *omerta* -- appeared early in the nation’s history; it is a fatal flaw. We will return to this subject.

Laws can and should be reviewed for their constitutionality. There is a logical, commonsense alternative to the despotism of the Supreme Court: a review commission consisting of members from all three branches, including the Supreme Court. Perhaps, one or more members should be elected directly by the people.

To repeat, without changes in the Supreme Court, any change made in the name of enhancing democracy and resurrecting the polity is at best a waste of time, at worse a case of the sham rights and illusory benefits Aristotle warned about. More on that in Chapter 6.

Why is The Third American Revolution so insistent about dethroning the Supreme Court?

Once more, Jefferson gave the answer.

Dreading the consolidation of the Court’s power as the ultimate arbitrator of constitutionality, he presaged in another breakfast-warmer letter:

 **“The Constitution [would be] a mere thing of wax in the hands of the judiciary which they may twist and shape into any form they please.”**[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2)

A House of Wax it has been for 200 years. That wax constitution is why nothing said here about the Supreme Court will perturb American oligarchs. Princes and princesses will sleep peacefully in their East Hampton palaces.

To those who are tempted to run out and try to establish a commission to determine the constitutionality of laws, as well as to change how Supreme Court Judges are selected, how long they serve, etc.: before taking action, I strongly advise you to consider what type of political system America *really* has.

I also advise you to contemplate the immortal words of [Johnny Cash](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_DLF7quqbCs):

Dream on,

dream on,

teenage queen;

prettiest girl

we’ve ever seen.

Dream on, then. And while you’re at it, R.I.P.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) « Je pense que les nations, comme les hommes, indiquent presque toujours, dès leur jeune âge, les principaux traits de leur destinée. » Alexis de Tocqueville, *De La Démocratie en Amérique I*, op.cit., p. 474. (II, X).

One can agree with Tocqueville while recognizing that, for both men and nations, there is more than one destiny.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) Letter to M. Jarvis, September 1820.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2)Letter to Judge Spencer Roane, November, 1819.

CHAPTER 2. The Remedy

 ***When the War of Independence ended,***

 ***America found itself divided between two opinions.***

 ***These opinions are as old as the world itself,***

 ***and one finds them assuming different forms***

 ***and called by diverse names in all free societies.***

 ***One opinion wants to restrain***

 ***the power of the people,***

 ***the other wants to extend it indefinitely****.*

-- Alexis de Tocqueville[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2)--

What is the deepest, darkest secret in America?

The [assassination of President Kennedy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assassination_of_John_F._Kennedy)?

[Polls show](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assassination_of_John_F._Kennedy) most Americans don’t believe the Warren Commission’s conclusion that [Lee Harvey Oswald](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lee_Harvey_Oswald) acted alone. Count me among the majority -- forever.

I was an expert marksman twice, with an air rifle and a 22. An air rifle is more difficult; you have to compensate for the wind.

I scored a bunch of 50s in my day; no “cheater” needed on the targets. Translation for non-gun readers: I could put five bullets in your eyeball before you knew I was in town.

A buddy once took me dove hunting with a shotgun. Never again. Shotguns are for sissies. All those pellets; the poor bird doesn’t have a chance. Where’s the “sport” in that? In addition, if you eat the bird for dinner, you risk a trip to the dentist. Finally, a shotgun makes a lot of noise, disturbs the neighbors. Solution?

I used to hunt quail with an air rifle. Never a nasty pellet in the meat to break your teeth; never an enraged neighbor. You, too, can perform the same feat. All you have to do is aim and time the movements of the bird’s head. Breathe out slowly. Squeeze -- don’t pull -- the trigger. Don’t blink. Even a child can do it.

In contests I was, like Marciano, undefeated. F.B.I. and C.I.A. agents, go to the N.R.A. headquarters: it’s all there. At 15, I was a better shot than you’ll ever be.

I did a lot with guns. One thing I could not do, however, is take Lee Harvey Oswald’s crap mail-order, $19.95 (plus postage and handling), 1940 Italian 6.5mm [Carcano](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_F._Kennedy_assassination_rifle)rifle and do what The Warren Commission claimed he did.

I watched on TV a re-creation of what Oswald saw through the scope. No way.

Both “backyard photos” taken by his wife show Oswald didn’t know how to hold a gun. What makes you think he knew how to shoot one? As a Marine, he barely scored a lowly “marksman.” I can take a kid off the street and in three weeks have him do better.

Get Real. Oswald couldn’t even shoot himself in the foot. He shot himself in the elbow, and was court-martialed.

Get serious. Oswald could not have killed Kennedy.

If he didn’t, who did?

A shooter on the grassy knoll? Maybe. Somebody in a position to know told a friend about a man with a rifle running along railroad tracks. The police chased him; he got away.

Here’s what I think went down:

Another shooter was in the room with Oswald. The second gunman was the Real Deal. His Carcano rifle -- if that is what he used[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) -- had been refurbished, the scope replaced or honed in, the bullets reloaded to make sure they would fire (otherwise, a noteworthy achievement).

End product: a perfect scam. Any and all ballistic studies would show that the bullets came from the top floor of the Texas School Book Depository Building where Oswald, wannabe communist and perfect arrogant stooge, was working.

Real Deal did the real deal, then vanished forever.

If that is what happened, Oswald, who claimed he was innocent, told the truth. Well, sort of. Ballistic tests would show a bullet or two came from his rifle. Moreover, to be a credible suspect, he had to have gunpowder burns. His rifle, his bullets, powder burns: Ferchristsakewhatnhellmoreduhyawant?

It may be easier to find Real Deal than you think.

He was a much better rifleman than me. And that’s the point. Where did he learn to shoot like that? I can assure you of something: like the ladies of the night, he didn’t learn it at home.

If I were working for the F.B.I., the second thing I would do is get a list of all the N.R.A. expert and distinguished riflemen alive at the time. That group is small. Somewhere, Real Deal left a paper trail; don’t be surprised if there is a newspaper photo of him as a kid with a medal, the proud winner of a local N.R.A. contest. I say kid because to achieve the level he did, Real Deal had to put in many years of target practice, yet still be young enough in 1963 to run out the building before the cops closed it off.

How many years of riding the rifle range? I estimate Real Deal put in at least a decade of target practice -- about the same time it takes a novice piano player to learn Gershwin’s “Rhapsody in Blue.” You might want to look at the sheet music sometime, and wonder.

I said examining the N.R.A. list and contest winners was the second thing I’d do. The first: go to the mail order house and get a list of everybody who bought a Carcano. F.B.I., did you get that list? If not, was it because you were afraid of tipping your hand, of showing by your inquiry that you suspected a second rifle was involved?

While we’re at it, F.B.I., was Real Deal the man on the railroad tracks?

Real Deal, if you’re reading these words:

The way I figure it, you’re 76 years old. Ever think of learning “Rhapsody in Blue”? You can afford a piano. You’ll need lessons. All those little black notes -- a piece of cake for a disciplined guy like you. There’s still time. And, Real Deal, you’ve got a lot of time on your hands. Among other things.

Real Deal, you aren’t the first person to believe that because you got away with something for half a century, you would do so forever.

What saved you wasn’t the C.I.A. or F.B.I. which, according to conspiracy theorists, employed you. I doubt either agency knows who you are, much less used your services. For why a conspiracy of more than a few people is likely to be discovered, read Machiavelli, The Prince And The Discourses. For why it is unlikely the C.I.A. or F.B.I. are exceptions to Machiavelli’s rule, search Google: “Exploding cigar, CIA, Fidel Castro.” (Don`t skip [The Guardian](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/aug/03/cuba.duncancampbell2) article.) While you are at it, check out recent bungled coup attempts in Venezuela and Ecuador. Both were so full of holes a typical teenager could play them like a flute.

Dear Reader, you smell something rotten in Dallas. So do I. I suspect that, like most magic tricks, the solution to the JFK assassination cover-up is so simple, it’s overlooked:

American government officials could not -- cannot to this day -- tell the world that President John Kennedy’s assassin got away, that they have no idea who he is. An unface and noninformation would forever contaminate the F.B.I.’s 10 most wanted list.

Did the inability to tell the truth about the assassination generate behavior and attitudes -- lies, fears, contempt, apathy -- that were the beginning of the end of the American polity?

I suspect the interplay is more complex. What happened in Dallas at 12:30 Central Standard Time on November 22, 1963, was a constellation as well as a creation of events and values.

One thing is certain:

The end product protects Real Deal. Can you imagine the political fallout if, after all these years and all those official investigations and denials, the F.B.I. announced tomorrow they arrested the…

Real Deal is too big to fail. He is number one on the Ten Most Unwanted List.

We come to the punch line:

The Kennedy assassination is not the darkest secret in America.

The reason is, you know about it. You couldn’t have escaped all those TV programs even if you wanted to. Same goes for the newspaper and magazine articles that won’t go away. Chances are you may have read Mark Lane’s book, *Rush to Judgment*, or seen [Oliver Stone’s](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/JFK_%28film%29) movie, “JFK.”

No, Dear Reader, there is another secret which is much darker, a lot deeper.

Unlike the JFK assassination, 99% of Americans don’t know it happened. Even more astounding: millions of people outside the U.S. not only know about it, they participated in it.

\* \* \*

January 8, 1961. If you look on the Internet, you’ll see that on that day The Bollinger Prize for poetry was awarded to Yvor Winters.

Anything else?

No light turned on? No bell sounded?

Of course not.

The war in Algeria for independence from France had raged for seven years. Thousands of dead and wounded. Till-death-do-us-part hatred. Dante inferno prisons, butchery, torture, treachery, murder -- you name it, it was happening.

The war was threatening to drag on … and on …

On the day you never heard of, French President [Charles de Gaulle](http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/gaulle_charles_de.shtml) held a national referendum. He asked, do you want an end to the war and independence for Algeria?

In metropolitan France, 75% voted yes. The turnout was 92%.

De Gaulle’s government started negotiations with representatives of the FLN, Algeria’s independence movement. On March 19, 1962, a settlement was reached. On July 3, President de Gaulle declared Algeria to be an independent nation.

A national referendum on a war? Let people -- many of whom would fight, kill, die, be mutilated -- set national policy?

The equivalent in the U.S. would have been letting Americans vote on the Viet Nam war. Today, it would be holding a referendum on the war in Afghanistan.

You want to know why, Dear Reader, you didn’t know about the French referendum? It is because de Gaulle set an example -- and examples are contagious.

Leadership is why people still talk about Charles de Gaulle. Lyndon Johnson? Who he? In the past 20 years, I heard his name mentioned once, when Ladybird died.

France, Switzerland, Ecuador: numerous nations have national referenda. The United States is not among them. The closest thing we have to something expressing the national will of the people on specific questions is the Constitutional amendment process. Unfortunately, as a vehicle for conveying public opinion, history shows that process is ungainly, inadequate.

Chapter 1 noted that **the American** polity**, i.e., a hybrid of oligarchy and democracy moderated by a large middle class -- the** best **form of government according to Aristotle -- died in 2008-2009:**

**“If you want to revive the polity, you must revive its democratic component. To revive its democratic component, you must weaken the oligarchy; such is the correlation of forces. Any Third American Revolution that does not realize that weakening is a revolution born in a coffin.”**

Chapter 1 discussed how to weaken the oligarchy. This chapter addresses how to revive the polity’s democratic component.

That revival requires a Constitutional amendment providing for referenda. No national referenda, no democracy. No democracy, no polity. It’s that simple.

The amendment is no final remedy. Referenda are a necessary but insufficient condition for democracy. We will explore other conditions in future chapters.

The oligarchy trembles, foams at the mouth, pounds on the desk at the mere suggestion of letting you, *the* *great unwashed*, *the* *little people*, have a direct say in their nation’s destiny. That is why so many readers learned about the Algeria referendum for the first time here, two minutes ago, 50 years after it took place.

Understandably, many readers will worry about the people deciding national policy. Your concern is as just as it is old.

Let’s look again at Alexis de Tocqueville’s words at the head of this chapter:

**“When the War of Independence ended, America found itself divided between two opinions. These opinions are as old as the world itself, and one finds them assuming different forms and called by diverse names in all free societies. One opinion wants to restrain the power of the people, the other wants to extend it indefinitely**.**”**

The Third American Revolution has neither of the opinions Tocqueville mentioned.

There is a third. It answers the question of expanding the power of the people this way: yes, but. *Yes*, an expansion, *but* not indefinitely.

France, Switzerland, Ecuador: I lived in them. I listened to countless discussions about their referenda. Some initial concerns:

(i) The threshold for allowing measures on the ballot must be high enough to stop frivolous proposals from cluttering up and undercutting the process. (The Swiss complain they have too many questions to decide).

(ii) The president and Congress should have the power to initiate referenda. So, too, should the people. The requirement of a high but reasonable number of signatures from registered voters in all 50 states is probative.

(iii) A time limit, perhaps one year, should be stipulated to allow for sufficient public dialogue, as well as to establish the constitutionality of the substance and wording of proposed measures. *No federal court can be trusted to make that constitutionality decision*. For the creation of a commission to determine constitutionality, see Chapter 1.

(iv) Any measure rejected by the voters should have to wait a specified time before being reintroduced.

(v) Make referenda legally binding. That slams the stoppers on politicos who would disregard or toss out a successful result they don’t like.

Other issues must be addressed. Before pursuing the amendment, a study should be conducted of referenda in other nations as well as in American states that already have them, e.g., Oregon and California.

What it comes down to:

Want to vote on the war in Afghanistan? I do. I’ll bet most Americans want to. So, let’s do it.

You aren’t so sure about what Americans want? To clear up any lingering doubt, I challenge [Gallup](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gallup_Organization) and other pollsters to ask about a national referenda amendment. The presidential election has started; now is the perfect time to raise the issue.

Vote on Afghanistan, on Iraq, on Viet Nam, on … Sounds too good to be true?

Reality Therapy Time. No, we can’t create a national referendum process, any more than pollsters can seriously ask about it. The truth is we no longer live in a polity, much less a democracy. America’s system is now an oligarchy with democratic trimmings, paraphernalia.

It’s easy to prove me wrong. In fact, there’s nothing I would like better. All you have to do is start a *serious* movement to adopt the referenda amendment. Where is it? Or create a commission to decide the constitutionality of laws. Where is it? Like the war in Algeria, the list goes on … and on …

There is nothing new whatsoever in any of the principles and practices advocated here. Alexis de Tocqueville summarized them in a little-known note:

 **“The remedy is above all else, outside constitutions. In order for democracy to govern, there must be *citizens*, i.e., people who are interested in public affairs, who have the capacity and the desire to participate in them. One must always return to this fundamental point.”**[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

The remedy. An increase in the (i) capacity and (ii) desire to participate on the part of the populace: may any political candidate or party, government agency or employee, any policy, law or regulation be judged accordingly.

You just saw the heart of The Third American Revolution.

A closing note to Doubting Thomases:

You believe the American people are irresponsible. You know something? I completely agree with you. It is easier to despair, however, than to answer. And there is an answer. It is seldom used because it is effective.

To make people become responsible, give them responsibilities. In this case, make them citizens fully, truly -- finally.

It is often said there are no rights without obligations. That expression is correct, but needs precision. The Third American Revolution -- and it alone -- makes it: *obligation = right; right = obligation*. No *sham* rights there; Chapter 14 will explore the connection between real rights and real power.

In the meantime…

You want to change the face of America? Really? All you have to do is couple the increased right to vote on specific issues with obligatory public service for one year by everyone aged 18-21. Having made an investment of time and energy in the nation, future generations will respect and protect it. As for how to pay for the program, it is the alternative to throwing away billions on the oligarchy.

Beware: obligatory public service is what it is -- *obligatory* -- not something else. Everybodymust participate. Physical and mental capabilities must be considered. However, after witnessing how corrupt the draft system was in the 1960s, I would say that, within broad classifications, assignments ultimately must be made by a true random draw. That means instead of being “assigned” as phony “aides” to Dad or the Cannes Film Festival, the Obama girls could end up emptying bedpans in a veteran’s home in Bismarck, North Dakota.

A closing note to the American oligarchy:

Vexed, panicked by possible contagion, you tried to suppress knowledge by the American public of the Algerian referendum. You succeeded for over 50 years. You were hoping to continue that suppression indefinitely.

You failed.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) (« Lorsque la guerre de l’Indépendance [en Amérique] eut pris fin […], la nation se trouva divisée entre deux opinions. Ces opinions étaient aussi anciennes que le monde, et on les retrouve sous différentes formes et revêtues de noms divers dans toutes les sociétés libres. L’une voulait restreindre le pouvoir populaire, l’autre l’étendre indéfiniment.») Alexis de Tocqueville, De La Démocratie en Amérique I, in Œuvres, Volume II, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1992, p. 196. (II, II).

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) The Carcano isn’t the only rifle which can fire 6.5x52 bullets: <http://www.calguns.net/calgunforum/archive/index.php/t-176238.html> and <http://www.carbinesforcollectors.com/greekrifles1.html>. Another option: go to the nearest Vo-Tech school, take Machine Shop 101 and make a gun barrel yourself. I took that class and later worked as a tool-and-die maker.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3) (« Le remède est surtout en dehors des constitutions. Pour que la démocratie puisse gouverner il faut des citoyens, des gens qui prennent intérêt à la chose publique, aient la capacité de s’en mêler et le veuillent. Point capital auquel il faut toujours revenir. ») Alexis de Tocqueville, Notes et variantes, in Œuvres, Volume II, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1992, op.cit., p. 1,019.

There is nothing idealistic, much less utopian, about Tocqueville’s remedy. All of France had a glimpse of what could be during the months preceding the [national vote on the proposed constitution](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4592243.stm) for the European Community. Several books debating the subject made the best-seller list. Almost daily, I witnessed a continuing, exciting dialogue.

Until the resurrection of the polity, America will not have a comparable experience.

CHAPTER3. Here´s Your Bonus

*He who has the money is always the master of the other.*

-- Montesquieu[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) --

In the United States, we do not have a democracy. We never did; we never will.

Preposterous? Indeed, the conclusion you just read is contrary to everything anybody has ever said.

Well, almost anybody...

Aristotle got there first, 2,000 years ago. If he were alive today, he would say America had, until recently, a **политей** or polity, i.e., an oligarchy/democracy hybrid moderated by a large middle class.

Aristotle was not alone.

Although they never called it by its real name, the American Founding Fathers were fully aware the system they were building was a polity. Chapter 9 will present evidence.

Aristotle thought the polity was the best type of government. Among other things, it allowed the rich and the poor to peacefully coexist:

“**There is no risk, in such a case, of the rich uniting with the poor to oppose the middle class: neither will ever be willing to be the subject to the other; and if they try to find a constitution which is more in their common interest than the ‘polity’ is, they will fail to find one.”**[**[ii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2)

Where is a polity headed?

Aristotle: a polity “is incline[d] more toward democracy.”[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

Democracy, in other words, is a direction, not a place. ***A*** north does not exist; you will never get there. All you can do is move closer or farther away.

The American polity perished in 2008-2009. It was swept out by the tsunami of billions of public dollars to the archi-rich. That Second American Revolution was a revolution in the true sense of the term, i.e., a change *of*, not *in*, political systems.

That moment was a decisive turning point in American history. We no longer have a polity *inclined more toward democracy*. Today, our political system is an oligarchy with democratic residues, overtures and leitmotifs.

It was an amazing achievement that the American polity lasted for over 200 years. Amazing, because any coalition of oligarchy/democracy is inherently delicate, strained.

The polity’s Achilles heel: the equal partners are not equal. Montesquieu:

**“It is impossible for wealth not to give power.”**[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn4)

Wealth it is, then, that menaces and eventually destroys a polity. Aristotle on oligarchs in a polity:

**“[Forgetting the claims of equity], they not only give more power to the well-to-do, but they also deceive the people [by fobbing them off with sham rights]. Illusory benefits must always produce real evils in the long run; and the encroachments made by the rich [under cover of such devices] are more destructive to a constitution than those of the people.”**[**[v]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn5)

Chapter 1 advanced this basic strategy for The Third American Revolution:

**“If you want to revive the polity, you must revive its democratic component. To revive its democratic component, you must weaken the oligarchy; such is the correlation of forces. Any Third American Revolution that does not realize that weakening is a revolution born in a coffin.”**

How, then, is an oligarchy weakened?

History records numerous efforts to destroy oligarchies by killing and imprisoning the rich or seizing their money. History also records the outcome. In the words of Shakespeare,

**“It cannot hold. It will not.”**[**[vi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn6)

The resounding crash of so-called “revolutionary” “communist” governments in Eastern Europe is only the latest example.

Collapse was inevitable because, in every single case, *how economic value was created*[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn7) went untouched. Thus, an oligarchy reappeared which was more violent and puerile than the one it replaced. Such is the normal and eventual outcome of anything that is repressed.

(A parenthetical note: you see why, unlike the oligarchy and middle class “revolutionary” “communist” rebels, The Third American Revolution is against repression. On top of everything else, repression doesn’t work.)

There is a second reason why kill-the-rich schemes are doomed.

Innovative, productive entrepreneurs [[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn8) play a cardinal role in economic development. That fact has been recognized by economists as diverse as Karl Marx (unlike his sleepwalking disciples) and Joseph Schumpeter (Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy).

The Third American Revolution wishes productive entrepreneurs well. Its goal is not to destroy the oligarchy. Successful entrepreneurs are oligarchs. Rather, the objective is to reduce the political impact of money. Not eliminate it -- which, as Montesquieu observed, is impossible -- reduce it.

No reform can achieve that reduction. The Third American Revolution does not focus on reform. Rather, it seeks authentic revolutionary changes, viz., *of*, not *in*, systems.

To accomplish that goal, The Third American Revolution begins at the beginning …

The political impact of money has its corner stone in political campaign contributions. Once set, the rest of the building follows.

The Third American Revolution does what no reform attempts, much less achieves: dig up the corner stone.

To politically weaken the oligarchy = reduce the political impact of money. To reduce the political impact of money = revolutionize the budgets of political campaigns.

On a practical level, reining in the power of money in campaigns is much easier than you think. It is also -- now that the polity is gone -- a lot harder than you imagine.

I want to caution you, Dear Reader, The Third American Revolution is about to present a solution that will never be implemented in oligarchic America.

\* \* \*

Here’s your bonus.

Every year at Christmas time in corporate boardrooms across America, the same scene is acted out. Company presidents assemble their top executives, and joyfully pass out checks in sealed envelopes.

The executives smile inwardly. There it is! They start dreaming about a family vacation to Europe, a new BMW, a sailboat.

The presidents glance over their shoulders. Yes, the door is closed.

Oh, by the way. We have this little project in mind, Build A Better America. Sure hope you’ll help out. Nothing, absolutely nothing, mandatory, you understand.

The executives look longingly at the envelopes. Wonder is the beginning of philosophy, Socrates said. Here, wonder is the last gasp of self-esteem.

With an invisible sigh, the executives pass back the envelopes.

Now it’s the company presidents’ turn to smile inwardly.

That is how some political action committees (PACs) raise money to contribute to political campaigns. No wonder PACs are often singled out as THEcorrupting force in American politics.

In reality, not all PACs are alike. Many education PACs, for example, collect money from members in small, honest, freely-given donations. Such PACs truly have money from -- as politicos off camera call them -- *the little people*.

The little people on the one hand, the PACs on the other: do you see why that is a false dichotomy? If so, getting rid of PACs is not the answer.

Political candidates loudly proclaim and defame to the stars above that their campaigns are supported by thousands of small individual contributors, as opposed to dirty, terrible, nasty, corrupt, evil, mean, deplorable, despicable, awful PACs.

Watch out! If you get the chance, corner such candidates and ask them two questions:

1. You are implying your campaign is being paid for entirely by thousands of small contributors -- “the people.” Are you denying that you took any money whatsoever from PACs?

2. Assuming you took some PAC money, tell us what proportion of your total contributions came from PACs*.*

Watch the candidate’s feet; you’ll see The Redneck Shuffle. When they respond, “Gosh, let me get back to you on that,” smile and tell him: “Gosh, that is exactly what somebody said you would say.”

Politicians lie because they are aware of the appalling reputation of PACs. No wonder lobbyists and politicos love to talk about outlawing PACs, putting a lid on the amount of self-funding by rich candidates, etc. To make a long story short, they want you to believe that campaign financing can be cleaned up by limiting contributions. Limits will, they insinuate, take the politics out of politics.

I’ll tell you here and now what every politician knows. Limits don’t work. Anybody who wants to drop a lot of cash on a candidate will find a way.

In fact, much of the corrupting activity the politicos and lobbyists love to moan about was generated by the very limits they claim are so wonderful. *PACs are a perfect example*. They were originally created to get around the legal $1,000 limit on personal individual contributions.

One illustration of why limits don’t work:

As far as I know, every state has limits, often $50, on the amount of money that can be contributed anonymously. I recall going to a neighborhood party for a candidate. Everybody and his dog showed up. Lobbyists, too, were there in force -- they were the wall-leaners with the suits on and power red ties, nodding and eating, and of course drinking.

In the middle of the living room was a huge fish bowl into which the neighbors were cordially invited to drop money. I saw numerous $100-dollar bills. Go figure. The public, official, legal campaign report showed only the aggregate total amount: “Neighborhood event: $10,000” (or whatever).

Here’s a second, completely legal trick: The Speaker’s Fund. The Speaker is the leader of any house of representatives. You give money to the Speaker; he says thank you, and gives the money to candidates he likes. None of the legal reporting requirements for PACs apply; your name, I promise you, will not appear on any list. Why?

This gimmick is simplicity itself. The Speaker isn’t a PAC -- he’s a guy. You gave money to a guy, that’s all. No law against that.

The land of campaign contributions is paved with double and triple-bottomed boxes. They are how trainloads of non-corrupt people end up promoting corruption.

A real life example:

While working for a house of representatives, I saw a bill that would have required all contributions made in an election year, no matter the amount, be reported down to the penny, including the name and phone number and address and occupation of the individual contributor (even if a PAC was involved), the contributor’s employer (if any), the date the contribution was made, whether the contribution was a check or cash or in-kind (such as free use of a car).

Sounds great, doesn’t it? I’ll bet if you were a legislator, you’d vote for it -- indeed, proudly co-sponsor it and brag about it in your campaign literature.

Congratulations! If the bill just outlined became law, you would have created a monster -- mayhem in which oligarchs would run amuck. What the proposed law stipulated was that all contributions made in NON election years would NOT have to be reported. You don’t think so? Read it again. Did a light go on? Do you see how your pure, just and true intentions were waylaid to create the very thing you want to get rid of?

I thought about writing a book, maybe two, about campaign money scams I’ve seen. No need to do it now that you get the idea: campaign reform laws are written to be evaded. As any insider in the campaign world knows, reforms create weasel holes faster than they plug them up. That is why the oligarchy, politicos and lobbyists love reforms.

You’ll be seeing a lot of reform proposals this year, as presidential contenders hit the campaign trail. You might want to follow Socrates, and wonder about them.

The Third American Revolution insists that all campaign donations be reported in full before -- not after -- elections. Other than that, reform blah-blah dances around the real issue: the ridiculously high price of campaigns. That high cost is how the oligarchy gets its foot in the door.

How high is high? In 2004 the total cost of the Bush/Kerry presidential general election campaign was $654 million. Four years later, the Obama/McCain campaign cost $859 million. That’s a 31% increase. I won’t go into campaigns for thousands of elected offices all over America.

When an oligarchy rules, not only does money talk, it has something to say: Me First. The exponential rise in the money thrown at office seekers is proving in millions of ways that a new political system is in place.

The basic cause of silly and soaring campaign costs is media advertizing. Ask Obama and McCain what percentage of their campaign budgets went to TV stations. Be sure you’re sitting down when they answer, because your brain is going to wobble.

The solution is simple.

As part of their public programming responsibility to acquire and maintain Federal Communications Commission licenses, the media should be required to broadcast campaign ads at no cost.

The time of day candidates’ ads are shown would be set by a rotation.

You’ve never seen that idea before. Such is the silence -- the omerta -- censuring this subject. The hush of money shows the incredible power that media owners have.

A lot more power than any political action committee.

There are of course other improvements. France sets aside a block of time, usually early in the evening, in which political ads run back to back. The show runs for 20 minutes or so, then regular programming resumes. I witnessed that procedure over many elections. Works fine.

Some readers no doubt believe it is the courageous, freedom fighter media versus the evil, corrupt oligarchy.[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn10) *On the one hand, on the other*. I hate to tell you, but your belief is a classic false dichotomy. Media magnates are just as much oligarchs as any Wall Street hedge fund mogul or computer tycoon.

Now you know why the soaring cost of campaigns is the oligarchy’s favorite game: heads we win; tails you lose. Given that reality, the revolutionary change proposed here for free broadcast time cannot and will not be implemented.

Free airtime is essential, but not sufficient. Montesquieu was right: money – hence, any oligarchy -- will always be influential. The Third American Revolution is a revival of democracy to the extent that he who has the money is not the *master* *of the other*. That condition, which would be new in world history, is a defining characteristic of The Third American Revolution.

You just saw another reason why it is designated a *Revolution*

Why is free advertizing not sufficient to solve the problem?

In the end, there is no end. Achieving a new, better oligarchy/democracy equilibrium is a task comparable to doing the dishes:

It never gets *done*.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) (« celui qui a l’argent est toujours le maître de l’autre […]. ») Charles de Montesquieu, De L’Esprit des lois, Œuvres complètes II, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1994, p. 472. (Book XIII, Chapter XIX).

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) Aristotle, The Politics of Aristotle, translated and edited by Ernest Barker, Oxford University Press, New York, 1962, p. 185. (Book IV, Chapter XII).

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3)  Ibid., p. 174. (Book IV, Chapter VIII). Brackets made by translator.

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref4) (« il est impossible que les richesses ne donnent du pouvoir […]. ») Charles de Montesquieu, Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des romains et leur décadence, in Œuvres complètes II, op.cit., p. 113. (Chapter VIII).

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref5) Aristotle, op.cit, p. 186. (Book IV, Chapter XII). Brackets made by translator.

[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref6) William Shakespeare, “Timon of Athens,” Act II, Scene 1.

[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref7) Under self-styled *communist revolutionary* regimes, the state became the one and only capitalist. All you throbbing-at-the-bone revolutionaries out there: sorry but state capitalism is still capitalism; even Lenin recognized that truth. So much for *communist*.

As for *revolutionary*, the same contradiction applies. Marx defined revolution as a change *of*, not *in*, economic systems, e.g., from feudal mercantilism to capitalism. If Marx’s definition is accepted, then no revolution occurred in Russia or elsewhere in Eastern Europe. Again, *state capitalism is still capitalism*.

There is one significant difference between state and private capitalism. State capitalist regimes are of, by and for middle class rebels.

[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref8) Finance capitalists -- who took the lion’s share of the 2008-2009 megabucks giveaway -- must be differentiated from productive entrepreneurs. Indeed, finance capitalists are now the biggest enemy of independent, creative capitalists:

**“The relentless pressure on profits was a recurring lament among multinational managers and a central paradox of the industrial revolution. In an era of declining labor wages, proliferating billionaires and awesome global enterprises, many people would intuitively reject the complaint as fraudulent. Nevertheless, the corporate anxieties were quite real, especially for manufacturing firms. The basic dynamics of technological innovation -- more from less -- had the perverse effect of depressing returns per unit of production while simultaneously increasing the new capital required to invest in the next round of innovation.** **[My emphasis] This squeeze left even the largest companies exposed to the threat of weak profits and capital shortages.**

**Across the last thirty years of globalization and technological change, corporate profits in the United States suffered almost in direct relation to the pace of revolution. In the booming 1960s, profits were typically 11 or 12 percent of U.S. national income and peaked at 14 percent. By the 1980s and early 1990s, they had declined to around 8 or 9 percent and fell as low as 6 percent. Manufacturing, in particular, used to be much more profitable than service industries, but was now less so. The wave of corporate restructurings that shed workers and factories in the first half of the 1990s succeeded in reversing the trend -- after-tax profit rates were booming again and reached a twenty-five-year peak in 1994 -- but it was not yet clear if this turnaround was permanent.**

**The capital insecurities, however, were deeply embedded in corporate balance sheets**: **U.S. companies had become much more dependent as borrowers…Corporate profits were 34 percent of corporate debt in 1960; by 1990, profits were only 15 percent of debt. [My emphasis]”**

William Greider, One World, Ready or Not, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1998, p. 83.

[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) The American model of media financing via advertising was neither the only option nor a done deal. A series of battles took place in the early 1900s over public versus private financing. The main event featured Arthur Morgan versus the oligarchs. The oligarchs won.

For a superbly documented, blow by blow account, see Robert McChesney, Rich Media, Poor Democracy, University of Illinois Press, 1999.

CHAPTER 4. Nauru and Beyond

*The flaw in the pluralist heaven is that*

*the heavenly chorus sings with*

 *a strong upper-class accent.*

 -- E.E. Schattschneider, [*The Semi-Sovereign People*](http://wikisum.com/w/Schattschneider%3A_The_semisovereign_people)[**[i]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) --

The word for the day: *Nauru*.

Nauru is:

(1) A tiny island nation.

(2) A Hawaiian desert similar to tiramisu.

(3) The Apache word for stranger.

(4) A middle class marriage rite in Zimbabwe.

(5) An Australian political party.

(6) None of the above.

The envelope, please.

O.K., you never heard of the place. Too bad. That [Micronesian nation](http://www.discovernauru.com/) of 9,265 residents may hold the solution to numerous problems of the United States.

You can forget The American Dream. You can’t forget The American Nightmare. You live it every day. Rich richer, poor poorer, middle class smaller: Chapter 10 examines it in depth.

Only a double-edged sword can end the nightmare. One blade cuts the power of the oligarchy; the other blade performs a life-saving operation of democracy.

That sword is the only way to resurrect the polity, the hybrid system built by the American Founding Fathers. It was the envy of the world.

A re-evolved polity would replace the oligarchic political system consecrated in 2008-9 with billions of dollars to America’s mega-rich.

The end of the present oligarchic political system is The Third American Revolution. It is as necessary today as the first revolution was in 1776. Chapter 13 will show the bottom line:

*You will never solve America’s emerging economic catastrophe without a change* of *-- not* in *-- the oligarchic political system.*

Chapters 1 and 3 presented two sides of the first blade that cuts the oligarchy’s power: (i) weaken its head, the Supreme Court, by taking away its unconstitutional power to determine the constitutionality of laws, and (ii) weaken its body, the political influence of money, by revolutionizing campaign economics.

Chapter 2 introduced the second blade. To resurrect democracy, the Constitution must be amended to provide for legally-binding referenda. They increase the power of the people, but not indefinitely.

As noted; national referenda are essential but not sufficient. Chapter 4 tempers the blade of democracy, makes it stronger.

\* \* \*

They say the best things in life are free. They also tend to be hidden.

In a little-known observation near the bottom of a stack of notes, Alexis de Tocqueville gave this summary of what America needs:

**“The remedy is above all else, outside constitutions. In order for democracy to govern, there must be *citizens*, i.e., people who are interested in public affairs, who have the capacity and the desire to participate in them. One must always return to this fundamental point.”** [[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2)

Return we do to this fundamental point. The Third American Revolution comes down hard on it, with both feet.

Chapter 2 elaborated on Tocqueville’s summary:

**“The remedy. An increase in the (i) capacity and (ii) desire to participate on the part of the populace: may any government agency or employee, any political candidate or party, any policy, law or regulation be judged accordingly.**

**A closing note to Doubting Thomases:**

**You believe the American people are irresponsible. You know something? I completely agree with you. It is easier to despair, however, than to answer. And there is an answer. It is seldom used because it is effective.**

**To make people become responsible, give them responsibilities. In this case, make them citizens fully, truly -- finally.”**

How, in practical terms, can the capacity and desire of Americans to participate be realized? How can they be converted into what they are not now and never have been: full, real citizens?

*That conversion is The Third American Revolution.*

E.E. Schattsneider observed that 40% of the voting age population did not vote. He thought that huge group sitting on the sidelines is what makes Americans a **“semi-sovereign people.”**

To illustrate: in 2004, George W. Bush was elected with 62,040,610 votes. The total voting age population was 221,256,931. That meant Bush was the choice of only 28% of that population.

In 2008, Obama was elected with 69,456,897 votes. The total voting age population was 230,782,870. Thus, Obama was put in the presidency by a mere 30% of the voting age population.

The conclusion is as obvious as it is inevitable. Any claim by United States presidents to represent the majority is ridiculous.

The low turnout raises serious questions of legitimacy not just for Bush and Obama but for the entire federal government. As for state and local governments, the picture worsens. Everybody involved in politics knows that with rare exceptions the vote for president is the highest -- as good as it gets. Thereafter, as they move down the ballot, people start leaving the voting booth.

The dubious legitimacy of our minority government is spreading, causing a crisis of authority in our schools, neighborhoods, work places, families -- our entire society. Sorry, oligarchs, you can’t have one without the other, i.e., a semi-sovereign people without disobedience in your boardroom and bedroom.

Before continuing, a specific problem must be addressed.

Schattschneider published his book in 1960, when a polity existed and you could say such things and not be fired. Question: is 40% still relevant as a ballpark figure for nonvoters in presidential elections?

In the 1950s and 1960s, the average turnout was slightly over 60%. Half a century later, in 2008, 57.48% of the voting age population voted in the Obama/McCain election. Thus, looking at the [turnout figures over the years](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/data/turnout.php), 40% was and still is a good estimate.[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

What could solve the low turnout crisis and wipe out the semi-sovereign status of Americans? What, stated differently, would make them fully sovereign, i.e., real, true citizens?

Shattschneider argued the 40% who stay home will vote only if (i) they see clear differences between the two parties, and (ii) the parties start to do what they are not doing: deal with the issues, mostly economic, important to nonvoters.

I want to address directly those who look to the parties and politicos to solve the low turnout debacle:

You do not understand or appreciate the fact that America now has an oligarchic political system. Because of the economic problems which the 40% wants addressed, it is in the oligarchy’s immediate self-interest that those nonparticipants continue NOT to participate. That self-interest explains why Schattschneider’s two conditions never will be met under an oligarchic system.

Stop asking the barber if you need a haircut. Given the clear and present dominance of the oligarchy, for you who persist in looking to the system to correct the system, I defer to the immortal words of [Johnny Cash](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_DLF7quqbCs&feature=related):

Dream on, dream on

teenage queen;

you should be

a movie queen.

There is a way to get the 40% to participate. It avoids Shattschneider’s dilemma because it does not require parties or politicos to change.

That brings me back to tiny Nauru. It practices that way.

Nauru isn’t alone. Argentina and Australia do it. So do Brazil and Singapore, Chile and the Congo, Ecuador and Fiji, Liechtenstein, Peru and Uruguay.

The remedy those nations offer: mandatory voting.

Based on their hard experience, *mandatory* would mean in America *not* that you would be thrown in prison for not voting, but that if you want services from the federal government -- social security, a passport -- you must show you voted in the last election. The proof: your voter registration card stamped at the precinct.

To require voting in America, a Constitutional amendment must be passed. Because we now have in place an oligarchic political system, Washington cannot and will not offer that amendment. Mandatory voting, therefore, requires that a national referendum be called and imposed by the people -- which in turn requires the referenda process analyzed and advocated in Chapter 2.

Compulsory voting would necessitate changes:

(1) The machinery for conducting elections would have to be revised to accommodate millions of new participants.

A related change: at present, federal elections take place on Tuesday. The Third American Revolution will change Election Day to Sunday for two reasons.

First, employers are understandably reluctant to give employees time off to vote. That hesitancy would increase exponentially with more employees absent. The change to Sunday would wipe out that reluctance.

And second, voting on Sunday would increase the gross national product by reducing the loss of work from people taking time off to go to the polls.

(2) To solve practical problems which mandatory voting would present requires a review of the 13 nations that practice it.[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn4) They present a myriad of models with different formats, notably regarding penalties and exceptions.[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn5)

(3) The unprecedented participation of the 40% would require changes in how campaigns are conducted.

Because campaigns think in terms of cost per voter, the tendency would be for costs to rise by 40%. Those new stratospheric heights in turn would play into the hand of the oligarchy, whose financial support would be all the more necessary. With increased money comes increased influence.

There is a way to undercut that lose/lose outcome. Chapter 3 presented it.

Now, what about public opinion polls?

I conducted surveys for TV stations and candidates. I am frequently asked if I think polls influence elections. My answer:

[George Gallup](http://www.gallup.com/corporate/21364/george-gallup-19011984.aspx) conclusively showed (The Sophisticated Poll Watcher’s Guide) that polls do not influence the vote up or down. Of course, polls so far have not included the 40% nonvoters. What would be the impact, if any, of poll results on that new group?

Although nobody fully knows, one thing is certain:

Nonvoters do not fit the picture that oligarchs paint: a horde of moronic barbarians at the gates craving to pillage and plunder.

In 2006, the [Pew Research Center](%28http%3A/www.people-press.org/2006/10/18/who-votes-who-doesnt-and-why/9) conducted a study of nonvoters. It confirmed other, longstanding research findings regarding nonvoters:

It is true that nonvoters have fewer college graduates than regular voters; however, the key differences are that nonvoters tend to be younger, have shorter residency and are more politically alienated. Non voters are also -- and here comes the real source of the oligarchy’s panic -- less well-off economically.

What I suspect is that polls tend to put a cap on turnout by reducing the drama. Indeed, the Pew study showed that nonvoters frequently cite indifference and boredom as reasons for not voting. Therefore, as a further stimulus for the 40% to turn out, publicly releasing poll results immediately prior to an election should be prohibited.

But how is immediately defined?

In France poll results cannot be publicly released 30 days before an election. Perhaps, two weeks would be more relevant for America.

A related matter: obviously, the national referenda process discussed in Chapter 2 would significantly reduce boredom and indifference. Put the war in Afghanistan and the death penalty on the ballot; see what happens.

(4) The oligarchy can afford to pay for last minute, private polls. Therefore, prohibiting public ones arguably would handicap the public in terms of information.

This problem has a solution: remove the benefits of last minute private polls.

To accomplish that purpose, along with the public release of poll results, last minute financial contributions should be prohibited. This change is consistent with an objective mentioned in Chapter 3: all campaign donations must be reported before -- not after -- elections.

(5) Ballots should be redesigned to allow for "None of The Above" and/or blank votes. The substance of the argument that required voting violates a person’s right *not* to vote would thereby dissolve. To clarify, The Third American Revolution will never insist that a person vote for or against specific candidates or referenda. That Revolution is only saying that to receive federal government services, an individual must participate in the *process* of voting.

To get an idea of the immense change in store, the next time you vote, count off 10 people in line. If mandatory voting becomes the law of the land, 4 will never have voted before.

To the oligarchs and others who dread the “new” 40% showing up at the polls, The Third American Revolution says

*Yes*, you are looking at a real democratic revolution. The American Government for the first time in history would be elected by the majority.

*Yes*, an honest, real, true strengthening of democracy means exactly that, not something else.

*Yes*, in America today you either have a strengthening of democracy, i.e., a polity, or you have an oligarchy. There is no Third Way.

*Yes*, ending the semi-sovereign status of Americans -- responsibilizing them, turning them into real, full citizens -- would create adverse consequences for the mega-wealthy. The strong upper-class accent Schattschneider observed would be submerged in new voices. Not eliminated -- submerged.

You just saw why mandatory voting will not take place in oligarchic America.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) E.E. Schattschneider, The Semi-Sovereign People, Wadsworth Publishing, 1975, p. 35. This work is in a handful of American political science books worth reading.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) (« Le remède est surtout en dehors des constitutions. Pour que la démocratie puisse gouverner il faut des citoyens, des gens qui prennent intérêt à la chose publique, aient la capacité de s’en mêler et le veuillent. Point capital auquel il faut toujours revenir. ») Alexis de Tocqueville, Notes et variantes, op.cit., p. 1,019.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3) Is the 40% estimate on the high side? After 1972, the voting age population included 18 year olds, which would of course increase the size of the voter pool – and consequently reduce turnout percentages. Also, the voting age population includes felons and other people ineligible to vote.

Much has been made of illegal aliens who presumably would swell the voting age population and thereby make turnout figures look worse than they really are. However, after working in a large county hospital with illegals, I concluded that argument is weak. When government census officials appear at the front door, illegals run out the back. Hence, they are undercounted in the official census.

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref4) At present, 32 nations require voting, 13 enforce it. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compulsory_voting>.

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref5) In case you are wondering: all nations with compulsory voting allow medical problems as an acceptable reason for nonvoting.

CHAPTER 5. The Suicide King

*When all is said and done, society pays itself*

*in the counterfeit money of its dream.*

-- Marcel Mauss, *Esquisse d’une théorie générale de la magie*[**[i]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) *--*

What would be the stupidest mistake President Obama could make?

1. Start a trade war with China.

2. Renew the cold war with Russia.

3. Attack Iran with nuclear weapons.

4. Give more money to the mega-rich.

5. None of the above.

Careful … We’re talking stupid -- incredible, appalling, blow-your-hat-in-the-creek stupid -- not cataclysmic.

The envelope, please.

The correct answer: 5. None of the above.

Only The Third American Revolution can resurrect the polity, i.e., the system moderated by a large middle class and tending toward more democracy. The American polity created by the Founding Fathers died in 2008-2009. Today, our system is an oligarchy with democratic blue smoke and mirrors.

The Third American Revolution is a double-edged sword. One edge cuts the political power of the oligarchy, the other revives democracy.

As the chief executive, the president is the nation’s point-man. That is true in more ways than one…

The White House at 1600 Penslyvania Avenue is the location where the two edges of the sword come together. Point-man = tip.

Sharp, deadly: at the tip of the tip is the [Electoral College](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electoral_College_%28United_States%29#Fourteenth_Amendment). The College makes and breaks presidents. American democracy, too.

Oligarchs love the College. They invented it; it is their hole card. If the *little people* out there in a fit of barnstorming stupidity or outright madness vote for Fidel Castro for president, the College can stop him from taking office.

Unfortunately for the nation, the oligarchy’s hole card is no ace. It is the King of Hearts. The suicide king.

Any system that does not recognize the popular vote as final is not democratic. It’s just that simple. As for those who believe otherwise -- who sniff in their Cloudberry liqueur about how the Electoral College is a “check-and-balance” mechanism, a “great compromise” of popular votes and state sovereignty -- I must defer once more to the immortal words of [Johnny Cash](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3wT5BL7UJ9s):

Dream on, dream on

teenage queen,

see you on

the movie screen.

The King of Hearts, Johnny confirmed, is not restricted to males.

To re-evolve the polity, its democratic component must be resurrected, strengthened. The point of the point, the Electoral College is the acid test.

\* \* \*

A friend asked what instantly enters my head when I hear the words *Electoral College*.

Instant answer: *The Blivet Trick*.

A non-instant explanation:

The Electoral College vote, not the popular vote, elects the president. The College is a creature of the Constitution (Article II, Section 1) and the 12th Amendment.

The College is based on congressional districts plus senators. Thus, New Mexico, which has three congressional districts and two senators, has five Electoral College votes.

The calculation for the nation is easy. 435 (representatives) + 100 (senators) + 3 (Washington; D.C.) = 538 total Electoral College votes.

Because every state automatically has 2 senators, the senate part of the equation is locked, settled. Political battles are fought over congressional districts. The latter are based entirely on population -- warm bodies counted by the census every 10 years.

What it comes down to: if your state increases by about 750,000 people, that addition will give you a new congressional district -- and hence one more Electoral College vote.**[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn1%22%20%5Co%20%22)**

I have designed many electoral districts from congressional districts on down. By far, the worst knock-down-drag-out fights occur over school districts. Congressional districts run a close second. In both cases, you are in mean-as-snakes territory.

Until-death-do-us-part wars over congressional turf gave birth to the Electoral College:

In the late 1700s the Founding Fathers could not agree on how to elect the president. The sticking point: rich Southern planters were unhappy with all proposals. They looked around and saw their states were short on population.

"Real" population, that is ...

The South had plenty of slaves. In 1790, slaves were 39% of the population of Virginia, 43% of South Carolina.**[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn2%22%20%5Co%20%22)**

Unfortunately for the rich planters, slaves did not count for electoral purposes for the same reason dogs did not count: they could not vote. Slaves and dogs could not vote because they were -- and any rich Southern planter would be happy to set you straight if you were confused about this point -- subhuman.

If only there was a way slaves could be counted as humans but not "really," the planters' dilemma would be solved.

This "compromise" resulted. A slave = 3/5 of a human being. That way, the South could puff up its population numbers, get more congressional districts, and consequently have more Electoral College votes -- all without giving slaves the right to vote. Clever, no?

The deal was cut, the impasse broken, the Constitution passed. But there was a terrible price to pay. The Southern planters forced America to live in an as-if world -- to act as-if the 3/5 formula was morally right and factually true.

*Confederate* and *counterfeit*: read or said, the two are easily confused. In accepting the unacceptable, a diseased window opened.

I have often wondered where The Great Compromise, which high school teaches us is the holiest of holies, turns into the compromise of greatness. 3/5 human? Really? Are you crazy? What we have here is not a failure to communicate but a textbook case of *The Blivet Trick*.

With the exceptions of Nebraska and Maine, the winner-take-all nature of the Electoral College allows someone who loses the popular vote for president to be elected anyway, by winning the Electoral College vote. That blatantly anti-democratic maneuver was executed three times: Rutherford B. Hayes in 1876, Benjamin Harrison in 1888 and George W. Bush in 2000. Attention: all three were Republicans.

What is far more important, however, is that 20 other presidential elections were so close that the loser of the popular vote could easily have won the White House.

For example, in 2004 George Bush handily beat John Kerry by 3 million votes. Bush won 286 Electoral College votes to 251 for Kerry. 270 are needed to win. That means if Kerry had won Ohio with its 20 Electoral College votes, Bush would have won the popular vote but lost the Electoral College vote and the presidency.

Talk about an interesting development. The oligarchic tool that put Bush in office, the Electoral College, would have kicked him out. Only one irony can top that one…

By the way, Bush beat Kerry in Ohio by 118,599 votes. Had 60,000 people switched to Kerry, well, you can be sure Kerry thinks about them now and then. Chances are your nearest university football stadium holds more people. If you watch the Florida Gators play at home, look around. The stadium seats 88,000 spectators.

As for President Obama:

The tale of the tape. He trounced McCain by close to 10 million popular votes, and 365 to 173 Electoral College votes. That margin was simply too big for McCain to overcome, right?

Wrong.

Of the seven billion people on earth, the United States president has the best access to information. Or so you would think ...

Here is something President Obama will never see. None of his new-found golf cronies, White House employees or campaign staffers will dare show it to him.

In 2008, a shift of fewer than 523,000 votes in the "right" places would have made McCain the winner.

Here’s how.

McCain fell short of the presidency by 97 Electoral College votes. One way (among others) McCain could have acquired them.

Step 1. Find a group of states McCain lost with at least 97 Electoral College votes:

Florida 27

Ohio 20

North Carolina 15

Virginia 13

Indiana 11

Iowa 7

New Mexico 5

Total: 98

Step 2. Here are Obama’s margins of victory in popular votes in those states:

Florida 236,450

Ohio 258,897

North Carolina 14,177

Virginia 234,527

Indiana 28,391

Iowa 146,561

New Mexico 125,590

Total: 1,044,593

Step 3. If one half plus one of those voters for Obama had switched to McCain, we would be looking at President McCain today. That’s right -- the old guy.

Here are the additional votes McCain needed to win those states:

Florida 118,226

Ohio 129,449

North Carolina 7,089

Virginia 117,264

Indiana 14,196

Iowa 73,281

New Mexico 62,796

Total: 522,301. That was the magic number of switch voters needed to defeat Obama in the Electoral College. More people live in Montpelier, Vermont.

In popular votes, Obama was out of reach for McCain. In Electoral College votes, Obama could easily have been had. Please note that George Bush carried all 7 states cited above in 2004, so in giving them to McCain our calculation is not demanding the impossible.

The last major vestige of slavery in our Constitution, the Electoral College is a spectacle that should have been shut down years ago. It is the dead hand of the dead past.

As for the magic trick that dead hand keeps performing, by now you get the idea.

*The Blivit Trick* is the attempt to shove 10 pounds of horse shit into a 5-pound bag. Ken Lay of Enron ("Our liquidity is fine. In fact, it's better than fine. It's strong."); Bernard Madoff ("In today's regulatory environment, it's virtually impossible to violate rules."); Herbert Hoover ("Prosperity is just around the corner"); creators of the Electoral College (“Blacks are 3/5 human”) -- all were erstwhile practitioners of *The Blivet Trick*. They were stuck with it. That is what happens when you live in an as-if world (see Introduction).

As-ifness and *The Blivit Trick*: you can’t have one without the other. That is especially true of the King of Hearts, the suicide king, to which both are genetically endemic.

So, why doesn’t President Obama change how the president is elected?

It is frequently said that because his father came from Kenya, Barack Obama missed the Black historical experience of slavery in America. I disagree. In truth, right now he has a more direct link to slavery than 99.9% of American Blacks. How is that possible?

Tocqueville observed that a slave thinks with the brain of his master. If that insight is accepted, then every second that the master oligarchy’s Electoral College exists, Obama is their slave. The same holds for Clinton, Carter or any other president.

President Obama had better do what he was elected to do: not write children’s books but be America’s point-man and get rid of the Electoral College before it gets rid of him. If the pigeons come home to roost in the College bell tower in 2012, we will witness simultaneously the bottom of the as-if contradiction to which the Electoral College relegated America and the pinnacle of political stupidity in world history.

That stupidity -- *not* that he was America’s first Black president[**[iv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) -- will be Barack Obama’s legacy.

Everlasting humiliation is more than a remote possibility:

To shut down the Electoral College requires a Constitutional amendment. Given the change of America’s political system to an oligarchy, *even if he wanted to*, President Obama could not start seriously that amendment process. Same goes for the house or senate. Ergo...

The oligarchy need not worry a single second that the College will receive its diploma, graduate and disappear into the real world. Its endowment is sumptuous, safe.

As for the rest of us, we would do well to get a deck of cards.

Look closely at the King of Hearts. I don’t know about you, but I can’t make out whose hand is wielding the sword.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[**[i]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) « En définitive, c’est toujours la société qui se paie elle-même de la fausse monnaie de son rêve. » Marcel Mauss, *Esquisse d’une théorie générale de la magie*, in Marcel Mauss, *Sociologie et anthropologie*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 2004, p. 119.

[**[ii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) The population needed to form a house district keeps going up because the population keeps growing and the number of congressional districts is fixed at 435.

[**[iii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) virginiaplaces.org/classschedule/9vapopulation.

[**[iv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) You think Obama’s racial/ethnic legacy is too remarkable to be forgotten? I have a two-word rebuttal: Charles Curtis. To learn more go to [www.vpcharlescurtis.net/](http://www.vpcharlescurtis.net/)

CHAPTER 6. Goodbye, Tweedledum.

*If you think we’re wax-works…*

*you ought to pay, you know.*

*Wax-works weren’t made to be*

*Looked at for nothing. Nohow.*

 -- Tweedledum[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) --

What could the government of the most populated land in the world, China, possibly have in common with the smallest, the Vatican City State?

Clue: Iran and Sweden also have one.

Hmmm …

Another hint. Monaco and Luxembourg, two of the richest places in the world, have it. So do Chad and Somalia, two of the poorest.

Don’t know? Come on … Costa Rica and Croatia, Greece and Guatemala, Kuwait and Laos, Mali and Malta, Greenland and Uganda: all have one.

What’s that you said? No, it has nothing to do with nonauthoritarian or authoritarian governments. Iceland and Israel have it; so do Cuba and North Korea.

Try again.

Not Anglo-Saxon? Nope, wrong. Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales have one.

It ain’t American? Sorry, terribly sorry … Nebraska has one. So do Washington D.C., Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Puerto Rico has one in the works.

Stumped?

I saved the best clue for last. Look out the window. Most American cities and counties have one.

O.K., I’ll put you out of your misery. The list is long. Roughly half of the sovereign nations on earth have one, including the [Republic of Nauru](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nauru), island nation of 8.1 square miles in Micronesia (Chapter 5).

What those incredibly different places have in common: a unicameral legislature.

That’s right -- no house and senate. One body does all the legislating.

The bicameral legislature of the American federal government and 49 of our states originated in Greece. In 594 B.C. the statesman, lawmaker and poet [Solon](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%29Solon)created the Council of 400 in Athens to check the power of the ruling aristocracy. In 508 B.C. [Cleisthenes](http://www.stoa.org/projects/demos/article_democracy_development?page=4&greekEncoding=) carried on Solon’s work. He revolutionized the existing constitution, for which he is known as the Father of Athenian Democracy.

Fast forward 1,700 years. England‘s bicameral legislature evolved in the 1200s/1300s out of a council that advised the king. Lords and [*Commons*](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/128885/House-of-Commons): from what I saw while living in London, those names tell you where it’s at. The Lords membership is decided by the queen, and is for life. In 1999, a reform removed the automatic hereditary right to many peerages, but not all. Commons members, on the other hand, are elected by popular suffrage for varying terms.

The original English legislature was not a polity, i.e., a hybrid of oligarchy and democracy. The House of Lords consisted of nobility and church leaders; the Commons, of knights and the bourgeoisie.

However, the English bicameral system readily lent itself to modifications favoring a polity. The American Founding Fathers used Britain as a model. To wit:

The Lords. 100 American senators, two per state, are elected for six year terms. Senatorial districts are statewide.

In time and space, senators are more remote than

The Commons. U.S. house representatives are elected every 2 years and have districts based solely on population, at present about 750,000 people.

The size difference in senate versus house constituencies can be gigantic. California, for example, has 2 senators and 53 house representatives.

The Founding Fathers believed that, given smaller districts and more frequent elections, house members would be closer to the -- as they are called behind closed doors in political circles -- little people. House representatives would represent them, not the rich. Think: Solon and the Council of 400.

It didn’t work. Otherwise, I wouldn`t have written this chapter. And you wouldn`t be reading it.

Today, the [house](http://economic.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/11/25/your-senator-is-probably-a-millionaire/) is rolling in money. In 2008, the average net worth of a house member was $4,600,000.[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) 240 out of 435 house representatives were millionaires -- 55%. In contrast, only 1% of Americans are millionaires. We’re a long way, literally and figuratively, from Athens.

Contrary to the ruling oligarchy, The Third American Revolution opposes soiled fairytales. They create *as-if* worlds that prevent *real* democracy from taking root, flourishing.

Senators are, as the Fathers anticipated, richer than house members. In 2008, 68% of senators were millionaires. Their average net worth was almost $14 million. In 2009, their median wealth was $2,380,000.

Look at the numbers again. Call it what you will, it still remains the same. America has two Houses of Lords. I will amend that statement shortly.

The American polity, which lasted 220 years and changed the course of the world, expired in 2008-9. Cause of death: massive hemorrhaging under the weight of billions of dollars doled out to America’s archi-rich. The second the oligarchs stepped out from behind the curtain to appear before the lights, cameras, action, the American system changed from a polity to an oligarchy. That transformation was The Second American Revolution.

*Revolution*, because what happened was no change in but rather of political systems. As the hapless camel experienced with one extra straw, qualitative addition led to qualitative change.

With the death of the polity and the birth of a full-blown oligarchy, the original reason for having a bicameral legislature no longer exists.

\* \* \*

But at the end of the day, does America have a bicameral legislature?

An unexpected question with a surprising answer.

The French have a saying: Jamais deux sans trois. If you have two of something, a third will appear. If that is true, no bicameral legislature is truly bicameral.

Bicameral legislatures in fact have a third body which is ad hoc. It suddenly is, then is not. You won’t find it on any formal organization chart.

That third body is the Conference Committee.

In a bicameral legislature, whenever one body passes a version of a bill that differs from that passed by the other body, the disparity must be resolved. For that purpose, a small group of members from the house and senate is appointed by their leaders. That group, the Conference Committee, meets in private.[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2) Its members iron out the discrepancies and report back to their respective bodies, who vote to pass or reject the Conference Committee Report.

For many years I worked for the leadership of a House of Representatives. I saw hundreds of Conference Committee reports. When they arrived on the house floor, the Reports were routinely subjected not to a formal roll call but to a show of hands or voice vote; hence, there was no public record of who voted how.

Not that it would have made any difference:

I do not recall a single Report being seriously debated, much less rejected. Which can open a very dark corridor …

The handful of lawmakers forming a Conference Committee can go beyond the call of duty and insert major, new, uncalled-for “stuff” that goes undetected until it is too late. That ability to sneak in new material -- or, as the case may be, old material that the legislature previously rejected -- is what makes the closed Conference Committee really, truly, a third body.

Typically, Conference Committees spring into existence in the closing days of a legislative session, when legislators are exhausted, hassled, hurried. All the easier to simply raise a hand or shout “Aye!” Especially when everybody else is doing it and your Floor Leader is leading the charge -- and you, the lawmaker, are fed up with the whole thing and only want to go home.

Of course, in a unicameral legislature there is no secretive Conference Committee. Its plots and subplots do not exist.

When discovered, art forgeries in museums make a swift trip in the freight elevator to the basement. Similarly, when a unicameral legislature is adopted, Conference Committees and all that does with them are quickly relegated to the outskirts of history. And they aren’t the only thing to be run out of town…

Lawmakers often introduce legislation merely for political purposes. They know in advance the other body will kill their indispensable bill to save the republic. Don’t waste your time, though, searching emails or monitoring phone calls; I never saw a single phony bill sponsor having to explain the facts of life to the leadership of the other body. Nod, wink.

Fraudulent bill sponsors don’t fear retaliation by voters. Batting averages are crucial in baseball. In legislatures, however, the percentage of bills a lawmaker sponsors that become laws means nothing whatsoever. “I tried,” your representative will tell you with a shrug and Cheshire cat grin. Henceforth, there’s your cue. It’s your turn to nod, wink: “Oh yeah?”

If a representative knows his bill was stillborn, why introduce it?

*Not really* bill sponsorship, aided and abetted by bicameralism, is a favorite scam of legislators to wring financial contributions out of everybody from oil tycoons and megabucks lobbyists to waitresses and farm workers.

Here is a case study you won’t find in any political science textbook:

Every year without fail in the legislature where I worked somebody would introduce a “[Right to Work](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right-to-work_law)” (RTW) bill. In right-to-work states, you do not have to join a union to get or keep a job.

Seconds after the bill was dropped in the hopper, the same old battle lines formed. The “shocked” and “horrified” union leaders actually loved it. The RTW menace instantly justified their jobs and expense accounts; it gave them the excuse to “remind” thousands of dues-paying members who their “friends” were in the legislature. Nod, wink.

Enemies, too. Anti-union conservatives of course loved the RTW bill, but not for the reason you expect.

Year after year, I watched the AFL-CIO trade away 95% of its action just to kill RTW. “Tell me what somebody wants,” one RTW sponsor told me, laughing, twisting an invisible stiletto, “and I’ll tell you their weakness.” Thus, the conservatives got the trade-offs; the unions were housebroken until the next legislative session.

As for the union leaders, having “defeated” RTW they jubilantly went home and made scores of self-serving calls to Washington; they held back-patting sessions up and down the state; they appeared on TV at the drop of a hat, and sent puff pieces to newspapers, which indolent editors in the boonies published verbatim; they gave spirited parties in which their rank-and-file members screamed “Victory!” among other things.

Everybody knows about chain letters. What they don’t realize is that such letters are predicated on failure, not success. After all, if chain letters really worked, they would travel around the world and back again, multiplying faster than clothes hangers in a closet. As the initiator of a chain letter, you would be sitting at home and suddenly receive millions of letters from China, India, Bangladesh, Croatia, Zimbabwe, all demanding a free bottle of booze (or whatever). In short, *if chain letters really worked, there would be no point in doing them*.

Likewise, the RTW bill was predicated on failure. It was in reality a Full Employment Act for legions of lawyers and lobbyists. Actual passage of the bill would have brought down the curtain on this otherwise perennial and predictable lucrative bit of stagecraft.

As indicated, RTW had a second ultimate purpose which both sides shared in equal measure: rally the troops. I noticed how thousands of *little people* -- those perfect soldiers who faithfully marched in the rain and snow and dutifully wrote letters -- invariably wound up being subjected to The Walt Disney School of Management principle: Children under 12 must be accompanied by money.

In these titanic struggles between the frogs and the mice, it is pointless to try to find the good guy and bad guy. Representatives and senators cheerfully alternated who played Mutt and Jeff -- who introduced the RTW bill, who killed it. A pile of other legislation, e.g., bills allowing for interstate banking and collective bargaining for public employees, were forever caught in the cogs of the same shameless shakedown.

When a unicameral legislature is adopted, senate/house crossfire tricks and traps instantly expire. In the same vein, now that the polity is dead, it’s time for houses of representatives all over America to give up the ghost. Our catastrophic public deficits urgently demand that bicameral legislatures soaking the nation go the way of [clackers](http://www.bigredtoybox.com/cgi-bin/toynfo.pl?clackersindex), [Metrecal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metrecal) and the [Edsel](http://www.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1658545_1657867_1657781%2C00.html). To survive as a nation, we must stop kicking the can down the street.

\* \* \*

 *“I know what you’re thinking about;”*

 *said Tweedledum,*

 *“But it isn’t so. Nohow.”* [**[**iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

In the movement to an American unicameral legislature, [Nebraska](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nebraska_Legislature) leads the way.

Nebraska started out with a bicameral legislature. Following a trip to Australia in 1931, [George Norris](http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/minute/George_Norris.htm), the state’s extraordinary United States Senator and one of JFK’s profiles in courage, took up the unicam cause. He campaigned long and hard, arguing that bicameral legislatures were anchored in the undemocratic House of Lords. Senator Norris also believed it was utter nonsense and a waste of money to pay two groups to do the same thing.

He won. Nebraska’s unicam swung into action in 1937. It never looked back.

In debates over changing from a bicameral to a unicameral legislature, one bone of contention invariably is flung on the floor. Which should disappear, the house or the senate?

Here, again, Nebraska leads the way. Its 1934 amendment to the state constitution abolished the house and transferred its powers to the senate. As a result, with 49 senators Nebraska has the smallest legislature in the nation.

Given The Third American Revolution’s goal of greater democracy, at first blush it would seem we should eliminate the senate -- the Lords -- not the house. As indicated, that view has been overtaken by events. Economic realities show that America now has two -- actually three -- Houses of Lords. By abolishing nationwide houses of representatives, we eliminate thousands of more politicos and their expenses -- staffs, rents, furniture, travel, retirement.

Equally important, by abolishing the house we get rid of the soiled fairytale. 2,000 years ago, Aristotle observed how the polity, the *best* government, eventually is killed by oligarchs:

**"**[**Forgetting the claims of equity], they not only give more power to the well-to-do, but they also deceive the people [by fobbing them off with sham rights]. Illusory benefits must always produce real evils in the long run; and the encroachments made by the rich [under cover of such devices] are more destructive to a constitution than those of the people."**[**[**iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

In America, the 2008-2009 encroachments made by the rich left the people holding sham rights and illusory benefits -- the flotsam jetsam of the sunken polity.

If houses of representatives are not *illusory benefits*, what is?

It’s time for the house to do formally what it has done in reality: disappear as a distinguishable entity.

The next time your house representative holds a town meeting, Primrose Path him:

(i) Ask him if, in general, he wants to save us taxpayers money.

(ii) He will exude a broad/broader/broadest smile, effuse a lite n’ lively “Aye.”

(iii) Ask if he wants to hear a practical hot idea that will save billions of dollars.

(iv) Christmas-tree like, your representative’s eyes will light up. He will exuberantly proclaim that to gather marvelous, creative, public-spirited, practical ideas like yours is the purpose of such open meetings he is holding right now with you, the sacred American people. After all, you are the be-all-and-end-all of his uncompromising struggle and personal sacrifice to public service. Indeed, on most matters, folks like you know a hell of a lot more than Washington. Blahblahblah. So …what’s your hot idea?

(v) The primrose path ends. Instruct your representative to abolish the House of Representatives.

After presenting your hot idea, step back. You will observe a tilt sometimes to the side, sometimes forward or backward in your representative’s body. Such is the inevitable outcome when someone’s knees buckle.

Proceed to tell him you are tracking [HR2551 RS](http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h112-2551), making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30; 2012. Here, lawyer-like, your representative will try to derail you; he will briskly tell you that any numbers are subject to change -- to which you briskly nod, wink, continue: as of September 15, 2011, appropriations for house salaries and expenses were $1,226,680,000. And that’s just the tip of the House iceberg.

Your representative will smile benevolently, smirk or giggle maybe, and inform you that “regrettably,” with regard to abolishing the house, it cannot be done. He is right (see below), but that is not the political point. “Benevolently” inform him you are paying him not to say ***no*** but to say ***yes***, then find a way. That’s his job. If he can’t do it, you’ll “regrettably” find somebody else. Smirk or giggle (optional.)

One can and should argue that if the house is eliminated the senate will need more money to handle the additional workload. That is especially true if required voting is enacted (see Chapter 4); the number of participants in the system could increase 40%. However, those costs would be greatly offset by savings in other areas, e.g., no more wasteful conference committees and phony house/senate cross fires.

*Nohow*. Tweedledum is right: you cannot abolish the house. The oligarchy won’t allow it. America’s hyper-rich love the bicameral system and its pretension to “democracy” with sacrosanct “checks and balances.” There is absolutely nothing new there. The sham rights and illusory benefits Aristotle saw and denounced two millennia ago characterize any transition from polity to oligarchy.

The proverbial bottom line: only public referenda can unwind the existing system and install unicameral legislatures on federal and state levels. A referendum is how Nebraska did it.

Nebraska may soon have company. On July 10, 2004, the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico held a referendum in which 84% of the voters approved a switch to a unicameral legislature.

Puerto Rico’s landslide is a signpost for America. When the people favor a constructive and responsible measure by an overwhelming margin, it is destructive and irresponsible not to enact it. Undemocratic, too. That is why any Third American Revolution worthy of the name supports a unicameral legislature.

2012 elections have cranked up. I call upon Gallup and other pollsters to ask voters about a unicameral legislature for America. I think I know the answer; so do you. 84%. Then, get ready ...

Well, not really. To let the American people decide if they want a unicam requires changing the Constitution to provide for national referenda (Chapter 2). As noted, the American oligarchy will never permit that amendment.

Despite it all, in those as-if “democratic” “open” meetings with your house representative, you can have fun. No politico or oligarch can stop you -- not yet.

In that regard, the tiny Republic of Nauru has a third valuable lesson:

Derived from the native language, the word nauru means “I go to the beach.”

So, do it. Go for a stroll, collect shells, sleep, get a tan, watch the sunset. For primrose-pathing your house representative, you deserve it.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) Lewis Carroll, *Through The Looking Glass.* <http://gabian.org/looking_glass.4.php>.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1)The [median net worth](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20023147-503544.html) of a house member in 2009 was $765,010. The base pay: $170,000.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2)The exclusion of Conference Committees from open meetings laws is not unique:

Ever been to a public meeting of a government body? Did you see notes passed under the table and telephone calls for and from your public officials? Those communications demonstrate that, within the open public meeting, other closed private meetings are taking place right under your nose. To my knowledge, nobody has ever complained about those open-secret reunions to which you, the public, are cordially not invited. Zero complaints mean everybody, including you, tacitly approves of them -- which in turn means nobody truly approves of public meeting requirements. Welcome to an as-if world discussed in Chapter 5 -- the world in which everyone behaves as-if we really had a “democratic” and “transparent” government “regulated” by “sunshine” laws in the “public interest,” etc. *As if*, because you know it isn’t true; the politicos know that you know it isn’t true; you know that they know that you know… Nod, wink: *Nohow*.

Look out! -- not all closed private meetings in open public ones are verbal. Watch for hand signals. I recall a legislative committee chairman who dropped his pencil on the table if he wanted a motion to table a bill; pointed the pencil down if he wanted a Do Not Pass recommendation; pointed the pencil up if he wanted a Do-Pass recommendation. Worked every time.

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3) Lewis Carroll, op.cit., <http://gabian.org/looking_glass.4.php>.

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3)Aristotle, The Politics of Aristotle, translated and edited by Ernest Barker, Oxford University Press, New York, 1962, p. 186. (Book IV, Chapter XII). Brackets made by the translator.

CHAPTER 7. Reapportionment (1): In Search of The Silver Bullet.

You can’t mix apples and oranges.

If you’re like me, you were 11 years old when you first heard that adage.

Maybe it was the brazen absoluteness of it, I don’t know, but that apples/oranges stuff struck my fifth-grader mind as an off-key note.

Flat, sharp: of course, no note is “wrong” per se. It is off-key only in terms of the key of the music being played. Key = context. If the music were in another key, that same note would be perfectly fine.

But it wasn’t. What key was the school trying to attune us to? At the time, I had no idea what other key out there made the apples/oranges dictum sound so wrong.

30 years later, I found it. Or rather, it found me.

The purpose of The Third American Revolution is to create a new and better polity, i.e., the oligarchy/democracy hybrid, which tends toward democracy.

A polity governed America for over 200 years. It lit up the world. Paraphrasing Winston Churchill, if you think a polity is bad -- in particular, because it allows an oligarchy to exist along with a democracy -- you should try the alternative. Indeed, that is exactly what Americans are doing right now.

The Third American Revolution’s strategy: (1) politically weaken the oligarchy that brazenly seized control in The Second American Revolution, and (2) revive and strengthen the polity’s democracy component.

In the resurrection of democracy, The Third American Revolution cannot ignore electoral reapportionment. Democracy itself is at stake.

The 14th amendment (1868) to the Constitution provides for equal protection under the law. Section 1:

**“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”**

That wording made a dead letter of the Supreme Court’s infamous Dred Scott decision (1857) that Blacks were not citizens,[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) and therefore could not enjoy the rights and protections of citizens.

The 14th amendment was also a response to the notorious Black Codes. The 13th amendment (1865) had abolished slavery. Nevertheless, some states passed laws designed to keep Blacks servile, e.g., they were forced to enter labor contracts, did not have freedom of movement and could not sue in court.

If trashing ridiculous and despotic Supreme Court rulings and tyrannical laws is not democratic, what is?

The 14th amendment was later applied by the Supreme Court to other groups, notably women and Hispanics, seeking equal rights. The Court also applied the equal protection clause to provide for equal weight of votes. More on that in a moment.

Racism is the crack in the diamond of America. Look around: like an anti-virus computer program that has been infected by a virus, racism has infested all conventional solutions to racism. The upshot: those cures propagate the very disease they are supposed to cure.

There is no better example of the-problem-is-in-the-solution than the Supreme Court’s repeated efforts to destroy racism by invoking the 14th amendment.

Let’s look again at what the amendment says: **“… nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”** Note that the amendment uses the word person not once but twice. There’s the rub.

Sorry, Your Honors: Blacks are not a person. Women are not a person, Hispanics are not a *person*. I know that from the perspective of your speeding stretch limos and lace-curtained palaces in Vienna and other prettified D.C. suburbs, all Blacks look alike -- that as a group they are one and the same guy, a stupid one at that, who is incapable to taking care of himself and constantly needs your divine intervention. You are absolutely convinced in your heart of hearts that the guy goes to bed every night, gazes heavenward in the dark and prays the same prayer not to some unknown god but to you, the Supreme Court: You must help me save me from myself.

A nonracist approach, anyone?

Try considering a man or woman with a grievance as an individual living at X address. As a real live person -- not as a member of any group other than citizen -- that individual is entitled to equal protection. That is what the 14th amendment says. Of course, Your Honors, Dred Scott showed your hand; you *cannot* see a Black as an individual, a person. I suspect you would like to, but you are unable. Such is your problem.[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2) Chapter 1 is a modest proposal to help you out of the hole you keep digging for yourselves and for America.

Barnstorming misapplications of the 14th amendment in no way mean that equal protection should be tossed out. On the contrary. As written in the hearts of the people, i.e., a feeling of fairness and justice, the 14th amendment is virus-free.

It is true that equal protection does not exist anywhere. The reason is simple: it is a basic component of democracy. And democracy is forever a work in progress. We can never arrive “there,” any more than we can arrive at A north or A west; we can only go more north or west.

Equal protection is a standard by which all governments, policies and politicians should be measured. The Third American Revolution, too.

The proverbial bottom line: equal protection is a hollow shell unless people’s votes have the same weight. The moment vote inequality is tolerated, a slippery slope begins. And it goes all the way down.

Equality of votes is incarnated in the principle, *One Person, One Vote.* As we will show, that principle is as crucial as it is misunderstood. It is often a myth, usually a lie and always a legend.

\* \* \*

If you are very quiet, you will hear knives coming out.

The 2010 census is finished. Reapportionment wars and lawsuits are just around the corner.

Expensive -- hideously expensive -- lawsuits.

Throughout America, lawyers in hair suits are making frenetic phone calls, holding Monday morning strategy sessions, rounding up plaintiffs, corralling expert witnesses. Been there; done that.

Economic catastrophe is staring America in the face. No catastrophe has ever blinked. Is there a way your tax money can be saved for something other than reapportionment wars? How about public education? Infrastructure? Health care? Debt service? Environmental protection? Law enforcement?

There are two ways to reduce reapportionment lawsuits:

(i) Abolish houses of representatives[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3) (Chapter 6). Tragically, the oligarchs in charge will never permit that change; the continued existence of a house and senate is vital for preserving The Great American Illusion that America has a democracy. We will examine that Illusion in Chapter 9.

(ii) Find the silver bullet for One Person, One Vote reapportionment under existing circumstances. The bullet has never been found because it requires refuting the time-honored apples/oranges maxim.

Since (i) is not a real option, we will proceed with (ii).

The crux of reapportionment lawsuits is in the famous -- or infamous -- One Person, One Vote principle. Politicians, lawyers and judges simultaneously curse and revere it. In my experience as an expert witness in reapportionment lawsuits, only one federal judge in America understands it.[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn4)

The principle means equality among individuals in their right to vote -- “that every voter is equal to every other voter in his State [*sic*] when he casts his ballot…” (Supreme Court, Gray v. Sanders, 1963). Equal rights are unconstitutionally impaired when the weight of a vote “is in a substantial fashion diluted when compared with votes of citizens living in other parts of the state [*sic*].” (Reynolds v. Sims, 1964).

One Person, One Vote has as a basic reference point the relationship *between* or among districts -- not inside one-and-the-same district. That distinction instantly clears up a lot of confusion. Election trickery aside, if you and I vote in the same district, our votes always have the same weight. 1 = 1; they weigh the same; they count equally. The One Person, One Vote principle does not come into question because it is fully realized. Such is the case in presidential and senate elections because, in both cases, the district in question is the entire state.[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn5)

But what happens when the weight of your vote is compared to the weight of a vote cast in other districts *within* your state, county or city? Thousands of elections for house representatives, county commissioners, city councilors and school board members come into play.

Tempers flare in a Pavlovian reflex when reapportionment appears. To avoid as many unnecessary bad feelings as possible, I am going to take a concrete case from long ago to illustrate why One Person, One Vote does not exist anywhere in America.

In 1982, a panel of three federal judges tossed out the state house reapportionment plan passed by the New Mexico State Legislature. The 70 house district population totals varied too greatly, the judges ruled, creating a “constitutionally impermissible” result violating the One Person, One Vote principle.

The judges’ remedy was simple, direct. “The Legislature,” they commanded, had “to construct the legislative districts as nearly of equal population as is practicable.”

What literally counted for the judges, then, was one thing only: warm bodies. For reapportionment purposes that meant:

(1) Divide New Mexico’s population (1,302,894) by the number of house districts (70), and you have the population of the ideal house district: 18,613.

(2) When you reapportion, keep all house district populations as close as practical to that number, and the One Person, One Vote principle will be realized.

The New Mexico legislature reapportioned -- guess who paid the tab -- rigorously following the three judges’ order.

Was the One Person, One Vote principle realized? Were the weights of votes roughly equal? The truth was just around the corner -- the first house elections.

Here’s what happened:

In 1984, 8,723 people voted in the state representative’s race in House District 30 in Bernalillo country (John McMullan, GOP, incumbent). Only 3,776 people voted in the state representative’s race in House District 33 in Dona Ana County (Ralph Hartman, Democrat, incumbent).

The conclusion is simple, direct. A vote cast in Hartman’s district had more than twice the weight of a vote cast in McMullan’s district. If that isn’t substantial, unacceptable dilution, what is?

Gross differences in vote weight appeared throughout the state.[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn6) What went so terribly wrong?

Answer: the judges’ warm body reapportionment solution -- make house districts equal in population -- was one person, one person reapportionment, not One Person, One Vote reapportionment.

That one person, one person reapportionment, by the way, ran directly counter to existing Supreme Court rulings.

In Gaffney v. Cummings (1973), the Court held that

**“total population, even if absolutely accurate as to each district when counted, is nevertheless not a talismanic measure of the weight of a person’s vote…The United States census is more of an event than a process. It measures population at only a single instant in time. District populations are constantly changing, often at different rates in either direction, up or down. Substantial differentials in population growth rates are striking and well-known phenomena. So, too, if it is the weight of a person’s vote that matters, total population – even if stable and accurately taken – may not actually reflect that body of voters whose votes must be counted and weighed for the purposes of reapportionment, because ‘census persons’ are not voters [sic]. The proportion of the census population too young to vote or disqualified by alienage or nonresidence varies substantially among the States and among localities within the States.”**

Inequality of vote weight is especially blatant when the district populations are indisputably equal following a federal court order. In New Mexico, in terms of the raw population they represented, fewer than 4,000 people in House District 33 had the same weight as more than 8,000 in House District 30.

Why were so few votes cast in Hartman’s district?

The Supreme Court gave the cause: ‘census persons’ are not voters. Hartman’s district was on the Mexican and Texas borders. Many of its residents were ineligible to vote in New Mexico. But in the three judges’ order that reapportionment be made solely on raw body counts, the eligible-ineligible distinction was lost.

Completely lost.

In another decision, the Supreme Court was even more explicit about not requiring reapportionment solely on the basis of warm bodies. In Burns v. Richardson (1966), the Court declared it never

**“suggested that the states are required to include aliens, transients, short-term or temporary residents, or persons denied the vote for conviction of crime in the apportionment base by which their legislators are distributed and against which compliance with Equal Protection Clause is to be measured.”**

The New Mexico state legislature did not go quietly into that dark night. It appealed to the Supreme Court. Given its two rulings cited above, you would think the Court would jump at the opportunity to assert itself and rebuke the slap-in-the-face delivered by three judges in Albuquerque.

The Court did no such thing. It refused to hear the case, thereby letting the contradictory ruling stand.

Why?

Remember Dred Scott. Where there is no pride, there is no shame -- some readers will conclude. I think the answer lies elsewhere. The end result produced by NOT hearing the contradictory ruling is *ambiguity*. The Supreme Court loves it, creates it by the trainload. The reason:

In an ambiguous situation, he who is the POSITION to know has the power. The Supreme Court is in that position. And power -- not justice -- is what the Supreme Court is all about. It has learned, a la computer tycoon, that money, full employment for lawyers, more funding for the judicial branch and other self-serving measures are *enhanced by creating problems, not solving them*.[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn7) Chapter 1 offers a solution to that infernal cycle in the judiciary.

The results are in and indisputable. Reapportioning on the basis of raw bodies doesn’t work. But what will?

There is a second, readily-apparent method for reapportioning. It is in the second half of the One Person, One Vote principle.

Conceivably, a reapportionment plan could ignore entirely the census population. The plan would start with the total voter turnout in the last statewide election. Staying with New Mexico, 408,621 votes were cast in 1986.

(1) To determine the ideal house district size, divide that total turnout by the number of house districts. 408,621 divided by 70 = 5,837.

(2) To reapportion, take each precinct’s votes cast. Put precincts together so as to form each house district as close as practicable to 5,837 votes.

The three judges commanded: make the populations equal and ignore the votes. The reapportionment method just outlined would make the votes equal and ignore the populations. Instead of one person, one person reapportionment, the second technique would be one vote, one vote reapportionment.

Beyond a doubt, using only votes cast would reduce the extreme variation in turnouts across districts. The McMullan/Hartman vote disparity would instantly vanish.

However, the price paid would be too high. One vote, one vote reapportionment would create excessive and unacceptable deviations in house district populations. Why? For the same reason one person, one person reapportionment does not work: different areas have different numbers of ineligible voters. We will say it again: ‘census persons’ are not voters. Children, out of state students, seasonal workers, convicted felons, foreign citizens -- all are census *persons*, none are *voters*. Two different groups. Apples and oranges.

To date, reapportionment lawsuits have focused on *population* inequalities. To my knowledge, no lawsuit yet has been filed over *vote weight* inequalities. The latter, however, is an idea whose time is coming...

Someday a lawyer will saunter into a courthouse, open his briefcase. The contents: the other shoe. It will drop with an almighty thud, creating tremors from the California redwoods to the New York islands. *Every state in the nation is guilty of gross vote weight inequalities, and for the same reason as New Mexico.* Those inequalities were created not by local ill will, not by politico debauchery and treachery, but by federal court orders. A classic case, if there ever was one, of making (and taking) money by creating problems, not solving them.

What if, you ask, the courts and not the states had to pay for their mistakes? Sorry, no can do. That common sense solution is inapplicable in post-polity, oligarchic America.

We have come to the end of a road.

Postscript. A Wonderland Without Wonder

The One Person, One Vote principle presents a conundrum: how can you mix two different things, apples (persons) and oranges (votes)?

The best testimony to the conundrum’s power is that it exists in a multitude of continents and languages, e.g., in Latin America, *Comparar peras con manzanas*.

The conundrum’s presence around the world indicates there is no common cultural origin. It is a maxim that belongs to us all as human beings: an unconscious archetype.

The earliest expression of the maxim I can find is implied: Plato’s [*Theaetetus*](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0172%3Atext%3DTheaet.%3Asection%3D185b), a dialogue (369-367 BC) between Socrates and Theaetetus, a mathematician.

**“Socrates:**

**Now in regard to sound and color, you have, in the first place, this thought about both of them, that they both exist?**

**Theaetetus:**

**Certainly.**

**Socrates:**

**And that each is different from the other and the same as itself?**

**Theaetetus:**

**Of course.**

**Socrates:**

**And that both together are two and each separately is one?**

**Theaetetus:**

**Yes, that also.”**

A thing is itself, not something else. In the famous Law of Identity, A = A. An apple is an apple; an orange, an orange. The apples/oranges maxim reasonably follows (or seems to) from it. That maxim -- the note -- is not off key.

Or is it?

Can the Law of Identity be correct in and of itself but, like the 14th amendment, be misconstrued, misapplied?

You who think the conundrum cannot be solved appear to be on solid ground; 2,000 years of existence plus multi-cultural appearances support you.

I disagree. After the 2008-2009 Second American Revolution that replaced a polity with an oligarchy, the United States entered a world beyond anything poor little Alice experienced. It is a world beyond a looking glass hidden in her world beyond the looking glass.

In the new wonderland without wonder run by an oligarchy, (1) people are paid to create problems, not solve them; (2) the problem is in the solution; (3) genuine solutions to problems are known but cannot be implemented.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) See Chapter 5 on how a slave was counted as 3/5 human. Oligarchs and other apologists for slavery and its byproduct, the Electoral College, are quick to argue that the 3/5-human formula never existed. They say that in practice here’s what happened:

3/5 of a state’s total slave population was added to the total free population to derive a state’s total population for the purpose of calculating congressional districts and hence, the state’s Electoral College votes. The 3/5 calculation, they swear, dealt with aggregate numerical quantities only; it said nothing whatsoever about the value of the life of an individual slave.

Call it what you will, gentlemen, it still remains the same. Let’s see how you feel when your wife’s bridge club replete with watercress sandwiches is counted as only 3/5 of another group for determining the size of a human population. You can’t kid me; I grew up in the South. There, your quaint theory, the 3/5-human equation never existed, was separate from practice all day every day. That squalid practice, let me remind you, gave rise to the 14th amendment.

When a theory is separate from practice that means only one thing: something is wrong with the theory. In the case of the Blacks are 3/5 human theory, we already know that; let’s move on.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) In 1957, a foam-at-the-mouth white racist working in a [Kudzu](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kudzu_in_the_United_States)-ensnared gas station in a Georgia hamlet -- where the major industry was two speed traps -- put it this way.

**“Southern Whites can accept Blacks as individuals, never as a group. Northern Whites can accept Blacks as a group, never as individuals.”**

That man with a second grade education nailed two varieties of racism on the head. If you think the latter type doesn’t exist, watch how northern Whites hunker down when a Black wants to move in next door. Prettified, D.C. suburb, lace curtain palaces with stretch limos included.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3) Cities and counties must reapportion, hence are subject to lawsuits; however, they are not where megabucks wars are fought. At least at present…

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref4) Name available on request.

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref5) The words in a State merit emphasizing:

Obviously, the 100 United States senators represent wildly varying populations. The biggest state, California, 37 million people, has two senators. The smallest, Wyoming, 563,626 people, also has two senators.

In a federal system, states qua states are deemed fundamental, distinctive, worthy of representation -- in short, sovereign. A = A: California = California, not Wyoming. What is given is given. In this case, the assumption of state sovereignty is why the issue of equality of votes is confined to within each state, not *among* them.

Other countries have provinces, cantons, regions, departments and other entities that have huge variations in populations. As with American states, however, each province, department, etc. is a basic, historically and culturally-defined, sovereign given. Thus, the equal vote weight principle is not relevant across them.

Someday, perhaps, due to migration patterns and economic developments, the entire American federal system should be revisited and states redefined or even abolished, replaced by something else. Not now, however. Given who is in charge, guess who would benefit.

[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref6) If mandatory voting is instituted (Chapter 4), election turnouts could increase as much as 40%. It follows that the need to include votes cast in the One Person, One Vote principle will become urgent.

[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref7) For controlling the out-of-control Supreme Court, see Chapter 1.

**CHAPTER 8. Reapportionment (2): A Formula For One Person, One Vote.**

*There is nothing new under the sun.*

-- Ecclesiastes 1:9 --

They got him.

[Anwar al-Awlaki](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anwar_al-Awlaki), Islamic cleric-terrorist, was [killed](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-11658920) on September 30, 2011 in a drone attack in Yemen. The good news was so good, President Obama [announced](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/09/30/obama-anwar-al-awlaki-dead_n_988924.html) it.

What could Anwar al-Awlaki possibly have to do with reapportionment?

Answer: everything.

In both cases, what is in play is the 14th amendment[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2) to the United States Constitution.

**"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."**

Born in Las Cruces, New Mexico, Anwar al-Awlaki was an American citizen. Thus, the 14th amendment applied to him.

Or did it?

Don’t expect CIA, FBI or Homeland Security officials to read the Constitution, much less understand or enforce it. Yes, I am serious. The reason is simple: they don’t have to. They are agents of the status quo, whatever the *status quo* happens to be. Such is their job. Obama, Stalin, Lincoln, Capone, Kennedy, Reagan, Elvis: whoever the president is, executive branch agents serve him. His political tendencies or personal attributes make no difference. You probably think it should be otherwise -- but it isn’t. Such a transformation awaits The Third American Revolution.[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

As for what that status quo is today …

We no longer have a polity, the oligarchy/democracy hybrid. In 2008-2009, when the White House and Congress doled out billions of public dollars to the American archi-rich, the polity went the way of all polities. It was, as Aristotle predicted, replaced by an oligarchy.[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn4)

The Bible got it right. *Nothing new under the sun*.

The continental plate shift in political systems is the second reason why the 14th amendment can now be ignored. Under an oligarchy, citizens *ipso facto* are not equal. Inequality is, in fact, a defining characteristic of oligarchy.

Now, it is often enjoyable but it is never rational to spend time on things that make no difference. Hence, given America’s new oligarchic political system, there is no rational reason for the CIA, FBI, Homeland Security -- indeed, for any government official -- to know or care about the 14th amendment and equal protection. Get used to that fact, you who are reading these words.

As for Barack Obama, Harvard law school professors can and do ignore the 14th amendment. They, too, are (1) agents of the status quo in (2) an oligarchic political system. For them to defend the 14th amendment would be not only a waste of time and misleading, i.e., the public would think its Constitutional rights and protections still exist, but also for the professors to support equal legal protection would potentially do something far more detrimental, more unpardonable, more unconscionable: jeopardize their jobs. Here we arrive at the third reason why the 14th amendment is irrelevant to Harvard professors:

(3) A half a century ago, when a polity existed and people could say such things and not be fired, the professor and anthropologist [Jules Henry](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jules_Henry) offered this explanation of who professors are:

**“All great cultures, and those moving in the direction of greatness, have an elite which might be called the cultural maximizers whose function is to maintain or push further the culture’s greatness and integration…The functions of a cultural maximizer include organization (i.e., maintaining the level of integration of the culture as it is) and contributing certain qualitative features necessary to the continuance of the cultural life. His function is never to alter the culture radically. He may help to give more intense expression to features that already exist, but he never wants to bring about a fundamental change. Thus, those who have the capacity to maximize culture in this sense are among the elite in all highly developed civilizations.”**[**[v]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn5)

Given their role in society, the elite cultural maximizers’ lack of consideration of fundamental change is not subject to “rational” argument or moral “improvement.”

Today, fundamental change means nothing less than replacing the reigning oligarchy with a polity. Given that reality, and because The Third American Revolution is rational and doesn’t waste time on things that don’t matter, it doesn’t look to Harvard professors for help, much less for salvation.

Strange isn’t it, though, how despite everything it keeps coming back. There it is again -- the 14th amendment: you can’t **“deprive any person of life… without due process of law,” and that all citizens are entitled to “equal protection of the laws…”** You don’t need a lawyer to tell you what those words mean; they are inscribed in the heart of every American.

The inscription is why no sooner was al-Awlaki’s death announced than White House and Justice Department officials fell all over themselves issuing pronunciamentos defending the drone attack. Watch the officials closely on the Internet, their tone of voice and eye movements; you are witnessing an archetypal case of a phenomenon discussed in Chapter 5: *The Blivet Trick*, i.e., trying to put 10 pounds of horse shit in a 5 pound bag. Overcompensation is the first refuge of the guilty.

The protestors were especially outraged at the happy face announcement by Obama, Nobel Peace Prize winner, of all people. Hopefully, however, the above comments will explain the contradiction. Obama´s disregard of the 14th amendment is entirely in keeping with his triple role of (1) agent of the status quo which is (2) an oligarchy, and of (3) cultural maximizer.

Incidentally, that the 14th amendment was enacted to fight racism is of no interest whatsoever to Obama. As his refusal to abolish the last vestige of slavery, the Electoral College (Chapter 5) shows, when out on the country club links with his golfing buddies, besieged by hooks, slices and sand traps, Obama can’t ponder incongruities. No time; busy/ busy/busy. Besides, gosh, it’s not nice to bring up stuff like that.

Today, a fundamental change would be to NOT disregard the 14th amendment, but to respect and enforce it as does The Third American Revolution.

I sense that you, Dear Reader, suspect that, in defending equal protection under the law, The Third American Revolution is beating a dead horse. You are right -- the horse is dead. *It is only with that public and candid admission, however, that necessary fundamental change can occur.*

The Third American Revolution entails more than one resurrection.

In the meantime, as public incredulity and doubt smolder and build, here’s a message for Obama:

Remember the horse you killed?

When you wake up tomorrow, you’d better have somebody look you over. You may have hoof marks running up and down your back.

\* \* \*

The Formula

There is a paradox in the One Person, One Vote principle:

Reapportioning solely on the basis of warm bodies counted in the census makes district vote totals vary to an unacceptable degree.

When districts A and B both have 18,000 people, and 8,000 votes are cast in A versus only 2,000 votes in B, something is wrong. Picture a scale, perfectly balanced, with 8,000 grains of sand in pan A and only 2,000 in pan B: how can the weight of each grain be the same? Such is the result of *one person, one person* reapportionment.

But reapportioning solely on the bases of votes cast would make district populations vary to an unacceptable degree. If districts A and B are redrawn so that each casts 5,000 votes, but 30,000 people live in A and only 6,000 in B, again, something is wrong. So outrageous is this discrepancy, one vote, one vote reapportionment to my knowledge has never been practiced.

The cause of the paradox is simple but fundamental. Raw census *population* and *voters* are two different groups. Apples and oranges. The former includes children, noncitizens and other people ineligible to vote. The latter excludes them.

**BOTH** people and votes must be counted to reapportion in a manner that truly, fully, finally operationalizes the One Person, One Vote principle. That operationalization is the only way in which, in accordance with the 14th Amendment -- with democracy too -- the weight of every person’s vote will be equal.

The solution to the One Person, One Vote paradox requires that a 2,000-year-old dictum be disproven. We can -- in fact, must -- mix apples (people) and oranges (votes).

The dictum has endured for two millennia because to disprove it requires neither inductive nor deductive but [abductive](http://user.uni-frankfurt.de/~wirth/inferenc.htm) logic. As [Charles Peirce](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/peirce/#dia) showed, abduction is inherently deep-seated, disruptive; its results cannot be anticipated much less controlled, which is why Harvard professors don’t practice it. Their omission is ensconced in the role of the elite “cultural maximizer”: His function is never to alter the culture radically.

Even though democracy, equal protection under the law and equality of votes are irrelevant in today’s America, The Third American Revolution re-evolves what the Founding Fathers started. In that regard, the Revolution’s watchword is totally incomprehensible to its opponents:

Do It Anyway.

Consider the following formula for equalizing vote weights:

Congressional District[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref7)
Population According                 The Average of The Total
to The Last Census                      Votes Cast in A Precinct                  Derived
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_        X         in The Previous Two             =     Precinct
                                                   Congressional General                 Population
The Average of The                     Election Years
Total Vote Cast in The
Congressional District
in The Previous Two[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref8)
Congressional Election Years

The “Derived Precinct Populations” are the new building blocks for constructing districts. Their physical boundaries, registered voters, voting machine locations, etc., are exactly the same as those of existing precincts.

When added up, there is nothing abstract whatsoever about derived precinct populations. More on that in a moment.

The formula, it must be emphasized, does not omit actual, real life people. They are at the top of the first column: “Congressional District Population According to The Last Census.” People ineligible to vote -- children, out-of-state students and soldiers, prisoners -- are absolutely, definitely included.

The mechanics of the formula will not be intuitively obvious to many readers. Hence, we offer a clarifying, hypothetical case:

(1) Assume a congressional district has a population of 800,000 people.[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn9) Assume, furthermore, that the average turnout in the last two congressional general election years was 400,000 votes.

The contents of the first column in the formula:

Congressional District Population

According to The Last Census = 800,000

Divided by

The Average of The Total Votes Cast

In The Congressional District

In The Previous Two Congressional

General Election Years = 400,000

For obvious reasons, the result of the first column will always be greater than 1. In our example, that figure is: total census population (800,000) divided by total votes cast (400,000) = 2.

(2) We come to the second column of the formula: “The Average of The Total Votes Cast in A Precinct in The Previous Two Congressional General Election Years.”

Let us assume that the congressional district consists of five precincts. Moreover, assume our task is to build two state house districts from those five precincts. Finally, assume the averages of the total votes cast in the two elections in question were the following:

Precinct 1.    50,000 votes.

Precinct 2.  100,000 votes.

Precinct 3.    80,000 votes.

Precinct 4.    20,000 votes.

Precinct 5.  150,000 votes.

Before proceeding, note that the total is 400,000 votes. That figure appears in the bottom part of the first column of the formula.

(3) The second calculation in the formula: multiply each precinct vote by 2, the result of the division performed in Column 1. The outcome is the “Derived Precinct Population.” Thus,

Precinct 1.  2 x   50,000 = 100,000 Derived Precinct Population.

Precinct 2.  2 x 100,000 = 200,000 Derived Precinct Population.

Precinct 3.  2 x   80,000 = 160,000 Derived Precinct Population.

Precinct 4.  2 x   20,000 =   40,000 Derived Precinct Population.

Precinct 5.  2 x 150,000 = 300,000 Derived Precinct Population.

Now comes something most readers will not anticipate:

The total of the “Derived Precinct Populations” is 800,000 -- the number shown at the top of column 1 of the formula. In other words, the total of the derived precinct populations is the same as the “real” population -- warm bodies -- counted by the census.

What happened is this: precincts with large numbers of people ineligible to vote -- transients, children, etc. -- did not receive undue representation relative to other precincts. What the formula accomplishes is not the elimination of ineligibles but the spreading of ineligibles over all the precincts in a congressional district.

(4) As mentioned, our task is to build two state house districts. If we put precincts 1 and 5 together, we have a district composed of (i) 400,000 derived precinct population and (ii) 200,000 votes. That decision leaves us no choice for building the second district: precincts 2, 3 and 4. Together, they form a district of (i) 400,000 derived precinct population and (ii) 200,000 votes.

End result: two identical house districts in (i) populations and (ii) votes. What could be more equitable than that? People and votes? Apples and oranges?

The essence of the formula: the votes-cast component checks the population component WITHIN congressional districts. The population component checks the votes-cast component AMONG congressional districts.

Apples and oranges are mixed so as to control each other. Those checks and the resulting balance are One Person, One Vote in action.

----------------------
[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) For a typical example of mainstream reporting, see [CNN’s article](http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2011/09/30/samir-khan-proud-to-be-an-american-traitor/?hpt=wo_bn4) on [Samir Khan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samir_Khan), an American citizen (New Yorker) who died with al-Awlaki.

The American media doesn’t know the difference between *description* and *analysis*, between *information* and *culture*. In Khan’s case, CNN regurgitates the description spoon-fed them by … a terrorist and middle class rebel (Daddy is a communications executive). After a few wooden paragraphs, it becomes obvious that Samir Khan had no more idea why he became a terrorist than does CNN. Had he known, he wouldn’t have done it.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) The Fifth Amendment, which is part of the Bill of Rights, declares:

**“No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law** [sic]**; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation**.”

Why was it necessary, some 80 years later, for the Constitution to repeat verbatim its guarantee of due process? Obviously, there was a problem.

As Chapter 7 explained, the 14th amendment was a

**“response to the notorious Black Codes. The 13th amendment (1865) had abolished slavery. Nevertheless, certain states passed laws designed to keep Blacks in a condition of servitude, e.g., they were forced to enter labor contracts, did not have freedom of movement, and could not sue in court.”**

This chapter’s subject is One Person, One Vote, which is anchored in equal protection. Consequently, the 14th amendment is emphasized rather than the 5th. Regarding due process, however, the amendments say the same thing.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3) Who gets elected president is inseparable from how they are elected.

The election of presidents who ignore the Constitution and other laws will continue until campaign economics are revolutionized. Chapter 3 observed that **“it turns out that the soaring, sky-high costs of campaigns are the oligarchy’s favorite game: heads we win; tails you lose.”**

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref4) For more on this subject, see the Introduction.

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref5) Jules Henry, Culture Against Man, Random House, 1963, p. 31. Truth in lending: Jules Henry was a close family friend.

[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref6) Be leery of [impeach Obama](http://www.nationaljournal.com/2012-presidential-campaign/ron-paul-says-obama-should-be-impeached-for-al-qaida-killing-20111005) talk. I know, I know: the logic is impeccable: (i) violating the Constitution is an impeachable offense. (ii) In not according al-Awlaki due process before taking his life, President Obama violated the Constitution. (iii) Therefore, …

Unfortunately, the above syllogism assumes the polity and not an oligarchy runs America, and consequently that the Constitution is still in effect. In reality, the House of Representatives would have to impeach Obama (the Senate conducts the trial). Thus, the impeach-Obama question turns on *whom* the House represents. At $4,600,000 per head, house members are a kick in the shins of America’s Founding Fathers who intended that the House represent *the* little people (Chapter 6).

[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref7) Why does the formula use congressional districts as the basic population unit? Other units, such as counties, could be employed.

There is nothing sacred about congressional districts. However, they are convenient. Federal courts, other government bodies and nongovernment organizations closely scrutinize congressional districts as to their equality of populations and communities of interest. In using those districts, the formula reapportions on an established political and legal consensus.

Reapportionment efforts outside the United States, notably Europe, will find other units of population -- provinces, cantons, departments, etc. -- to be useful. The basic logic of the formula, however, remains valid.

[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref8) Why use more than one election year to form a votes-cast figure?

Turnout can vary significantly from year to year due to local political and weather conditions. To reduce extreme turnout deviations up or down, the formula takes two general elections and averages them.

[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) The real number is below 800,000. I am simplifying things so that you will not need a calculator.

For those purists who insist on an exact count of warm bodies per precinct, I will reveal here a dirty little secret.

That count is all too often unavailable. The reason:

The census bureau takes its counts according to *enumeration districts*. Those districts are frequently not codeterminous with voting precincts. Let’s assume enumeration district 101 has 1,000 people. Let’s also assume that district is split geographically between two voting precincts 1 and 2. Question: where do the 1,000 people reside? Should you arbitrarily split the number in half and assign 500 people per precinct? What if a swamp occupies the precinct 1 portion and nobody lives there? In reapportionment work, I spent countless hours driving around, as well as counting rooftops in aerial photos of mountainous areas. O.K, are you looking at a warehouse or barn with 0 population? A family of 8?

At the end of the day, only guesstimates are possible. When it comes to population counts per precinct, we are a long way from the god’s truth the courts and lawyers want you to believe they have in hand.

CHAPTER 9. The Great American Illusion

 *Every culture produces, in an unbelievably*

 *appropriate and rigid way, a philosophy that*

 *fits its needs like a glove.*

*--* Jules Henry*, Culture Against Man*[*[i]*](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) *--*

No, it is not The American Dream.

The Great American Illusion is more powerful than any dream.

When a dream ends, you wake up.

When an illusion begins, you are awake. You are asleep, yet awake.

What is this dream which is no dream?

A dream brings problems to the surface so that consciousness can resolve them. An illusion represses problems, thereby making them unavailable to conscious resolution.

Shakespeare’s Hamlet tossed and turned between dreams and illusions. To be or not to be? The illusions won. Over Hamlet’s dead body, the faithful Horatio pronounced the ultimate obituary: Good night sweet prince (Act 5, Scene 2).

Horatio’s line is largely forgotten, with one notable exception. Boxing announcers sometimes summon up the good night epitaph when a fighter is KO’d. Out cold, carted off: such is the closing act of illusions. Movie scripts say it well: FADE OUT.

The greatest illusion of all times: The Great American Illusion. Over the years it has carted off billions of people.

The Illusion concerns the American polity, the oligarchy/democracy hybrid. Enacted in 1789, it shook the world. The Second American Revolution in 2008-2009 killed the polity. An oligarchy replaced it.[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1)

Why was there no death notice?

With an oligarchy in charge of America, no medical examiner will dare certify the death. *All quiet on the Western front* -- at Harvard and MIT, CNN and PBS, Fox and Democracy Now. While we’re at it, forget Radio France and the BBC.

Why the American *omerta* – the silence?

An obit for the polity instantly would raise questions. And no oligarchy likes to be questioned.

Whatever you do, do not hold your breath awaiting the official announcement. If history is any guide, look for one in 500 years.[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2)

Most importantly, a formal obituary of the polity would break the spell of The Great American Illusion. Which is precisely why The Third American Revolution issues the notice: THE POLITY IS DEAD.

The Third American Revolution is dedicated to the proposition that the polity must be resurrected with a new and better balance of its oligarchic and democratic constituents. That better equilibrium requires greater weight for the democratic element.

A lot more.

Enhanced democracy, however, is impossible without first identifying and dismantling The Great American Illusion. It is blinding men to realities two feet in front of them. They are literally out cold. *Goodnight, sweet prince*. FADE OUT.

A perfunctory introduction to The Great American Illusion:

You have always been told that America has a democracy, not a polity. Me too -- I never heard anybody say otherwise. The American democracy may be corrupt, stupid, evil -- Marxists denounce it as “bourgeois” -- but it is a democracy.

The universally-held mantra, America has a democracy, is the prepackaged, predigested, popular culture version of The Great American Illusion. As we shall see, the mantra is to the Illusion what checkers is to chess, pinochle to bridge. Not “bad,” just stripped down.

America has a democracy. There it is – the American philosophy. Appropriate, rigid.

So powerful is The Great American Illusion that, apart from this author’s work, what you will read here has never been said before. The product of years of experience working with all three branches of government, this Chapter sets the record straight: the Great American Illusion, not the polity, is in need of an obituary.

My motive is diametrically opposed to that of the oligarchy:

I hope you will learn what I learned but quicker and without the hardships. I want you to build on what you find here, form new insights and surpass me. If that happens, this book succeeded.

We will say more shortly about the decisive importance of what is at stake: culturally acquired traits.

\* \* \*

To see The Great American Illusion for what it is -- an illusion -- requires an awareness of what a polity is. An analogy explains why:

Alcoholics Anonymous has been singularly successful because it recognizes and puts into practice something basic about people. Anyone seeking help must stand up in an AA meeting and admit he is an alcoholic. That public admission is the key to effective treatment. AA will not work with alcoholics who do not acknowledge what they are.

Obviously, an admission is meaningless if the person making it does not understand alcoholism. The greater the knowledge, the deeper the admission and, consequently, the greater the change.

For exactly the same reason, The Great American Illusion must be admitted publicly before The Third American Revolution can begin. As with alcoholism, knowledge is indispensable for a meaningful admission.

Sadly, the most rudimentary knowledge of a polity is lacking. Silence shrouds this theme. *Omerta* American style.

Did you ever wonder why in schools across America, no discussion of the polity has ever taken place? Of course you didn’t. The fact that question never occurred to you shows the uncontested supremacy of The Great American Illusion.

The adjective Great is right, not hype.

\* \* \*

**Полите** **й**. It’s Greek, and not just to you.

Oligarchy, aristocracy, democracy, tyranny: the Greeks invented the typology of governments 2,000 years ago. In the process, they made the glasses through which you see the political world. An astonishing achievement.

One Greek stands out: Aristotle. His classification of governments and related insights prevail to this day throughout the Western world.

Aristotle wrote that neither the rich nor the poor would

**“tolerate a system under which either ruled in its turn: they have too little confidence in one another. A neutral arbitrator always gives the best ground for confidence; and ‘the man in the middle’ is such an arbitrator.”**

What makes the man in the middle so trustworthy?

The middle class **“forms the mean,”** and **“moderation and the mean are always best.”** Being moderate and the best, those who occupy the middle **“are the most ready to listen to reason.”**[**[iv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

In brief, the middle class was Aristotle’s totem.[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn4) America’s, too -- and why not? In both worlds that class performed the indispensable role of reconciling the upper and lower classes.

Its resounding success is nowhere more manifest than in the scorn Karl Marx poured on the middle class, the *petit bourgeoisie*. If you dreamed of a proletarian revolution and the middle class was the only thing stopping it, you’d be outraged and enraged too.

History shows time and again what happens when the middle class reconciler role fails. A Marxist revolution is not the only thing waiting in the wings. Adolph Hitler and Dr. Strangelove are there, too. Where a revolution of, by and for such understudies succeeds, death is swift and thorough.

Because the middle class is the best class forAristotle, it follows that

**“first, the best form of political society is one where power is vested in the middle class, and secondly that good government is attainable in those states where there is a large middle class...”**[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn5)

Aristotle named that best political system a ***политей*** or polity. It is a

**“mixture of democracy and oligarchy…incline[d] more towards democracy…”**[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn6)

Finally, not only is the polity the best political system, it is also inherently stable:

**“** **There is no risk, in such a case, of the rich uniting with the poor to oppose the middle class: neither will ever be willing to be the subject to the other; and if they try to find a constitution which is more in their common interest than the ‘polity’ is, they will fail to find one.”**[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn7)

In one sentence: a polity is a middle class-moderated, oligarchy/democracy hybrid inclined toward democracy. You saw a polity in action in America; you lived it.

Until 2008-2009.

\* \* \*

What killed the polity? An economic decline (Chapter 10) weakened the middle class to the point that it could no longer moderate the other classes. That decline made possible The Second American Revolution, which replaced the polity with an oligarchy. That change in political systems is causing The Great American Illusion to become conscious after more than 200 years of uncontested and unconscious supremacy. That change is why the Illusion -- the American philosophy if you will -- no longer fits like a glove.

Why the emerging consciousness is unraveling the Illusion: *The ideology that becomes conscious is the ideology that dies.*

The Illusion gave legitimacy to authority throughout American society. The result is a legitimacy crisis in all walks of life: governments at all levels, schools, neighborhoods, work places, families (Chapter 4).

Paradoxically, that crisis is *forcing* upon us the rare and fleeting opportunity to fully identify and discard the The Great American Illusion and subsequently to resurrect and re-evolve the polity, starting at its roots:

From its inception, The Great American Illusion was never spoken aloud.

The Founding Fathers knew the word polity; Alexander Hamilton and James Madison used it.[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn23) However, they employed the term only in its generic sense of political system.

That omission is extremely curious given the following connection:

The Founding Fathers designated Montesquieu to be the “oracle” that guided them in writing the Constitution so that the “legislative, executive, and judiciary departments ought to be separate and distinct.”[[x]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn24)

Well, Montesquieu wrote that the ancient Greeks “called that type of constitution a police.” He then noted, “See Aristotle, Politics, Book IV, Chapter VIII.”[[xi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn25)

In that chapter, Aristotle analyzed the polity.

There’s the link. Don’t tell me the American Founding Fathers didn’t know about Aristotle’s writings on the polity. They did -- case closed.

In that light, to say nothing about the polity is to say everything...

Why were the Founding Fathers unwilling to use the word police/polity, either in its sense of the separation of powers (Montesquieu) or as a hybrid of oligarchy/democracy (Aristotle)? Why didn’t they simply declare what they were doing: creating a polity? That is to say, create what Madison characterized in a note to himself:

**“The most difficult of all political arrangements is that of so adjusting the claims of the two classes [i.e., ‘the class with, and the class without property’] as to give security to each, and to promote the welfare of all.”**[[xii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn26)

The reason why the Founding Fathers could not openly acknowledge they were building a polity comes in two parts.

(1) On the one hand, by acknowledging a polity they would have admitted that the system they were creating included an oligarchy. That open admission would have been unacceptable to the majority of the American people who had just fought a war of independence and were extremely divided over the Constitution being proposed by the Founding Fathers.

The risk was not merely hypothetical. The opponents of the Constitution, Patrick Henry among them, were vociferously arguing it would establish an oligarchy.[[xiii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn27) They knew where to hit.

Confronted with that damning charge, Madison used an expedient and powerful defense:

He, too, vigorously attacked any **“pretended oligarchy.”**[[xiv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn28) And what exactly, according to Madison, would stop the proposed constitution from favoring not just the oligarchy but indeed any particular class?

**“I answer: the genius of the whole system; the nature of just and constitutional laws; and, above all, the vigilant and manly spirit which actuates the people of America -- a spirit which nourished freedom, and in return is nourished by it.”** [[xv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn29)

(2) Madison’s genius effusion gives the impression he was a fervent supporter of democracy. False. The confidence Madison placed in the vigilant and manly spirit of Americans ran directly counter to what he wrote earlier:

**“In all very numerous assemblies, of whatever characters composed, passion never fails to wrest the scepter from reason. Had every Athenian citizen been a Socrates, every Athenian assembly would still have been a mob.”**[**[xvi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn30)

On the other hand, then, Madison did not favor a democracy -- a mob -- which was unacceptable to the American oligarchy.

Neither an oligarchy nor a democracy, then. But that leaves unanswered the all-important question: what type of government were the Founding Fathers constructing?

A masterpiece of political positioning took place in Madison’s explanation of the system he and his colleagues were building -- a republic, the word they substituted for polity.[**[xvii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn30) Nowhere, incidentally, did Madison deny he made that substitution.

*Democracy* did not share the same fate. A republic, Madison asserted, was most certainly not a democracy. More than once, he attacked any **“confusion of names,”** e.g., the

**“confounding of a republic with a democracy, and applying to the former reasonings drawn from the nature of the latter. The true distinction between these forms…is that in a democracy the people meet and exercise the government in person; in a republic they assemble and administer it by their representatives and agents. A democracy, consequently, must be confined to a small spot. A republic may be extended over a large region.”**[**[xviii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn31)

By attacking both an oligarchy and a democracy, then, Madison gave the impression that a republic was neither. But the Founding Fathers could not stop there:

Madison’s definition of a republic, i.e., governance by representatives, cited above closely resembles the definition of oligarchy given by Aristotle, i.e., “that some of the citizens should deliberate on all matters. This is characteristic of oligarchy.”[[xix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn32) Once again, it is clear that in the 1780s, an outright stamp of approval on an oligarchy was politically inadmissible.

An impasse within an impasse. What was to be done?

To give legitimacy to the system they were proposing, the Founding Fathers resorted to what Madison had severely criticized: a confusion of names.

That confusion was performed by none other than … Madison.

He erased his own distinction between democracy and republic (see above) this way:

**“In the most pure democracies of Greece, many of the executive functions were performed, not by the people themselves, but by officers elected by the people ...”**[[xx]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn33)

The most pure democracies governed by representatives: that total oxymoron, was it made deliberately? I think so.

The confusion of polity with democracy, as well as of polity with oligarchy, existed in Aristotle’s time. He held that such confusions were GOOD, that

**“it is a good criterion of a proper mixture of democracy and oligarchy that a mixed constitution should be able to be described indifferently as either. When this can be said, it must obviously be due to the excellence of the mixture. It is a thing which can generally be said of the mean between two extremes: both of the extremes can be traced in the mean, [and it can thus be described by the name of either].**

**A properly mixed ‘polity’ should look as if it contained both democratic and oligarchic elements -- and as if it contained neither.”**[**[xxi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn34)

Oligarchy, democracy: both, yet neither. *Only one system fills the bill.* Madison read Aristotle’s analysis of the polity and learned. We should too.

The oligarchy certainly did. *Democracy*? *Oh, all right… have it your way.* They *knew* an oligarchy was included in the new system: they were it. So satisfied were they, the oligarchs saw no need to step out from behind the curtain until 2008-2009, when, to an incredulous audience around the globe, they showed where it’s at.

The incredible thing is, despite all the lights/camera/ action-proof to the contrary, The Great American Illusion still prevails, albeit the flame is lower.

In reality, Madison’s equation, Republic = Democracy, was the cover version of another equation: Polity = Democracy. The latter is The Great American Illusion. It has never been said, much less admitted.

On its surface, the Illusion retains simultaneously the refusal to confuse names and Madison’s erasure of that refusal. Republic? Democracy? Oligarchy? Now you see it, now you don’t -- of whatever you want or have in mind.

On a deeper level, the Illusion is official dogma and a cultural given. *It is taboo to call a polity a polity*; nobody does it except The Third American Revolution. Rather, the democracy/oligarchy hybrid must be called a democracy, representative democracy or a republic.

That taboo was never broken.

The source of the taboo’s enduring power is The Great American Illusion; it is alive, if not well. Where there is a totem, there are taboos; wherever there is a taboo, there is a totem.

As a real life consequence, the American polity became an as-if democracy. Everyone *except the oligarchy* behaved as if America had a democracy; a government of, by and for the people, etc. -- but it didn’t. The oligarchy knew better.

Given its unquestioning acceptance by generations of billions of people around the world, The Great American Illusion is the greatest ideological maneuver of all times.

Why the Illusion captured countless hearts and minds worldwide is not difficult to discern. Polity = Democracy is one of the greatest poetic works of all times, i.e., you wish it was true. But it isn’t.

Once Polity = Democracy (or its cover version, *Republic = Democracy*) is recognized for what it is -- an illusion -- the issue before us becomes clear: more democracy or less democracy in a polity?

There is no third way. *The polity never mentioned but insinuated to be a democracy was The Third Way*. That way is nearly extinct. Drop by drop, the bottle was emptied until the time came when even the most bright-eyed optimist no longer truly believed the bottle was half full. At that point, support for the existing polity that no longer existed turned into de facto support of an oligarchy (Aristotle, it must be remembered, observed that a polity is *inclined* toward democracy).

The capability of the oligarchy to step into the full TV light of day in 2008-2009, to demand and receive billions of public dollars in front of billions of astonished *little people*, was an historic turning point. Tocqueville foresaw it, dreaded it. Aristotle warned about it, reviled it.

Which bring us back to the key: admission.

Good evening. I am an alcoholic. Alcoholics Anonymous[[xxii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn36) shows the transformative power that begins with a simple, honest admission. AA knows that without it no constructive outcome is possible.

Ladies and Gentlemen, good evening. America never had a democracy. We had a polity. A polity is an oligarchy/democracy hybrid. Today, the polity is gone. An oligarchic system replaced it.

AA hears an alcoholic’s admission countless times daily all over the world. In America, the equivalent *political* admission has never been made. Not once, by anyone.

To the contrary, that admission is the opening words of The Third American Revolution.

Now comes the proverbial *however*:

Take out your binoculars. No Third American Revolution is on the horizon.

So, get ready. In Madison’s words, because the American oligarchy is unable to promote the welfare of all, it cannot give security to each -- to those with and without property.

It is a grave error to reduce the problem to ill will. Even if they wanted to, the oligarchs running America could not promote the general welfare. As we will show, they don’t have the power.

Unlike The Third American Revolution.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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PostScript. Illusion, Delusion, Allusion

Ama quilla. Ama lulla. Ama shua.

Don’t lie. Don’t steal. Don’t be lazy.

-- Inca Empire Code --

C.G. Jung in Answer to Job apologized profusely in the preface for what he was about to do: demonstrate that on a rational basis, Christianity makes little or no sense.

It was not without considerable doubt and self-questioning that I engaged in a similar undertaking with regard to The Great American Illusion.

Myths and legends -- The American Dream, Johnny Appleseed, George Washington and the cherry tree, The American Melting Pot, JFK -- are necessary for social cohesion. To rip them apart one stitch at a time is a serious matter. I did so only after concluding that if Polity = Democracy (in its public form Republic = Democracy) began as a Madisonian myth necessary to unify a young nation, it is now something else: an illusion morphing into a delusion.

Because it is less appropriate, the Illusion is becoming more rigid.

The Second American Revolution of 2008-2009, which replaced the polity with an oligarchy, accounts for the difference. That change *of*, not *in*, political systems transformed what had been imagination into lies, foresight into opportunism.

Myths and legends are NOT illusions. Myths and legends lead; illusions mislead. See below.

Given the tectonic shift in political systems to an oligarchy, the Madisonian myth of the 1700s is today an illusion in search of a proper epitaph, a decent burial.

No illusion is alone. The Great American Illusion sits atop a pyramid of other illusions in need of recognition and public admission. One example:

Chapters 7 and 8 discussed an illusion that could cost millions of dollars to already cash-strapped federal, state and local governments. Henceforth, when the county has to lay off teachers or policemen, or when the city can’t fix that damned hole in your street or the streetlight the kids shot out, no need to ask where your money went:

Lawyers. There’s gold in them thar reapportionment hills.

The Supreme Court ordered[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) all state and local governments, when they reapportion, to make raw body counts equal across districts. All over America, states, counties, and cities reapportioned accordingly. Bravo -- the One Person, One Vote principle was realized in America. Or so we were told…

Chapter 7 showed that nothing of the sort happened. In insisting otherwise, however, the Supreme Court maintains an *illusion*. Which is a polite way of saying: the Court is lying to you.

The Third American Revolution says that when an oligarchy is in control, justice sure is blind.

Back to The Great American Illusion, *Polity = Democracy*: Is it not The Great American Delusion.

Time to define our terms.

[Merriam Webster](http://http:%20merriam-webster.co,/dictionary/illusion):

**1. Illusion. (1) (i) A misleading image presented to the vision. (ii) Something that deceives or misleads intellectually. (2) The perception of something objective existing in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature.**

For 200 years, the actual nature of the American system was a polity. A polity is NOT a democracy; a polity has democratic elements and it TENDS toward more of them.

From the very beginning, James Madiso fostered the perception of the polity in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature (Chapter 9). That way presented the polity as a democracy via an intermediary: the republic. Simply stated, Madison created an *illusion*, i.e., a misleading image that deceives intellectually.

He had no choice:

(i) As explained in Chapter 9, Madison could not openly announce that he and other Founding Fathers were building a polity. To do so would have spelled the death of the Constitution they were proposing to a young and divided nation.

(ii) To have presented the The Great American Illusion directly, without the republic as intermediary, would have destroyed the Illusion, because the statement Polity = Democracy is patently false.

(iii) A polity, in and of itself, independently of Madison or any other statesman, is inherently misleading. The trick to a good polity, Aristotle noted, is that *it is not identified as a polity*. “A properly mixed ‘polity’ should look as if it contained both democratic and oligarchic elements -- and as if it contained neither.” (See Chapter 9 for the full quote).

Madison took Aristotle’s observation and turned it into a recipe.

Can the American polity exist without resorting to the illusion that it is a democracy? Can the polity openly be called a polity and still succeed? It would be the first time in world history.

That open admission is precisely what The Third American Revolution makes.

Not everybody wants to bury The Great American Illusion:

Oligarchs work day and night to keep the Illusion alive. Like Madison, they have no choice -- but for an entirely different reason. For oligarchs to admit the truth, that the United States now has an oligarchic political system, would create unforeseeable, unmanageable trouble for the top 5% hyper-rich.

We, on the contrary, make that admission here because we, too, have no choice.

As Chapter 12 will discuss, the world is entering a new epoch of scarcities of absolute necessities -- water, air, food. It will be an era unlike anything the world has ever known.

Oligarchs monetarize the world, turn it into money. That is what they do, how they live, who they are. In the process, they are creating looming environmental catastrophes. Read again the ancient Inca code quoted at the top of this postscript. Manicured hands shamelessly outstretched to take billions of freebee public dollars showed to astonished eyes around the globe that America’s oligarchs do not practice the simplest moral precepts. It’s not a question of not wanting to be honest: American oligarchs simply *don’t know how*. What on earth makes you think they can solve impending world shortages of water and other resources essential for life?

There is a second reason for reviving the polity. Forget ill will or moral precepts: *even if they wanted to*, American oligarchs don’t have the power to do what must be done. Chapter 14 identifies why.

I should note that in resurrecting the polity and calling it by its real name, The Third American Revolution loses none of the public support and emotional appeal that *democracy* creates. Under a polity identified as such, Americans would experience democracy as a direction, not a place. You can’t arrive at **A** democracy anymore than you can arrive at **A** north. However, with work, creativity and constant vigilance, you can get closer to it. Which is exactly what a polity does. In Aristotle’s words, it tends toward democracy.

The ultimate paradox could turn out to be that in openly calling a polity a polity, a polity becomes for the first time ever…a real polity.

Only with a change *of*, not *in*, the American system of government -- from an oligarchy to a polity -- will the people no longer *need* The Great American Illusion and a boatload of subsidiary illusions, e.g., One Person, One Vote is a reality in America.

That is to say: the people will no longer *need* to be misled about their government.

A second definition from Merriam Webster:

**2. Delusion. A persistent false psychotic belief regarding the self or persons or objects outside the self that is maintained despite indisputable evidence to the contrary.**

*Illusion* and *delusion* are not mutually exclusive. An illusion can and often does develop into a delusion. You might want to wonder -- in more ways than one -- about the children’s books Obama is writing in the White House. Look beyond the ones with hard covers.

The Great American Illusion, Polity = Democracy (or its public version, Republic = Democracy), is already a delusion for massive numbers of people. Hundreds of thousands of American soldiers went to Iraq and Afghanistan absolutely convinced that their government -- an object outside the self -- is a democracy. They clung unto death to that belief despite indisputable evidence to the contrary.

This very moment, hundreds of thousands of American soldiers are carrying The Great American Illusion in their backpacks. You call it good for morale. I call it extra weight -- a weight that doesn’t go away when the backpacks are put down. Look at the walking dead veterans. In hospitals, drug rehab clinics, jails, divorce courts and unemployment lines, these used and discarded men and women are living, breathing testimony to a reality/belief discrepancy -- the *as if* world – the Great American Illusion traps them in. Out cold, carted off. FADE OUT.

As of last reports, reality is not going away anytime soon. With the change from a polity to an oligarchy, the lack of democracy is increasing, not decreasing. Which means, look for more walking dead in the future among soldiers of all sorts, not just ones in uniform.

Not all illusions are delusions. However, all delusions have illusions as a component. As the oligarchic political system tightens its grip, as the contradictions in income and power grow, as the police state required to enforce the new system becomes more abusive and blatant, the belief that America has a democracy will become ever more tenuously and desperately held. At some point, for the nation as a whole, The Great American Illusion will morph into The Great American Delusion, i.e., a persistent, false psychotic belief.

We may be closer than you think – one or two equations away.

While we’re at it, another Merriam Webster definition:

**3. Allusion. (1) an implied or indirect reference especially in literature. (2) the act of making an indirect reference to something.**

Illusion and allusion: again, the one does not preclude the other.

As noted, The Great American Illusion operates via The Great American Allusion: Polity = Republic = Democracy. Republic, it turns out, is the indirect reference to the polity.

We didn’t leave out the literature. Chapter 9:

**“Why it captured millions of hearts and minds is not difficult to discern. Polity = Democracy is one of the greatest poetic works of all times, i.e., you wish it was true. But it isn’t.”**

To a significant degree, the United States has government by allusion -- a highly poetically-charged one. Presidential candidate Barack Obama intuited that fact; it appeared repeatedly in his adult fairytales about “unity.” Watch, in particular, his [speech to the Democratic Convention](http://www:%20americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2004/barack_obama2004dnc.htm) in 2004, which launched his meteoric rise to the top. What were those unity excretions but a direct appeal to democracy -- a democracy not shown but *alluded to*, which does not, never did, and never will exist? They enabled him to leapfrog over thousands of more seasoned politicos, notably Hillary Clinton.

Those fairytales won him the presidency. You don’t believe it? Take away the unity appeals and you have…well, what exactly?

Chicago politico, he is. Nevertheless, Obama did not coldly manipulate the fairytales. Watch his facial expressions in 2004when he talked about unity; he is digging down deep. Which means Obama is as unconscious as 99% of Americans about such things. In that respect, he truly represents them.

The bottom line: his unity stories manipulate him more than he manipulates them. The truth is in the pudding: (i) the children’s books he continues to write in the White House. Perfect soldier that he is, Obama still *believes*. (ii) The next time Obama appears on TV, watch his eyes glued to the teleprompter, his deadpan delivery of predigested lines spoon-fed by media consultants. This is a man going through the motions. He is not acting; he is posing. The last remaining drop of spontaneity evaporated long ago and quickly, under the heat of the Guantanamo sun. Why does he bother? The problem is his investors. *Just one more fight*, they swear.

Win or lose, American spectators will effuse a collective sigh, Good night sweet prince -- push the button, change channels.

*You cannot be disillusioned without having an illusion in the first place*. It’s impossible. Barack Obama is clearly a disillusioned man, but that, tragically, does not mean he will be coming down to earth anytime soon. He shakes his head, grasps at straws. Again, the children’s stories. Foreign leaders have noticed the same thing, and are taking advantage of it.

There is precious little that is poetic on about the federal government. A trip to any of their offices will confirm that observation. There, you will see only gray on gray.

Unless, of course, you are delusional.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) As Chapter 7 noted, the Supreme Court has overtly denied that raw body counts are all that matter in reapportionment (see Gaffney v. Cummings (1973) and Burns v. Richardson (1966).) Granted the Court makes such common sense declarations from time to time, it fails to incorporate them into practice, e.g., it refused to hear the New Mexico case which reapportioned solely on raw body counts. The Court thereby let that ruling stand.

CHAPTER 10. The Ultimate Taboo Question

 *Source, where are you?*

 *Remedy, where are you?*

 *Economics, are you finally*

 *going to change?*

-- René Char, Feuillets d’Hypnos[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) --

The Third American Revolution resurrects the **политей**, the polity, but on a new, better basis.

That better basis is greater democracy.

A polity is moderated by a large middle class. And there’s the rub...

The American middle class has been declining economically since the 1970s. Official economic data are presented below.

To be or not to be? That is no longer the question. Economics, are you finally going to change? replaced it.

If economics do not change, the American middle class is doomed.

If the middle class is doomed, a polity is impossible.

If a polity is impossible, The Third American Revolution is nonsense.

Source, where are you? What is causing the economic ruin of the middle class?

\* \* \*

This chapter examines the disaster of our times.

You will never solve the middle class decline without discovering its source. You will never discover the source without asking the ultimate taboo question...

The American middle class is caught in a double play. Don´t look for it on CNN or PBS, Fox or Democracy Now. Forget Harvard and Stanford. Teacher and student, do not bring it up in class. If you work for the government, do what you always do: keep silent, confound and confuse, collect your biweekly paycheck and retire.

If you are a journalist, are granted an interview, and mention the double play, George Soros and Bill Gates will politely, firmly, look at their watches. To show it’s nothing personal, their bodyguards will gently close your car door for you: Ya’ll come back now, ya hear?

Why the national silence? The *Omerta* American Style?

Because of a national fear.

Nobody in government, academia, the media or any other cultural maximizer[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2) can pose forbidden questions. That activity is not in their job description. On the contrary: maximizers create and maintain the culture as it is, propagate it, integrate it -- including the national fear and the silence feeding it.

The Third American Revolution is no cultural maximizer. It goes straight to the ultimate taboo question:

Is the middle class being destroyed by processes intrinsic to capitalism?

That question takes us directly to Karl Marx, the pioneer on middle class decline.

*Karl Marx*: talk about an American taboo. All cultural maximizers reading these words: I do not wish to create problems for you. I don’t want your university president to get a call from his off-campus boss, telling him … So, for your wife’s and kids’ sake, you are cordially invited to stop reading this book. Go fishing with other Lake People, walk your golden retriever, play Parcheesi. Have fun -- good-bye.

On the middle class, Marx was right/wrong/right.

For him, the economic foundation of the middle class is inexorably destroyed as capitalism matures:

**“…the small tradespeople, shopkeepers and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants -- all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which Modern Industry is carried on and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because their specialized skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production...”**[**[iii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

For over a century, two socio-economic tendencies have held sway: (i) the enlargement of the scale of enterprise, notably via mergers,[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn4) and (ii) the disappearance of small extractors/producers, of which the most publicized example is the decline in small farms.[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn5)

Small producers thrown out at first base: there’s the first out in the double play. Joseph Schumpeter, no Marxist, summed up: “[T]he capitalist process unavoidably attacks the economic standing ground of the small producer and trader...Here of course Marx scores.”[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn6)

Also beyond dispute: the middle class in America and other developed Western nations was not destroyed. Why?

An economic revolution occurred in the twentieth century -- a revolution so monumental on an everyday level that it took place virtually unnoticed.

For the first time in recorded history, increased productivity allowed for more people to live off the maintenance and distribution of wealth -- soldiers, priests, doctors, lawyers, teachers, bureaucrats, stockbrokers, real estate agents, accountants -- than from the creation of that wealth.

In the United States, the service sector furnished 80% of all jobs in 2002, versus only 60% in 1960.[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn7)

America isn’t alone.[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn8) Looking at the 13 developed Western nations comprising the OECD, in 2005 over 70% of all employment was in the service sector, as well as nearly all employment growth.[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn9)

Marx did not foresee that incredible boom. In fact, as did every other political economist of his time, he missed it entirely.

The undeclared service sector revolution saved the middle class. That extraordinary salvation is why those who discount the evidence of a recent decline of the middle class, are not to be discounted. Their premises and conclusions are on a solid ground that continues to impress.

But is that salvation permanent or merely a pause?

The core of the service sector middle class consists of craftsmen, tradesmen and professionals. The foundation of their economic existence is higher levels of training and education required for tasks which are more complex.

How secure is that foundation?

Writing in 1776, Adam Smith identified a fundamental characteristic of capitalism: the division of labor.

**“The quantity of materials which the same number of people can work up, increases in a great proportion as labour comes to be more and more subdivided; and as the operations of each workman are gradually reduced to a greater degree of simplicity, a variety of new machines come to be invented for facilitating and abridging those operations.”**[**[x]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn10)

The division of labor begets simplification, which in turn begets routinization/standardization of work. The levels of training and education needed to perform complex tasks are lowered.

In short, under capitalism work tends toward machine-tending. Although Adam Smith no doubt overstated his case, his essential point remains valid:

**“Long apprenticeships are altogether unnecessary. The arts, which are much superior to common trades, such as those of making clocks and watches, contain no such mystery as to require a long course of instruction. The first invention of such beautiful machines, indeed, and even that of some of the instruments employed in making them, must, no doubt, have been the work of deep thought and long time, and may justly be considered as among the happiest efforts of human ingenuity. But when both have been fairly invented and are well understood, to explain to any young man, in the completest manner, how to apply the instruments and how to construct the machines cannot well require more than the lessons of a few weeks; perhaps those of a few days might be sufficient.”**[**[xi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn11)

A few days. It was Karl Marx who first saw the corrosive impact of the specialization of labor on what today is the core of the middle class, i.e., those with specialized skills.

Marx emphasized that not only production but also education and training themselves are sapped. He wrote of the “commercial worker [who] belongs to the better-paid class of wage workers -- to those whose labour is classed as skilled and stand above average labour,” that his wage

**“tends to fall, even in relation to average labour, with the advance of the capitalist mode of production. This is due [first] to the division of labour...Secondly, because the necessary training, knowledge of commercial practices, languages, etc., is more and more rapidly, easily, universally and cheaply reproduced with the progress of science and public education…The universality of public education enables capitalists to recruit such labourers from classes that formerly had no access to such trades and were accustomed to a lower standard of living. Moreover, this increases supply, and hence competition. With few exceptions, the labour-power of these people is therefore devaluated with the progress of capitalist production. Their wage falls, while their labour capacity increases.”**[**[xii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn12)

The erosion of skills and education is a long-term process. 60 years ago, when a polity existed and one could say such things and not be fired, the sociologist C. Wright Mills wrote:

**“[T]he rationalization and down-grading of the work operations themselves and hence the lessening importance of education and experience in acquiring white-collar skills, the leveling down of white-collar and the raising of wage-worker incomes, so that the differences between them are decidedly less than they once were; the increased size of the white-collar labor market, as more people from lower ranks receive high-school educations, so that any monopoly of formal training adequate to these jobs is no longer possible;…the increased participation of white-collar people, along with wage-workers, in unemployment...All the factors of their status position, which have enabled white-collar workers to set themselves apart from wage-workers, are now subject to definite decline. Increased rationalization is lowering the skill levels and making their work more and more factory-like.”**[**[xiii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn13)

A highly visible sign in our daily world of the simplification of work and the tendency of skill and wage levels to fall is the general para-lyzation occurring throughout developed economies -- the emergence of paramedics for doctors, paralegals for lawyers, etc.

More factory-like. You would think that institutions of higher learning would be leading the charge against the downgrading of education. Guess again. Their turf was sapped years ago. Downgrading in universities is observable every time an instructor is replaced by a graduate student teaching assistant or adjunct.[[xiv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn14) Beware: the downsizing of ivory towers has only just begun.

In point of fact, professors don’t understand the process Smith described as well as does the first unemployed guy you meet living under a bridge or the most illiterate Mexican assembly line worker pulling double shifts in a border town blue jeans maquiladora plant. It is not that the professors are stupid; rather, as cultural maximizers, they are paid to study certain things -- which means, they are paid NOT to study others.

As did the middle class in the production sector, will the middle class in the service sector decline?

The service sector revolution is too recent a phenomenon to be fully understood. An answer can be drawn inferentially, however, and it is shocking.

Back in 1996, the economist Edward N. Wolff sounded the alarm:

**“Between 1983 and 1992, real incomes have fallen for all households except the top 20 percent of the income distribution. Median net worth has also fallen. Median financial wealth was the same in 1992 as in 1983 -- still only $10,000. The average indebtedness of American families relative to their assets continued to rise between 1983 and 1992…There has been almost no trickle down of economic growth to the average family: almost all the growth in household income and wealth has accrued to the richest 20 percent. The finances of the average American family are more fragile in the 1990s than in the early 1980s. It is not surprising that there is a growing sense of economic insecurity in the country.”**[**[xv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn15)

The specialization of labor undercuts higher training, education and specialized skills. *Thrown out at home.* That is the second out in the double play.

It is time to look at the harrowing realities of the new America. They are not comfortable to see; however, you **cannot ignore them and escape chaos.**

**To view them in naked black and white, go to** [**www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/data/historical/families/index.html**. Table F-2](http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/data/historical/families/index.html.%20Table%20F-2)**.**

**What you will see:**

**The census bureau periodically takes the U.S.A. population and divides it into five equal parts. The bureau then reports the size of the slice of the national income pie going to each fifth. Thus, in 1947, the poorest fifth received 5.0% of our nation’s income. In 2009, that same fifth received only 3.9%.**

**Undoubtedly, a poor American today is well off compared to a poor Chinaman in the 1100s.** Poor**,** middle **and** rich **are defined not in absolute terms but rather** relative to the total wealth **of the society in question.**

**Once that definition is accepted, the figures cited above for the lowest fifth of the American population speak for themselves. But how are American families in general doing?**

**(1) The richest, top fifth of all families received 43.0% of the national income in 1947. In 2009, their share had ballooned to 48.2%.**

First conclusion: the rich are getting richer**.**

**Two facts worth noting: (i) the mega-rich benefited the most. The slice of the national income pie going to the top 5% of all families grew from 17.5% in 1947 to 20.7% in 2009. (ii) The rise of the rich is relatively recent. The share going to the top 5% actually declined after 1947 until 1989, the first year of the Bush Sr. administration, when it reached 17.9%. Thereafter, the climb continued, consolidated.**

**(2) The rich and their spokesmen like to say a rising tide raises all boats. Sorry, not true. The rise of the rich took place directly at the expense of those least able to afford it. The share of national income going to the lowest two fifths of the population fell from 16.9% in 1947 to 13.3% in 2009.**

Second conclusion: the poor are getting poorer**.**

**(3) 1947?** Old stuff**, you sniff.**

**O.K., let’s run the clock back only to 1995, Bill Clinton’s third year as president. As of 2009, (i) the lowest, poorest fifth of the population’s share of the income pie fell from 4.4% to 3.9%; the share of the second lowest fifth fell from 10.1% to 9.4%; of the third fifth (the middle) from 15.8% to 15.3%. The slice going to the fourth fifth stayed at 23.2%. The share going to the remaining fifth, the richest, rose from 46.5% to 48.2%. (ii) If** middle class **is defined as the second, third and fourth fifths of the population, then the share of the national income going to the middle class in 1995-2009 shrank from 49.1% to 47.9%.**

Third conclusion: the middle class is shrinking.

**(4) The fall of the middle class, like the rise of the rich, is a relatively recent phenomenon. In 1981, Ronald Reagan’s first year as president, the middle class (second, third, and fourth fifths) received 53.5% of America’s income. In 2009, the middle class’s share had slipped to 47.9%. (During the same period, the slice going to the richest 5% of the population ballooned from 14.4% to 20.7%).**

(5) **In 1992, the middle class’s share of America’s income pie was 51.0%. In 1993, its share slipped to 48.9%, and never again rose above 50%. More on that threshold later.**

Poor poorer, rich richer, middle class smaller**. The triple-edged sword is as deadly as it is undeniable.**

**\* \* \***

The service sector revolution’s newness is not the only thing complicating analysis of where the middle class is and where it is going.

The service sector per se is in the contentious and litigious category of subjects on which billions of dollars and immense political power are riding on definitions. Organic, national security, pornography, sanity: the category is as big as the money and power at stake.

The definition of poverty serves as an instructive example. In 1999, the United States Census Bureau began

**"to revise its definition of what constitutes poverty in the United States…**

**The bureau’s new approach would in effect raise the income threshold for living above poverty to $19,500 for a family of four, from the $16,600 now considered sufficient. Suddenly, 46 million Americans, or 17 percent of the population, would be recognized as officially below the line, not the 12.7 percent announced last month, the lowest level in nearly a decade…**

**Sociologists and economists who study what people must earn to escape poverty in the United States place the line even higher...** **[T]hey put the threshold for a family of four somewhere between $21,000 and $28,000…**

**In opinion polls, Americans draw the poverty line above $20,000…**

**But a higher threshold means government spending would have to rise to pay for benefits that are tied to the poverty level, like food stamps and Head Start programs. That would require an incursion into the budget surplus that neither Republicans nor Democrats seek."**[**[xvi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn16)

Further complicating any analysis, a transition is taking place in services (see below), and *transitions are by definition difficult to define*. The ongoing dispute over defining service sector illustrates the problem:

**"Is cooking a hamburger patty and inserting the meat, lettuce and ketchup inside a bun a manufacturing job, like assembling automobiles?**

**That question is posed in the new Economic Report of the President, a thick annual compendium of observations and statistics on the health of the U.S. economy.**

**Putting jobs at McDonald’s, Burger King and other fast-food enterprises in the same category as those at industrial companies like General Motors and Eastman Kodak might seem like a stretch…**

**But the presidential report points out that the current system for classifying jobs ‘is not straightforward…When a fast-food restaurant sells a hamburger, for example, is it providing a "service" or is it combining inputs to "manufacture" a product?’ the report asks.** **Sometimes, seeming subtle differences can determine whether an industry is classified as manufacturing. For example, mixing water and concentrate to produce soft drinks is classified as manufacturing. However, if that activity is performed at a snack bar, it is considered a service.**

**The report notes that the Census Bureau’s North American Industry Classification System defines manufacturing as covering enterprises that are ‘engaged in the mechanical, physical or chemical transformation of materials, substances or components into new products.’**

**Classifications matter, the report says, because among other things, they can affect which businesses receive tax relief [sic]…**

**David Huether, chief economist for the National Association of Manufacturers, said that he had heard for several years that some economists wanted to count hamburger flipping as a manufacturing job, which he noted would result in statistical reports showing many more jobs in what has been a declining sector of the economy."**[**[xvii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn17)

Given such complications and confusion, we are compelled to proceed neither inductively nor deductively but abductively from hard economic data to the following axiom:

Our era is characterized by the conversion of services into commodities. In the process, services are being subjected to the same division, simplification and standardization characterizing commodity production in general. As in the production sector in the past, in the service sector today those processes are eroding the complexity of tasks and the higher levels of education and training needed to fulfill them.

What took that conversion, i.e., capitalism, so long to enter the service sector?

Professions, tradesmen, craftsmen: the heritage of the middle class service sector comes from the European feudal guilds, not from the proletariat. The two are decidedly different. In fact, an essential role of the guilds in the Middle Ages was to lock out the emerging urban proletariat.

Adam Smith portrayed in stark terms the fierce, anti-capitalism nature of the feudal guilds in his discussion of how, if a trade were too easily learned, the apprentice

**“would have more competitors, and his wages, when he came to be a complete workman, would be much less than at present. The same increase in competition would reduce the profits of the masters as well as the wages of the workmen. The trades, the crafts, the mysteries, would all be losers. But the public would be a gainer, the work of all artificers coming in this way much cheaper to market.**

**It is to prevent this reduction of price, and consequently of wages and profit, by restraining that free competition which would most certainly occasion it, that all corporations [i.e., guilds], and the greater part of corporation laws, have been established…**

**The inhabitants of a town, being collected into one place, can easily combine together. The most insignificant trades carried on in towns have accordingly, in some place or other, been incorporated, and even where they have never been incorporated, yet the corporation spirit, the jealousy of strangers, the aversion to take apprentices, or to communicate the secret of their trade, generally prevail in them, and often teach them, by voluntary associations and agreements, to prevent that free competition which they cannot prohibit by bye-laws.”[1]**

Secret books, secret machines, secret networks -- in sum, the education and training necessary to perform higher level tasks: those were the economic foundations of the feudal guilds. Today, those same foundations provide for the economic survival of the service sector middle class.

With time, however, capitalism degrades and weakens those foundations because higher rates of profit are found in commodities, not in the corporation spirit and other feudal residues. The constant search for higher profits is why the division of labor and its impersonal simplification and standardization of work characterize capitalism, as opposed to personalized feudal mercantilism.[[xviii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn18) Against the desperate, constant quest for higher profits, the service sector, insulated for centuries by guild principles and practices, i.e., the mysteries -- could not hold out indefinitely.[[xix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn19)

Because socio-economic forces are causing the decline of the middle class, it is reasonable to suppose that decline will take place in conjunction with those forces, i.e., move cyclically and over the long term with the economic cycles inherent to capitalism. That basic assumption -- and only The Third American Revolution has it -- is opposed not only to the perennial Marxist prediction of an imminent middle class crash but also to the conservative, often fanatical faith of *status quo* defenders who see the middle class as eternal and predestined to expand.

But what does long term mean?

Again, the service sector revolution is so recent we have little historical precedent for guidance. Furthermore, wars and other unforeseeable catastrophes have a large impact on economic inequality trends. Nevertheless, as a probative point of departure, one study found that income inequality in the United States in 2002 reached levels last seen some eighty years ago.[[xx]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn20) If experience bears out that time frame, the decline of the middle class could occur over centuries.

So, how long is long? Nobody knows.

In the meantime, two conclusions of The Third American Revolution are probative:

(i) In the course of its economic decline, the American middle class slipped below the critical 50% threshold of all households. The middle class simply no longer had the economic strength to moderate other classes. That weakness accounts for why the polity was replaced by an oligarchy.

(ii) The polity and a large middle class are hallmarks of Western civilization. Without them, that civilization ceases to exist as we know it.

Overall decline, cyclical swings: the most poignant statement of the middle class’s trajectory is not found in economics. Edgar Allan Poe expressed it in the title of his 1842 novel, The Pit and The Pendulum.

The terrors of the Spanish Inquisition that Poe feared, however, are microscopic compared to those which will result from the collapse of the Western world.

Source, where are you? The Third American Revolution found it -- the ultimate taboo answer to the ultimate taboo question: capitalism’s double play against the middle class.

Two outs, nobody on. Home team losing.

Inning unknown but fans heading for the exits.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) (« Où êtes-vous source? Où êtes-vous remède? Économie vas-tu enfin changer ? ») René Char, Feuillets d’Hypnos, Gallimard, Paris, 2007, p. 18. (Fragment 37).

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) The anthropologist [Jules Henry](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jules_Henry) :

**“All great cultures, and those moving in the direction of greatness, have an elite which might be called the cultural maximizers whose function is to maintain or push further the culture’s greatness and integration…The functions of a cultural maximizer include organization (i.e., maintaining the level of integration of the culture as it is) and contributing certain qualitative features necessary to the continuance of the cultural life. His function is never to alter the culture radically. He may help to give more intense expression to features that already exist, but he never wants to bring about a fundamental change. Thus, those who have the capacity to maximize culture in this sense are among the elite in all highly developed civilizations.”**

Jules Henry, Culture Against Man, Random House, 1963, p. 31.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3) Karl Marx and Frederic Engels, The Communist Manifesto, in Dirk J. Struik, Editor, Birth of The Communist Manifesto, translated by Samuel Moore, International Publishers, New York, 1971, p. 97.

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref4) In politics, appearance and reality seldom coincide. You think Republicans are more pro-big business than Democrats?

**“‘We’re in the greatest merger wave in history …,’ said John Shepard Wiley Jr., a professor of antitrust law at the University of California at Los Angeles. ‘There has been a sea change in attitudes toward large mergers. It’s a much different philosophy from the 1960s when the polestar was the protection of small business.’**

**During the 12 years of the Reagan and Bush administrations, which are widely viewed as among the most permissive antitrust periods of the century, there were 85,064 corporate mergers valued at more the $3.5 trillion, according to Securities Data Co. Under nearly seven years of the Clinton administration, there have so far been 166,310 deals valued at more than $9.8 trillion."**

Stephen Labaton, “Clinton Legacy Still Remains Merger Friendly,” International Herald Tribune, November 9, 1999.

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref5) Agriculture is the economic base of Iowa. A native Iowan provided this case study:

**"The percentage of the population over 80 is larger in Iowa than in any other U.S. state. Iowa is the only one besides Florida with more people over 75 than under five.**

**The population problem in Iowa is not merely that its residents are getting old and its young people are leaving. The problem is tied directly to the character of agriculture in the state. In 1960 there were 174,707 farms in Iowa, down from a peak of around 215,000 in 1930. Last year there were about 96,000 farms, though the amount farmland in cultivation had barely changed. There are 15 million hogs in Iowa, but they are raised on fewer than half as many farms as just a decade ago.**

**It can be hard to grasp the implications of a shift that large.**

**Think of a farm, for a moment, not as a tract of land or so many acres of corn and soybeans. Think of a farm instead as a constellation of people, each of whom has ties to a local community, to churches and schools, to banks and farm implement dealers, to co-ops and Lions Clubs.**

**In 1960, small towns were thriving not on the prosperity of town residents alone but on the prosperity and the population of farms in the adjoining countryside.**

**Now half of those farms are gone, their groves cut down, their houses bulldozed, their constellations of people dispersed. Year by year, the size of farms increases and their work force diminishes. School districts have consolidated, and small town business is just a ghost of itself. It is not uncommon to come across a sense of disinheritance among Iowans, especially those in small towns.**

**The bond that tied them to the farmland around them, a bond that was social as well as economic, has to a striking degree been severed.**

**There is no one on the farms, and the towns have no one to serve except their aging residents.**

**All of this has come about because of a faith, an unproved faith, that the only way for agriculture to prosper is for farms to become bigger and bigger.**

**There is no question that Iowa raises vastly more corn and soybeans than it did in 1960. But at what cost? Farm prices are as low as they have ever been, and farmers now pray for emergency funding from Congress the way they pray for rain..."**

Verlyn Klinkenborg, “Bigger Farms Don’t Make For a Contented Iowa,” International Herald Tribune, September 5, 2000.

The time has come to dynamite a popular illusion:

**"The idea that the United States is a nation of entrepreneurs and self-starters has become almost accepted wisdom.**

**‘Welcome to the free-agent nation,’ declares Tom Peters, one of the world’s best-known management gurus. Thirty million Americans -- and counting -- are now some form of freelancer, recent articles in business magazines have proclaimed. This is the era of the** ´**e-lance economy,**´ **experts say, with the Internet allowing millions of people to bid goodbye to corporate life and become their own bosses.**

**There is a problem, however, with this futuristic, seemingly sensible vision: It does not appear to jibe with reality…**

**Since 1994, the number of self-employed Americans outside agriculture has fallen by 146,000, to 12.9 million, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The period from 1994 to 1999, hailed as a golden age for entrepreneurs, is actually the first five-year span since the 1960s in which the number of self-employed fell…**

**‘We have this idea that everyone’s out there working for themselves,’ said Robert Fairlie, an assistant professor at the University of California at Santa Cruz who has studied the history of self-employment. Instead, he said, millions of Americans have joined the working economy during the decade-long boom and almost all of them were employed by existing businesses.**

**And, contrary to an earlier trend, most of them have taken jobs with big companies. Those with a least 1,000 employees have grown the fastest since 1994, while the percentage of people working for companies with fewer than 25 workers has slipped to 29 percent from 30.1 percent.**

**In fact, running a small business or acting as an independent consultant has in many ways become more difficult than it once was, analysts say…**

**The decline in self-employment has accelerated since 1997, and it has occurred in most industries, including construction, finance, retail and services in general. The drop has also taken place in every region…"**

David Leonhardt, “Shattering The Myth of ‘E-Lancers,’” International Herald Tribune, December 2/3, 2000.

[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref6) Joseph A. Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, Harper Collins, 1975, p. 140.

[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref7) David Leonhardt, “History Points to a Relatively Small U.S. Economic Rebound for 2002,” International Herald Tribune, January 3, 2002.

[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref8) France provides another case study: Professor François Chatagner wrote that the most spectacular development of the past 50 years has been the explosion in the number of white-collar workers. The French service sector contained only 15% of the working population in 1936, versus over 50% in 1997. As for small producers, after World War II farms in France became more concentrated, and non-agricultural independent producers -- artisans, small commercial and industrial enterprises -- were reduced from l7.5% of the working population to 7.5%.

François Chatagner, Les Classes sociales: pertinence et permanence, Le Monde Éditions, Paris, 1997, pp. 53, 54, 55, 58.

[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) OECD, [resume](http://www.oecd.org/LongAbstract/0.3425%2Cfr.) of “Enhancing The Performance of The Service Sector,” 2005.

[[x]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations, Penguin Books, London, England, 1997, p. 372.

[[xi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref11) Ibid., p. 226.

[[xii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref12) Karl Marx, Das Kapital, translator unknown, Volume III, International Publishers, New York, 1970, pp. 300-1.

[[xiii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref13) C. Wright Mills, White Collar: The American Middle Classes, Oxford University Press, New York, 1956, pp. 249, 297.

[[xiv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref14)

**"WASHINGTON. Compared to other industries, universities’ product -- knowledge -- may be more abstruse, and their function more complex than turning out widgets. The way they have reshaped their work force, however, is taken right from the pages of Corporate America’s handbook.**

**The ‘casualization’ of labor -- allowing the attrition of full-time staff, then replace them with cheaper part-timers -- has become commonplace in business, and just as much so in higher education…**

**Part-time professors make up nearly half of the faculty in America’s institutes of higher education, compared to one-fifth 30 years ago, according to the U.S. Department of Education.**

**The hardscrabble existence of part-timers who piece together a living course by course (usually getting between $1,500 and $2,000 for each) generally includes no health insurance, or phone number, or cost-of-living raises. They often commute between several colleges. Their schools don’t pay their way to conferences, or their journal subscriptions. In some cases, they don’t even get a library card…**

**An adjunct typically teaches twice as many classes and three times as many students as a full-time, tenure-track professor. Only 59 percent hold office hours, compared to 91 percent of full-timers, according to the American Association of University Professors…**

**With less time to spend, adjuncts give fewer assignments and essay exams, and they are less likely to be able to nurture a long-term mentoring relationship with students, write recommendations or serve as an adviser.**

**Adjuncts rarely get to do the research that would keep them on top of their profession. Part-timers complain, too, that they lack what is the bedrock of the concept of university:  intellectual and creative freedom.**

**And, many part-timers say, they can’t afford to truly challenge their students. Unlike tenure-track professors, whose performance is measured against detailed criteria, adjuncts are generally judged solely by students’ evaluations. Woe to the professor who gets on the wrong side of the 18-year-olds."**

Linda Perlstein, “Can Adjuncts Do the Job?,” International Herald Tribune, February 15, 1999.

Today, the most controversial form of downgrading of tasks is outsourcing. The legal profession is a case in point:

**"NEW YORK: Bruce Masterson, the chief operating officer of Socrates Media, asked his outside counsel to customize a residential lease for all 50 U.S. states in 2003. About $400,000 was the firm’s estimate. He rejected that cost and hired QuisLex, a firm in Hyderabad, India, that did the work for $45,000.**

**‘It was good quality,’ said Masterson, whose company, which is based in Chicago, publishes legal forms on the Internet. ‘We’ve been working together ever since.’**

**Clients are pushing law firms like Jones Day and Kirkland & Ellis to send basic legal tasks to India, where lawyers tag documents and investigate takeover targets for as little as $20 an hour. The firms are part of a trend that will move about 50,000 U.S. legal jobs overseas by 2015, said Forrester Research in Boston."**

Cynthia Cotts and Liane Kufchock, “U.S. legal work is moving overseas, and India wins a big part,” International Herald Tribune, August 22, 2007.

[[xv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref15) Edward N. Wolff, Top Heavy: The Increasing Inequality of Wealth in America and What Can be Done about it, The New Press, New York, 1996, pp. 73-4.

Wolff’s disturbing picture was still relevant over a decade later. Candidates are converting it into political hay, little else:

**"WASHINGTON: On Capitol hill and on the presidential campaign trail, Democrats are increasingly moving toward a full-throated populist critique of the economy under President George W. Bush…**

**Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York calls it ‘trickle-down economics without the trickle.’…**

**[T]he latest resurgence of populism is deeply rooted in the current economic realities of stagnated wages and fears about losing jobs, analysts say, and it is framing debates over tax policy, education, trade, energy and health care…**

**[There is] a striking contrast with the approach taken by Democrats during much of the 1990s, when President Bill Clinton asserted that trade would create American jobs and that paying attention to the concerns of Wall Street would help the economy by lowering interest rates…**

**Democrats say they are responding to economic trends that the statistics in the headlines do not capture, including middle-class insecurity about job loss, the affordability of health insurance and the costs of education. The times have changed, those Democrats argue, and six years of Republican tax and economic policies have heightened the inequities…**

**[A]ll the major Democratic candidates for president are promising to use government to ease the insecurity of the middle class, on issues from education to health care."**

Robin Toner, “Democrats lean left on economy,” International Herald Tribune, July 17, 2007.

For the record: the Census Bureau’s historical income tables show that between 1992 and 2000, the Clinton presidency years, the poorest fifth of the American population’s share of the national income fell from 3.8% to 3.6%; the richest fifth’s share rose from 46.9% to 49.8% (the top 5%’s share rose from 18.6% to 22.1%); and the share of the middle class -- the middle 60% of the population -- fell from 49.4% to 46.7%.

[[xvi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref16) Louis Uchitelle, “More Cash in Hand, but Poorer,” International Herald Tribune, October 19, 1999.

[[xvii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref17) David Cay Johnston, “Should burger-flipping be a heavy industry?,” International Herald Tribune, February 21/22, 2004.

[[xviii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref18) Michel Foucault identified

**"the defining characteristics of guild apprenticeship: a relationship of dependence simultaneously individual and total vis-à-vis the master; a fixed duration of training that is completed by a qualifying proof, but that cannot be broken down into a precise program; a wide exchange between the master who should give his knowledge and the apprentice who should give his services, his aid, and often a remittance. A form of domesticity is mixed with a transfer of knowledge."**

(« [L]es caractères propres à l’apprentissage corporatif : rapport de dépendance à la fois individuelle et totale à l’égard du maître ; durée statuaire de la formation qui est conclue par une épreuve qualificatrice ; mais qui ne se décompose pas selon un programme précis ; échange global entre le maître qui doit donner son savoir et l’apprenti qui doit apporter ses services, son aide et souvent une rétribution. La forme de la domesticité se mêle à un transfert de connaissance. »)

Michel Foucault, Surveiller et punir, Gallimard, Paris, 2000, pp. 183-4.

[[xix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref19)

**"Paris. Thomson is a French electronics company that was close to bankruptcy in the 1990s when it was state-owned, no longer able to make money manufacturing televisions, video players and other consumer gizmos in the face of fierce competition. Then, it made an unusual move…**

**‘We’ve completely changed the nature of our activities,’[Frank Dangeard, Thomson’s chief executive] said…‘Our business today has nothing to do with consumer electronics.’...**

**Manufacturing also still accounts for a sizable -- though dwindling -- portion [i.e., about 30%] of European employment…**

**But providing global services, like managing vast amounts of information and technology, has become as important as the act of manufacturing a product in the developed West. In fact, often ‘it’s more lucrative to provide those services than to continue making things,’ said Peter Daniels, director of the Service Sector Research Unit at the University of Birmingham in England.**

**‘Ten years ago, you invested in the local Coca-Cola bottler when a country liberalized,’ said Charles Elliott, an analyst with Goldman Sachs in London. ‘Now you invest in services providing digital entertainment services.’…**

**‘There is a big question mark over whether services and solutions are a viable long-term escape route,’ said Yves Doz, a professor of global technology and innovation at the business school Insead."**

James Kanter, “European firms bloom by shifting to services,” International Herald Tribune, June 7, 2005.

[[xx]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref20) Thomas Piketty and Emmanuel Saez, [“Income inequality in the United States, 1902-2002.”](http://elsa.berkeley.edu/~saez/)

CHAPTER 11. The Oligarchy’s Solution: "Happiness House."

 Merry and tragical! Tedious and brief!

 That is, hot ice and wonderous strange snow.

 How shall we find the concord of this discord?

-- William Shakespeare, “A Midsummer-Night’s Dream” --

Act V, Scene 1[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1)

An American disaster could submerge the Western world in anarchy. No need to wait. You are living the disaster right now.

The rich are getting richer, the poor poorer, the middle class smaller.

Is there a remedy?

If not, men who heretofore have been parallel to history will create history without parallel. Not Character is Destiny but Characters are Destiny -- hysterics with gun and knife in hand, nuclear weapons too, will tell you what to think, how to live. And you thought Mad Max was just a movie -- that you had seen the end of bin Laden.

The Third American Revolution is the only alternative to high-tech and low-tech pandemonium without precedent. That Revolution seeks to resurrect -- with crucial changes -- the form of government founded by Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and the other Founding Fathers. Their creation, The First American Revolution, set the world on a new course.

In 2008-2009, The Second Revolution occurred. The mega-rich killed the polity and replaced it with an oligarchy.

Again, The Third American Revolution resurrects the polity but with major changes. Those changes give more power to the democratic component, less to the oligarchy. Without that better balance, any “remedy” is not worth a child’s tear.

And there are remedies. I count 10.

With so many remedies, why is there a problem?

Some remedies are more remedies than others. Also, it depends on what problem you have in mind...

This chapter looks at the three remedies offered by the ruling mega-rich, the oligarchy, the top 5% of American households receiving 20% of the nation’s revenues. They make more clipping coupons in one minute watching iCarly reruns than you do working hard all year.

You think Carly’s vacuous presence is not a role model for oligarchs? At $180,000 per episode, think again.

I would skip entirely the oligarchy’s remedies were they not creating the prevailing feeling-tone of America today.

(1) We need to unleash Adam Smith’s guiding hand. Unbridled capitalism will mysteriously and unfailingly find the solution. Just leave the market alone, give the mega-rich more megabucks, cut their taxes, and everything will be fine. Honest.

The Third American Revolution calls this remedy by its real name: surf nazi economics. I give it two minutes of coupon-clipping time because, like certain shampoos, it creates the problem it pretends to solve.

Of course, for the hyper-rich, what problem? They are richer than ever; hence, this remedy is indeed a remedy.

Oligarchs and iCarly aside, virtually nobody believes in wanton capitalism. For those disappearing few who do believe and who are not oligarchs, I will step aside and let your fate be determined by the guiding hand you trust so much: the guiding hand giving you a court order and the other guiding hands waiting nearby -- of the movers, reaching out, taking your home entertainment center, the cherrywood dining table Grandpa made, Apple Computer, wife’s car and jewelry, kids’ toys and comic books; the guiding hand pounding the “For Sale” sign in the front yard; the guiding hand guiding your wife/husband and family out of divorce court to a new life after you lose the case; the guiding hand giving you a subpoena after you missed your first child support payment; the guiding hand giving you a pink slip after 30+ years of faithful service; the guiding hand handing you $50 and a mystery package, then whispering the guiding words, *All ya gotta do is…*; the guiding hand closing the door to your cell where other guiding hands eagerly await you; the guiding hand committing you to a retirement home where visible hands become invisible hands when it comes time to empty bedpans; the guiding hand throwing dirt on your casket. Your two minutes are up.

(2) Incompetence and (3) corruption. These two remedies belong together -- increasingly so. They are forming a new fact of life under oligarchic rule: incomcruption.

Capitalism’s division of labor, i.e., its simplification of tasks and reduction of educational and training levels (Chapter 10), erode the economic foundation of the core of the middle class, which today is in the service sector. Under capitalism *that erosion cannot be stopped, much less reversed*. However, it can be slowed.

Given capitalism’s primordial quest for higher profits, incompetence and corruption -- along with public and private subsidies necessary to pay for them -- are totally, completely, absolutely unacceptable. Nevertheless, they are accepted because they are preferable to the immediate collapse of the middle class.

Wonderous, strange new snow, indeed.

One need only look at the most important institution of the middle class, the United States Government. Incompetence and corruption are one thing, but to recognize them and not correct them -- to be incapable of correcting them because the means of correction themselves are incompetent and corrupt[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2) -- is another.

I lived in Moscow in 1994, when a joke was circulating. In the days of the Soviet Union, the people pretended to work and the government pretended to pay them. In America, the joke doesn’t work because the government really, truly does pay them.[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3)

Thus, incompetence and corruption in their manifold manifestations -- bureaupathic behavior, inefficiency, duplication of effort, waste -- have an indispensable place in the Western world. That world talks and acts as if they were not necessary -- but they are. The preservation of the middle class -- the bureaucrat watching the clock, the accountant who can’t add, the tenured professor lecturing from 30-year old notes -- is paramount, the vexations and traumas of individuals involved therein, incidental.

Feudal guild principles and practices -- not capitalist ones-- form the heritage of the service sector middle class (Chapter 10). Exploitative, jealous, secretive: you might want to read Adam Smith’s description again. That heritage makes the service sector middle class ready, willing and able to make certain, well… compromises.

Rich richer, poor poorer, middle class smaller. Faced with a calamity that could create a Dark Ages a lot darker than the last one, American politicians and oligarchs seek, above all, to be “realistic.” They behave as if *Realism = Competence*. Such is the new millennium American code.

The trick is to recognize that their “realism” and competence are not equivalent -- unlike incompetence and corruption.[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn4) The latter are rapidly morphing from fraternal into identical twins. Shakespeare caught the drift:

**"We came into the world like brother and brother;**

**And now let’s go hand in hand, not one before another."**[**[v]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn5)

As for distinguishing incompetence from corruption, as time passes the distinction is becoming less important -- indeed, possible.[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn6) Hand in hand, they provoked the most startling speech ever delivered by an American politician…

On July 15, 1979, President Jimmy Carter gave his famous -- or infamous -- Malaise Speech. **“This is not a message of happiness or reassurance,”** he announced, **“but it is the truth and it is a warning.”**

Carter spoke of a **“crisis of the American spirit”** striking **“at the very heart and soul and spirit of our national will”**:

**"The erosion of our confidence in the future is threatening to destroy the social and the political fabric of America…**

**In a nation that was proud of hard work, strong families, close-knit communities, and our faith in God, too many of us now tend to worship self-indulgence and consumption. Human identity is no longer defined by what one does, but by what one owns."**

President Carter summed up the malaise as **“paralysis and stagnation and drift.”**[**[vii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn7). But if he correctly described the symptoms, he completely failed to identify the germ.

Which is not surprising…

That germ, incomcruption, can be understood only if

(i) the crucial importance of socio-economic class is accepted. When they turn out the lights and stare at the ceiling, Americans *know* social classes matter. However, they *behave* as if classes do not count or do not exist.

(ii) It is recognized that the political system governing America until recently was not a democracy but a polity, i.e., a hybrid of oligarchy and democracy.

An explanation is called for:

Tocqueville believed that in the United States, **“where public officials have absolutely no class interest they want to prevail,”** incompetence and corruption were individual and not *systemic*. The reason was that in any (so-called) democracy such as America’s,

**"the bad administration of a public official is an isolated fact that only has influence during the short term of that administration. Corruption and incompetence are not mutual interests which can tie men together in a permanent manner.**

**A corrupt or incompetent public official will not combine his efforts with another official on the sole basis that the latter is incompetent and corrupt like him, and these two men will never work together for the goal of having corruption and incompetence flourish in their great-nephews. The ambition and maneuvers of the one will serve, on the contrary, to unmask the other. The vices of an official in democracies are in general entirely personal, individual.**

**But public officials in an aristocracy have a class interest that forms…a mutual and durable connection. It invites them to unite and to combine their efforts toward a goal that is not always the happiness of the greatest number…**

**Why should one be surprised if an official in an aristocracy is completely unable to resist? Also, one often sees, in an aristocracy, the spirit of a class carry in its wake those whom it does not corrupt, and makes them, without them being aware of it, accommodate society little by little to their practices, and prepare it for their descendants.**[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn8)

The economic meltdown and megabuck handout in 2008-2009, showed billions of times that Tocqueville’s hypothesis that incompetence and corruption in America are entirely individual and not systemic, is not valid today.

A landmark trial in the year 2000 gave an early warning. The case involved CUC International where a *culture of corruption* was in place:

**NEWARK, New Jersey. In pleading guilty to fraud, three former executive of CUC International said that for almost the entire history of the company, its top executives directed a conspiracy to inflate profits so as to meet Wall Street analysts’ forecasts and to keep the stock price high.**

**The three former executives pleaded guilty to federal charges in what the authorities said was the largest and longest accounting fraud in history, continuing at least 12 years and costing investors $19 billion…**

**“It was a culture that had been developing over many years,” Cosmo Corigliano, the former chief financial officer of CUC and the most senior executive to plead guilty, said when asked by Judge William Walls why he had participated in the conspiracy.**

**“It was just ingrained in all of us, ingrained in us by our superiors, over a very long period of time, that that was what we did,” said Mr. Corigliano. He said the conspiracy to falsify the company’s books had been directed by his corporate superiors, although he did not identify them…**

**In a packed courtroom, Judge Walls tried to cut through the accounting jargon. “Don’t we call that cooking the books?” he asked [Casper. Sabatino, a CUC accountant].**

**“Yes, sir,” Mr. Sabatino replied.**

**“Why did you do it?” the judge asked.**

**“Honestly, your honor, I just thought I was doing my job,” Mr. Sabatino replied."**[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn9)

Incompetence and corruption which are *systemic* or cultural, then, testify -- applying Tocqueville’s logic -- to the presence of a significant oligarchy/aristocracy.[[x]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn10) Once the latter is recognized, however, it follows that the political system under consideration is not a democracy. This conclusion is the flip side of Tocqueville’s thesis that if there are *no* classes in America, then any incompetence or corruption there can *only* be individual.

The recognition of (i) the saliency of socioeconomic class and (ii) a powerful oligarchy is essential to explain the malaise President Carter described. That recognition, as noted, is almost nonexistent in America today. No wonder that, in searching for an explanation of the general feeling tone of the country -- that it is on the wrong track – only silence and mystery prevail.

Savage capitalism, incompetence, corruption: President Carter’s speech resonnated words from150 years earlier. Tocqueville described where America was headed.

He foresaw an anti-utopian future. **“I think that the type of oppression which menaces democratic peoples will be unlike anything that has come before it.”** He presented this 1984 Big Brother scenario:

**“I see an immense crowd of men all alike and equal who turn around themselves ceaselessly, in order to acquire small and vulgar pleasures with which they fill up their souls. Each one, marginalized, is a stranger to the destiny of all the others…, and although he may still have a family, it can be said that he has no country.**

**Above all of them is an immense, titular power, which designates itself to be the sole provider of their joys and to look over their fate. That power is absolute, detailed, regular, attentive, and soft. It would be like a paternal power if it had as a purpose the preparation of men to be adults; but it seeks, on the contrary, to keep them irrevocably in infancy. It wants its citizens to be joyful, as long as they dream only of being joyful. It works willingly for their happiness; but it wants to be the only agent and arbitrator of happiness. It provides for its citizens’ security, anticipates and takes care of their needs, facilitates their pleasures, takes in hand their major affairs, directs their industry, regulates their successions, divides their inheritances. Can it not take away entirely the trouble of thinking and the pain of living?**

**Thus, with each day that passes, the titular power renders less useful and rarer the work of an independent arbitrator;…it does not break people’s wills, but it softens them, bends them, directs them. It rarely compels people to act, but it endlessly opposes their actions. It does not destroy, it stops from being born; it never tyrannizes, but it bothers, it upsets, it snuffs out, it creates problems, and it reduces in the end each nation to being a herd of timid and hardworking animals, of which the government is the shepherd.**

**I have always believed that sort of servitude, controlled, sweet and peaceful, which I have depicted, could combine itself better than is generally imagined with some of the exterior forms of liberty, and that it would not be impossible for it to establish itself in the very shadow of the sovereignty of the people.”**[**[xi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn11)

Far more than any prison, hospitals incarnate the soft, tranquil servitude Tocqueville so eloquently portrayed. Babied, bothered, timid and hard-working animals: such is the emerging “Happiness House.”

In the end, the oligarchy’s remedies to the American crisis are Orwell’s animal farm without training wheels. Merry and Tragical in Shakespeare’s words.

As for the middle class, the oligarchy’s gently violent, paternalistic state implies the continuing *development of underdevelopment*. To wit:

As the middle class economically deteriorates, the function of class reconciliation will be taken over by an institution identified with that class -- the government. Here the state does not wither away; it is the middle class that withers away. The class that heretofore had been politically indispensable is disposed of. Other than serving as Mandarin bureaucrats of that state, the middle class no longer meaningfully exists.

*Happiness House or chaos*, the oligarchy will tell you -- Shakespeare’s hot ice.

Fortunately, other remedies exist.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref1) William Shakespeare, “A Midsummer-Night’s Dream,” in William Shakespeare, The Comedies of Shakespeare, Random House, New York, undated, p. 533.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2)

**“Washington. In June [2006], officials at the General Services Administration were short of people to process cases of incompetence and fraud by federal contractors, and they responded with what has become the government’s reflexive answer to almost every problem.**

**They hired another contractor.**

**It did not matter that the company they chose, CACI International, had itself recently avoided a suspension from federal contracting; or that the work, delving into investigative files on other contractors, appeared to pose a conflict of interest…**

**Without a public debate or formal policy decision, contractors have become a virtual fourth branch of government. On the rise for decades, spending on federal contracts has soared during the Bush administration, to about $400 billion in 2006 from $207 billion in 2000…**

**The most successful contractors are not necessarily those doing the best work, but those who have mastered the special skill of selling to Uncle Sam. The top 20 service contractors have spent nearly $300 million since 2000 on lobbying and have donated $23 million to political campaigns.”**

Scott Shane and Ron Nixon, “Contractors take seats in government offices,” International Herald Tribune, February 5, 2007.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3) The latent reference point of fake work became manifest when George Bush shouted at film director Michael Moore: “When are you going to get a real job?”

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref4) The definition of incompetence is in the measurement of observable performance in terms of a specific objective; thus, the term is relatively clear, operational. The definition of corruption, on the other hand, remains obscure after centuries of dispute. I offer the following observation: competition worsens the performance of a corrupt competitor; it improves the performance of a healthy one.

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref5) William Shakespeare, “The Comedy of Errors,” in William Shakespeare, The Comedies of Shakespeare, op.cit., p. 336. (Act V, Scene 1.)

[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref6) Incompetence or corruption? The issue was at the heart of the war in Iraq:

**“A Pentagon audit of $8.2 billion in American taxpayer money spent by the U.S. Army on contractors in Iraq has found that almost none of the payments followed federal rules and that in some cases, contracts worth millions of dollars were paid despite little or no record of what, if anything, was received…**

**In one case, according to documents displayed by Pentagon auditors at the hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, a cash payment of $320.8 million in Iraqi money was authorized on the basis of a single signature and the words ‘Iraqi Salary Payment’ on an invoice. In another case, $11.1 million was paid to IAP, an American contractor, on the basis of a voucher with no indication of what was delivered.**

**Mary Ugone, the Pentagon’s deputy inspector general for auditing, told the committee that the absence of anything beyond a voucher meant that ‘we were giving or providing a payment without any basis for the payment.’**

**‘We don’t know what we got,’ Ugone said…**

**The report is especially significant because while other federal auditors have severely criticized the way the United States has handled payments to contractors in Iraq, this is the first time that the Pentagon itself has acknowledged the mismanagement on anything resembling this scale…”**

James Glanz, “Iraq spending broke rules, Pentagon says. No paper trails exist for army contracts worth billions, a military audit reveals,” International Herald Tribune, May 24/25, 2008.

*We don’t know what we got*. Incompetence or corruption? A week after the Florida controversy-riddled American presidential election of the year 2000, Larry Sabato, a political scientist at the University of Virginia, observed,

**“‘If you put 100 lawyers in a strike force, as we now have in Florida, into any one of the 50 states, in two weeks you will have enough horror stories to convince you that the system is rigged…That’s how bad it is…There is some fraud and corruption, but most is just sloppiness and messiness.’**

**Yet there are no obvious alternatives…**

**‘If would be wrong to conclude that one election system is better than another,’ said John Seibel, president of True Ballot, which runs union elections. ‘My fear is that we will jump into a system that will solve one problem, only to get involved in a much larger one.’”**

Leslie Wayne, “Voting System in U.S. Has Long Been Faulted,” International Herald Tribune, November 11/12, 2000.

Sorry, True Ballot, but some election systems are better than others. The dilemma goes far beyond this or that voting system, however, for the general distinction of incompetence from corruption is becoming less possible as the two phenomena become more confounded. For more on Florida 2000, see Appendix 1.

Incompetence or corruption? A second example from the year 2000 of the entanglement is provided by the private sector:

**"In 1977, I stood huddled with three terrified children and other mother on the shoulder of Interstate 5 in California’s Central Valley, all of us shaking as we stared at a 16-inch (40-centimeter) tear in the wall of the Firestone tire that had blown out, almost killing us. I felt shock and rage when I learned, at the gas station we limped to, that this tire was notorious for failing…**

**Galvanized by a mother’s fury, I wrote a magazine article on the Firestone 500 tire that spurred, in 1978, congressional hearings and the largest tire recall in U.S. history. Firestone, nearly bankrupt, was saved with a buyout by the Japanese tire maker Bridgestone.**

**To read about the current case -- Firestone’s recall of 6.5 million tires on Aug. 9, six months of growing complaints and lawsuits, and a federal investigation -- brings back the lessons of 1978…**

**Behind 41 deaths attributed to the Firestone 500 by American government investigators were 14,000 complaints from disgruntled tire owners, their trunks full of failed, ripped, blown 500s -- like me, alive by luck. Now, as in that scandal, drivers have complained, and dangers have been known but not acted on.**

**The 500 was the product of hidebound industry adapting antiquated equipment and mind-sets to try to catch the wave of steel-belted radials sweeping in from technologically superior Michelin. But Firestone has had 22 years to improve the manufacture of steel-belted tires, and today’s parallels alarm me.**

**I see the same corporate smoke screen, made even more dense by the symbiotic involvement of two companies. Proof does not come to light, because confidentiality is often the condition of the settlements that grieving families choose over the prolonged pain of a trial, although it is in the courtroom that evidence can be exposed and the finger of guilt pointed publicly by a jury.**

**I see the same old tire industry culture that perpetuates low technology, the same blame-the-consumer attitude, the same penny-pinching prorated tire replacement policies. And, above all, the same cynical willingness to let cascading reports of dangerous problems pile up. Even as Ford was replacing the suspect tires on its Explorers in overseas markets last year, the dangers were kept from the American public.**

**As Ford tries to focus the heat on Firestone, as Firestone argues that Ford and its customers trade safety for the smoother ride of under-inflated tires, the basic issue must not be obscured: Firestone tires are failing. The results, given the tendency of sport utility vehicles like the Ford Explorer to roll over in highway blowouts, are even more lethal than the ones in the 1970s."**

Moira Johnston, “Failing Firestone Tires: More Lessons to Learn,” International Herald Tribune, August 22, 2000.

Incompetence or corruption? A few days after Johnston’s article was published, Bridgestone announced that the recall of 6.5 million tires in the United States would reduce its net earnings by 48.5% for the first six months of the year. Cynthia McCafferty, Bridgestone/Firestone spokeswoman, announced, “We still haven’t determined that a problem exists with these tires.” (Author not identified, Reuters, “Recall Pummels Net Earnings At Bridgestone,” International Herald Tribune, August 26/27, 2000).

O.K., which one is it, incompetence or corruption? The billions of bailout dollars handed over to America’s mega-rich in 2008-2009 gave rise -- by sheer volume alone -- to The Third American Revolution’s definitive, final answer:

*Incompetence or corruption, it makes no difference.*

[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref7) A video of President Carter’s speech can e viewed at: <http://www.americanpresidents.org/presidents/president.asp?PresidentNumber=38> .

What is extraordinary for a political speech is that today, a quarter of a century later, the Malaise Speech is still hotly debated and widely discussed. (Sarah Vowell, “Oh, how a girl can dream,” International Herald Tribune, July 14, 2005; Richard Bernstein, “A German mood swing. Malaise could affect the next elections,” International Herald Tribune, March 24, 2004; Adam Nagourney, “A political decision not to say ‘I’m sorry’. Bush advised not to apologize over 9/11,” International Herald Tribune, April, 16, 2004; Steven R. Weisman, “All the President’s Intellectuals,” International Herald Tribune, January 11/12, 2002.).

After the Malaise Speech, the presidential election of 1980 was never in doubt. Ronald Reagan, President Carter’s Republican opponent, claimed there was no crisis of the American spirit; rather, the problem was that the federal government had grown too large. (See his inaugural address: <http://www.reaganfoundation.org/reagan/speeches/first.asp>). The voters elected Ronald Reagan. Thus, the as-if ideological world of reassurance was up and running just as before, when “The Greatest Show on Earth” won the Academy Award for best picture of 1952.

The bill for Reagan’s as-if world would not come due until 2008-9. A bill, by the way, paid in real dollars.

[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref8) (« où les fonctionnaires publics n’ont point d’intérêt de classe à faire prévaloir »):

**(« La mauvaise administration d’un magistrat, sous la démocratie, est d’ailleurs un fait isolé qui n’a d’influence que pendant la courte durée de cette administration. La corruption et l’incapacité ne sont pas des intérêts communs qui puissent lier entre eux les hommes d’une manière permanente.**

**Un magistrat corrompu, ou incapable, ne combinera pas ses efforts avec un autre magistrat, par la seule raison que ce dernier est incapable et corrompu comme lui, et ces deux hommes ne travailleront jamais de concert à flaire fleurir la corruption et l’incapacité chez leurs arrière-neveux. L’ambition et les manœuvres de l’un serviront, au contraire, à démasquer l’autre. Les vices du magistrat, dans les démocraties, lui sont, en général, tout personnels.**

**Mais les hommes publics, sous le gouvernement de l’aristocratie, ont un intérêt de classe [sic] qui […] forme entre eux un lien commun et durable. Cet intérêt forme entre eux un lien commun et durable; il les invite à unir et à combiner leurs efforts vers un but qui n’est as toujours le bonheur du plus grand nombre […].**

**Comment s’étonner s’il [le magistrat aristocratique] ne résiste point ? Aussi voit-on souvent, dans les aristocraties, l’esprit de classe entraîner ceux mêmes qu’il ne corrompt pas, et faire qu’à leur insu ils accommodent peu à peu la société à leur usage, et la préparent pour leurs descendants. »)**

Alexis de Tocqueville, De La Démocratie en Amérique I, op.cit., pp. 267, 268. (II, VI).

[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) Floyd Norris and Diana B. Henriques, “Fraud Was Part of Job at Cendant, Executives Admit,” International Herald Tribune, June 16, 2000.

In August 2005, E. Kirk Shelton, the number two executive at Cendant/CUC International, was sentenced to 10 years in prison. He claimed he had no knowledge of the fraud. Floyd Norris, “Ex-Cendant executive gets 10-year jail term,” International Herald Tribune, August 4, 2005.

In January 2007, the former head of Cendant/CUC, Walter Forbes, was sentenced to 12 years and 7 months in prison and a restitution of over three billion dollars. During his trial Forbes stated, as did Shelton, that he did not know about the fraud. (Author not identified, “Former Cendant chief is sentenced and ordered to pay $3.275 billion,” AP, International Herald Tribune, January 17, 2007).

Is a consensus emerging about the *systemic* nature of corruption in America? A Washington Post editorial summed up the Enron affair:

**“The weekend’s revelations about Enron make it tempting to see the scandal as an epitaph for the 1990s bubble. The firm seems to have assembled the various strains of hubris found in different corners of the country: the technological vanity of Silicon Valley mixed with the financial alchemy of Wall Street, the influence peddling of Washington fused with the ten-gallon brashness of Texas. Not content with earning hundreds of thousands of dollars, Enron’s senior executives cooked the books so that they could pocket millions. Not content with having created a wonderful new market in energy derivatives, they lied and cheated to create an illusion of impossibly fast earnings growth. Contemplating Enron’s self-destructive arrogance, Senator Byron Dorgan has spoken quite accurately of ‘a culture of corporate corruption.’”**

Author not identified, “A Culture of Corruption,” International Herald Tribune, February 6, 2002.

[[x]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) Tocqueville’s distinction of oligarchy from aristocracy is not clear. He wrote about an “aristocracy of money” (« l’aristocratie d’argent ») that existed between an aristocracy of birth and a democracy. This aristocracy of money “often forms a transition between the two, and one does not know if it spells the end of the rein of aristocratic institutions, or if it already is opening up the new era of democracy.” (« elle forme souvent comme une transition naturelle entre ces deux choses, et l’on ne saurait dire si elle termine le règne des institutions aristocratiques, ou si déjà elle ouvre la nouvelle ère de la démocratie. ») Alexis de Tocqueville, De La Démocratie en Amérique II, « Notes  Deuxième partie », op.cit., pp. 855, 856.

Although Tocqueville’s insight has valuable connotations, The Third American Revolution keeps aristocracy (birth) separate from oligarchy (money).

[[xi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref11) **(« l’espèce d’oppression dont les peuples démocratiques sont menacés ne ressemblera à rien de ce qui l’a précédée dans le monde. »)**

**(« Je veux imaginer sous quels traits nouveaux le despotisme pourrait se produire dans le monde. Je vois une foule innombrable d’hommes semblables et égaux qui tournent sans repos sur eux-mêmes pour se procurer de petits et vulgaires plaisirs, dont ils remplissent leur âme. Chacun d’eux, retiré à l’écart, est comme étranger à la destinée de tous les autres […] et, s’il lui reste encore une famille, on peut dire du moins qu’il n’a plus de patrie.**

**Au-dessus de [tous] s’élève un pouvoir immense et tutélaire, qui se charge seul d’assurer leur jouissance et de veiller sur leur sort. Il est absolu, détaillé, régulier, prévoyant et doux. Il ressemblerait à la puissance paternelle si, comme elle, il avait pour objet de préparer les hommes à l’âge viril ; mais il ne cherche, au contraire, qu’à les fixer irrévocablement dans l’enfance ; il aime que les citoyens se réjouissent, pourvu qu’ils ne songent qu’à se réjouir. Il travaille volontiers à leur bonheur ; mais il veut en être l’unique agent et le seul arbitre ; il pourvoit à leur sécurité, prévoit et assure leurs besoins, facilite leurs plaisirs, conduit leurs principales affaires, dirige leur industrie, règle leurs successions, divise leurs héritages ; que ne peut-il leur ôter entièrement le trouble de penser et la peine de vivre ?**

**C’est ainsi que tous les jours il rend moins utile et plus rare l’emploi du libre arbitre ; […] il ne brise pas les volontés, mais il les amollit, les plie et les dirige ; il force rarement d’agir, mais il s’oppose sans cesse à ce qu’on agisse ; il ne détruit point, il empêche de naître; il ne tyrannise point, il gêne, il comprime, il énerve, il éteint, il hébète, et il réduit enfin chaque nation à n’être plus qu’un troupeau d’animaux timides et industrieux, dont le gouvernement est le berger.**

**J’ai toujours cru que cette sorte de servitude, réglée, douce et paisible, dont je viens de faire le tableau, pourrait se combiner mieux qu’on ne l’imagine avec quelques-unes des formes extérieures de la liberté, et qu’il ne lui serait pas impossible de s’établir à l’ombre même de la souveraineté du peuple. »)**

Alexis de Tocqueville, De La Démocratie en Amérique II, in Œuvres, ibid., pp. 836-8. (IV, VI).

CHAPTER 12. The Five Fates

 *My wisdom is as despised as chaos.*

 *What is my annihilation*

 *compared to the stupor that awaits you?*

 -- Arthur Rimbaud, Illuminations[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn1) --

A centuries long, but inexorable, cyclical decline of the middle class -- a decline prolonged by massive subsidies of incompetence and corruption: such is the cold ground beneath a sunless haze that is becoming America’s future.

A.k.a. “Happiness House” (Chapter 11) a privately owned, public facility.

Stupor, indeed, The hush of money.

Inside that haze and hush, life will follow the dramaturgy of American horror movies: long periods of soporific droning routine punctured occasionally by spikes of horrific catastrophic violence.

*“Jaws”:* a poor man’s Moby Dick*?* What critics wrote off as retinal junk food could prove to be prescient.

The rising world of falling expectations;[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn2) of open meetings of closed minds; of more church steeples and stop signs; of legal crimes;[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn3) indeed, of a tyranny of the laws:[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn4) is it inevitable?

Yes, if we submit to the oligarchy’s three remedies to the disaster that could cast the West into chaos.

You don’t need official statistics[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn5) to know that disaster. You see it every day where you live and work: the rich are getting richer, the poor poorer, the middle class smaller. That triple-edged sword is swinging ever lower over our heads. The Pit and The Pendulum by Edgar Allan Poe was a masterpiece of horror and, if America crashes, reality.

A double-edged sword is needed to fight it.

The Third American Revolution is the renaissance of the system of government that characterized America for over 200 years: not a democracy but a **политей**. The polity died in 2008-2009. While it slept, poison was poored in its ear. An oligarchy seized control.

That death was predicted 2,000 years ago.

Aristotle warned that the major threat to a polity comes not from outside enemies, not by the poor, not by the middle class, but by the wealthy:

**“[Forgetting the claims of equity], they not only give more power to the well-to-do, but they also deceive the people [by fobbing them off with sham rights]. Illusory benefits must always produce real evils in the long run; and the encroachments made by the rich [under cover of such devices] are more destructive to a constitution than those of the people.”**[**[vi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn6)

If billions of freebee Bush-Obama dollars to the mega-wealthy were not encroachments made by the rich, what is? If adult fairytales about unity and a president [rockin’ around](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/8930409/Barack-Obama-joins-Kermit-at-Christmas-tree-ceremony.html) the Christmas tree with Kermit The Frog are not illusory benefits, what are?

A polity requires a middle class large enough to moderate the other classes. Obviously, if the economic ruin of the middle class continues, a polity is impossible.

If a polity is impossible, The Third American Revolution is nonsense.

Which leaves us not recourse but to reveal the real name of Happiness House.

\* \* \*

Consider the following fates.

All are remedies to the catastrophe we are simultaneously living and awaiting. Of course, some remedies are more remedies than others to the particular problem at hand, the sword with three edges.

Please do not view the fates as predictions, much less as visions, but rather as tools in a toolbox to be used as appropriate. They are not mutually exclusive.

(1) A classic Marxist revolution. The middle class falls into the proletariat and the lumpen proletariat: drug dealers, card sharks, pimps, burglars, welfare cheats.

There is a proletariat revolution. With the support of ambitious noncoms and generals who collect fossilized fish, it succeeds.

What happens next?

Answer: exactly what happened before in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. Middle class rebels take over. Here we arrive at the political fallacy of Marxism:

Lawyers and grocery store checkout girls, Marx tells us, are both working class because they have only their labor power to sell. Well, Karl, when the two groups get together, guess who is going to end up on top. Revolutionary ideals -- self-sacrifice, unity -- do not always prevail when politicos deal out plum jobs: “I get to be ambassador to England!” “Oh no you don’t! I called it first!”[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn7)

Not tossed a single bone with any real meat attached, one by one, the checkout girls check out. “Gotta shadow ‘em,” the rebel in the White House scowls, crossing his Doc Martin combat boots on top of the walnut desk; after all, they might be traitors.

Middle class rebels can’t manage themselves much less national economies, so what happens next?

Exactly what happened before:

In 1942, Joseph Schumpeter[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn8) observed that socialism had become capitalism’s repair shop. Of course, once the car is fixed, nobody keeps it in the garage. Nobody.

The end of a Marxist revolution is not the end of history but an alternating system of (1) private capitalism owned and operated by a new mega-rich, i,e, an oligarchic despotism. In this corporatist state, policies are decided by company oligarchs in conjunction with high level politicos. In a polite bow to tradition, that state will retain democratic blue smoke and mirrors. (2) When things don’t work -- and they won`t -- private capitalism is replaced by state capitalism under a totalitarian tyranny run by middle class rebels. After a while, when things don’t work -- and they won’t -- they system reverts to (1).

Truncated, stunted, the middle class survives willy-nilly in a world ruled by The Cult of The Contact. And you thought religion was dead…

What we have here is not a failure to communicate -- oligarchs and middle class rebels communicate quite well -- but rather capitalism and incomcruption (Chapter 11) gone to seed.

Don’t be taken in by revolutionary blahblah. The seamless transition in the 1990s between “revolutionary” “communist” “vanguard” members to ownership of privatized state enterprises is a two-way street. A few layers down, the middle class survives mainly as Mandarin bureaucrats.

(2) Growing scarcities of natural resources and absolute necessities (air, water) create unprecedented world strife. An uptick in armed conflict -- look for a mamawar between China and the U.S. -- increases demand for higher levels of education and training to meet the needs of military combat. Gigantic public and private outlays foot the bill, benefitting the middle class.

A case study of this particular fate -- not of scientific socialism but of socialism for scientists -- already exists: Los Alamos, New Mexico. One evening, kids safely in bed, a Lab employee whispered over a scotch on the rocks its mysterious, secret inner essence: “I got mine. You got yours?”

Talk about a “classless” society…

(3) Mysterium Conjunctionius. This remedy to the middle class decline involves the co-mingling and confounding of (i) public and private sectors, (ii) productive and unproductive labor, and (iii) economic surplus and non-surplus-financed activities. Marx, Smith, Ricardo: none foresaw the arising *Mysterium*. Its political repercussions are astounding.

(i) Public versus private seems obvious enough (for the moment).

(ii) Adam Smith’s classic idea of productive versus unproductive labor:

**“There is one sort of labour which adds to the value of the subject upon which it is bestowed: there is another which has no such effect. The former, as it produces a value, may be called productive the latter, unproductive labour. Thus the labour of a [manufacturing worker] adds, generally, to the value of the materials which he works upon, that of his own maintenance, and of his master’s profit. The labour of a menial servant, on the contrary, adds to the value of nothing…A man grows rich by employing a multitude of [manufacturing workers]; he grows poor by maintaining a multitude of menial servants.”**[**[ix]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn9)

Smith characterized as unproductive labour[**[x]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn10) that of soldiers and other **“servants of the public…maintained by a part of the annual produce of the industry of other people.”** Other service sector middle class members: **“churchmen, lawyers, physicians, men of letters of all kinds; players, buffoons, musicians, opera-singers, opera-dancers, etc.”**[**[xi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn11)

Question: if service sector employees perform unproductive labor, then where does their daily bread come from? Clearly, if everyone has to work all day merely to feed themselves, no unproductive laborers are possible.

Smith gave the answer above. In case you missed it:

(iii) Unproductive laborers live off the surplus created by the productive work of other people:

**“[W]hen by the improvement and cultivation of land the labour of one family can provide food for two, the labour of half the society becomes sufficient to provide food for the whole. The other half, therefore,…can be employed in providing other things, or in satisfying the other wants and fancies of mankind…The desire of food is limited in every man by the narrow capacity of the human stomach but the desire of the conveniences and ornaments of building, dress, equipage, and household furniture, seems to have no limit or certain boundary. Those, therefore, who have the command of more food than they themselves can consume, are always willing to exchange the surplus, or, what is the same thing, the price of it, for gratifications of this other kind. What is over and above satisfying the limited desire is given for the amusement of those desires which cannot be satisfied, but seem to be altogether endless.”**[**[xii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn12)

The boundary separating productive from unproductive labor is vanishing, mainly because of the growing confusion of the secondary and tertiary economic sectors (production and services).

That comingling has only just begun. In fact*, the transformation of services into commodities, which are the essence of the productive sector, is the defining economic characteristic of our times*.

Chapter 10 explored that transition and provided the following example:

**“Is cooking a hamburger patty and inserting the meat, lettuce and ketchup inside a bun a manufacturing job, like assembling automobiles?**

**That question is posed in the new Economic Report of the President, a thick annual compendium of observations and statistics on the health of the U.S. economy.**

**Putting jobs at McDonald’s, Burger King and other fast-food enterprises in the same category as those at industrial companies like General Motors and Eastman Kodak might seem like a stretch…**

**But the presidential report points out that the current system for classifying jobs ‘is not straightforward.’…**

**‘When a fast-food restaurant sells a hamburger, for example, is it providing a “service” or is it combining inputs to “manufacture” a product?’ the report asks.**

**‘Sometimes, seeming subtle differences can determine whether an industry is classified as manufacturing. For example, mixing water and concentrate to produce soft drinks is classified as manufacturing. However, if that activity is performed at a snack bar, it is considered a service.’**

**The report notes that the Census Bureau’s North American Industry Classification System defines manufacturing as covering enterprises that are ‘engaged in the mechanical, physical or chemical transformation of materials, substances or components into new products.’**

**Classifications matter, the report says, because among other things, they can affect which businesses receive tax relief [sic]…**

**David Huether, chief economist for the National Association of Manufacturers, said that he had heard for several years that some economists wanted to count hamburger flipping as a manufacturing job, which he noted would result in statistical reports showing many more jobs in what has been a declining sector of the economy.”**[**[xiii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn13)

The comingling and confounding of heretofore separate and distinct functions and sectors is expanding logarithmically. To wit:

A post office, for example, should be a clear-cut, elementary case of (i) a public sector entity (ii) performing nonproductive labor paid for by (iii) the economic surplus. However, in France the post office is a mixture of all three. It is both publicly and privately owned, and performs both unproductive services and productive work, e.g., banking services and the manufacture of stamps and packages.

Could the post office remove the tripled-edged sword hanging over the Western world? Could the guy behind the counter be what Shakespeare was seeking -- the concord of this discord?[[xiv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn14)

Lenin thought so. He wrote shortly before he took power: **“To organise the whole economy on the lines of the postal service…is our immediate aim. This is the state and this is the economic foundation we need.”**[**[xv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn15)

I believe history will show that the French post office is far ahead of its time. We are witnessing the emergence of All Directions economics. Its public representative is All-Directions politics:

**All directions? How is that possible?**

**The standard ruler of Left, Center and Right instantly presents itself as the tool to tell us politically where we are and where we are going.**

**In truth, that tool is as flat as it is narrow --** tedious**,** brief **in Shakespeare’s words. Not only does it show only three positions but also, because it has only length, it cannot measure up or down, backward or forward.**

Doubts about the old political ruler will grow as its one dimension becomes increasingly irrelevant. The reason is that the oligarchy has learned that the best ideological camouflage to hide the death of the polity is to present its political system as one of All Directions -- Left, Center, Right. [**[xvi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn16)

As the middle class decline worsens, the confounding of economic sectors and functions will expand for reasons of political expediency. Mixing, matching, and blurring conceal vital differences, e.g., a middle class service sector employee and a lower class production worker are more easily confused if each performs functions of the other. Now you see a proletarian; now you don’t. Which is why, in *Mysterium* Conjunctionius, seeing is no longer believing.

The upshot is that the revolutionary potential of the middle class decline is blunted, if not thwarted. In an All Directions world, life goes on (sorry, Karl). Merry and tragical (Shakespeare)[[xvii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn17) would call it. We extrapolate from another set of games: *Harder, Faster, Louder, Dumber*.

(4) Modernism, with its boundless faith in science and progress, makes a roaring comeback and rescues the middle class.

In the past, creations of science and technology -- notably trains and automobiles -- gave vital impetus to capitalist economies at decisive junctures. In the future, equivalent creations give rise to new industries, thereby generating enormous demands for higher levels of education and training. The middle class decline is thereby forestalled.

The power of science and technology to transform economics is poignantly illustrated by the following example:

Writing in 1776, Adam Smith, deigned the **“tune of the musician”** to be a classic case of unproductive labour -- unproductive because it **“adds to the value of nothing.”** [**[xviii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn18)

Centuries later, thanks to science and technology, the unproductive tune changed tunes:

**“The music industry is one of the largest in the United States, employing hundreds of thousands of people. Album sales alone bring in $30 billion a year, and this figure doesn’t even account for concert ticket sales, the thousands of bands playing Friday nights at saloons all over North America…Americans spend more money on music than on sex or prescription drugs.”**[**[xix]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn19)

The transformation of unproductive into productive work is accountable to no one. We may be to scientific and technological innovations tomorrow what our shadows on the ground are to us today. Discoveries in stem cell research, in nanotechnology, of life on another planet, of nuclear fusion: all could be sources of presently imponderable developments stimulating higher education and training, thereby resuscitating the middle class.

To halfway appreciate what future scientific and technological discoveries could have in store: take your visible hand and show Adam Smith a laptop computer. Ask him what he thinks...

There may be more than one 1492 out there.

(5) Capitalism undergoes significant changes. In particular, its quest for ever higher rates of profits is permitted only in certain areas, e.g., environmental protection. In those sectors, higher levels of education and training are required to invent and apply new processes; hence, the middle class is revived. In the profit-capped areas, the division of labor and simplification of tasks slow. There, too, an immediate benefactor is the middle class.

There is a serious practical problem with this remedy. The reigning oligarchy must approve any changes in capitalism, e.g., a cap on profit rates. The oligarchy will never permit such changes.

To enact significant changes *in* -- not *of* -- capitalism, therefore, requires first a change *of* -- not *in* -- the American political system.

Enter The Third American Revolution. We will return to this issue.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[i] (**«**Ma sagesse est aussi dédaignée que le chaos. Qu’est mon néant, auprès de la stupeur qui vous attend?») Arthur Rimbaud, « Vies : I », Illuminations in Œuvres complètes, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1994, p. 128.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref2) The following article was published shortly before the economic meltdown of 2008:

**“New York. America’s self-confidence is on the wane. That is something that has happened two, or perhaps three, times in recent decades, as fear grew that the country was on the wrong course and that the economic situation was unlikely to improve…**

**Evidence for the loss of confidence came this week when the Conference Board released its consumer confidence survey for March [2008]. What stood out was how far economic expectations have fallen.**

**The amount of pessimism -- as shown by people who forecast that things will get worse -- is not quite at record highs. But the amount of optimism that things will get better is as low as it has been in the four decades that the Conference Board has been asking questions…**

**It was in December 1973 that the Conference Board’s consumer expectations index hit its lowest level ever, of 45.2.**

**The reading disclosed this week, of 47.9, ranks second.**

**In some ways, there is even less optimism now than there was then.**

**A lower proportion of those surveyed [8.1%] said they expected business conditions to improve. The percentage of people who think their own income will rise [14.9%] is much lower than it was then. Only in jobs is there more optimism now than there was then, and the difference is small.”**

Floyd Norris, “In America, less-great expectations,” International Herald Tribune, March 28, 2008.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref3) Montesquieu asked if it was possible to “cause the law to be broken by the law?” (« faire violer la loi par la loi ? ») Charles de Montesquieu, De l’Esprit des lois, in Œuvres complètes II, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1994. p. 444. (Book XII, Chapter XIV).

Today, the most blatant legal crimes in America are political campaign financing laws. Those crimes orbit around Wisconsin, a state renowned for its political reforms:

**“Madison, Wisconsin. Even before this state approved one of the most rigorous campaign finance laws in the country 20 years ago, Wisconsin was known as the pioneer in enacting political changes, from inventing the direct primary to establishing a civil service system for state employees.**

**But now the trend-setting is pointing in the opposite direction…**

**The unintended effect of the clean-government mentality is that Wisconsin’s stringent laws governing campaign donations and spending have led determined donors to be even more resourceful.**

**The state was a pioneer in offering public subsidies for candidates who limited their spending. Now, Wisconsin has become a breeding ground for organizations to perfect techniques for bending or evading restrictions on how much political action committees and parties can contribute directly to campaigns.”**

Richard L. Berke, “A Reform Backfires in Wisconsin. Clever Contributors Find Ways to Evade Campaign Finance Law,” International Herald Tribune, July 27, 1998.

To mention one technique: issue advocacy. Groups are formed to pay for ads which they claim are not political, but which in fact favor certain candidates. In such cases, donors and methods of fund raising do not have to be reported.

Make no mistake: *campaign laws are written to be evaded*. Those who put pen to paper are fully aware of what they were doing: using the law to break the law. I challenge any lawyer, lobbyist or lawmaker to meet with me behind closed doors and, face to face, deny that statement.

Almost a decade after the above article was published, nothing had changed:

**“Over the last decade, former President Bill Clinton has raised more than $500 million for his foundation, allowing him to build a glass-and-steel presidential library in Little Rock, Arkansas, and burnish his image as an impresario of global philanthropy. The foundation has closely guarded the identities of its donors -- including one who gave $31.3 million last year.**

**The secrecy surrounding the William J. Clinton foundation has become a campaign issue as Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton seeks the Democratic presidential nomination with her husband as a prime source of strategy and star power.**

**Some of her rivals argue that donors could use presidential foundations to circumvent campaign finance laws that are designed to limit political influence…**

**The New York Times has compiled the first comprehensive list of 97 donors who gave or pledged a total of $69 million for the Clinton presidential library in the final years of the Clinton administration. The examination found that while some $1 million contributions were longtime Clinton friends, others were seeking policy changes from the administration. Two pledged $1 million each while they or their companies were under investigation by the Justice Department.**

**Other donations came from supporters who had been ensnared in campaign finance scandals surmounting Bill Clinton’s 1996 re-election campaign...**

**In raising record sums for her campaign, Hillary Clinton has tapped many of the foundation’s donors. At least two dozen have become ‘Hillraisers,’ each bundling $100,000 or more for her presidential race…**

**To limit the influence of any single donor, U.S. election law prohibits foreign donations to presidential campaigns and limits individual Americans to $2,300 an election.**

**But presidential foundations are free to accept unlimited and anonymous contributions, even from foreigners and foreign governments. For instance, the Saudi royal family, the king of Morocco, a foundation linked to the United Arab Emirates, and the governments of Kuwait and Qatar have made contributions of unknown amounts to the Clinton Foundation…**

**William Brandt Jr., a bankruptcy lawyer in Chicago and prolific Democratic fund-raiser, pledged $1 million in May 1999. At the time, the Justice Department was investigating Brandt’s testimony to Congress about a $10,000-a-couple fund-raiser he had held for the president’s 1996 re-election campaign. At issue was whether he lied when he denied promoting it as an explicit opportunity to lobby a top bankruptcy official at the event.**

**In August 1999, the Justice Department determined that ‘prosecution is not warranted.’ Brandt, who is now a Hillraiser, did not respond to several phone and e-mail messages.”**

Don Van Natta Jr., Jo Becker and Mike McIntire, “Bill Clinton’s foundation haunts campaign,” International Herald Tribune, December 21, 2007.

Reforms of campaign financing will always fail as long as what is normal is considered to be abnormal. And what is normal is the dominance of the oligarchy, which manifests itself in laws that are illegal.

The prevailing resistance to recognize the American system as an oligarchy is part of the reigning abnormal normalcy.

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref4) That expression comes as an oxymoron to most American readers who are taught in high school that “there are governments of laws and there are governments of men,” and that the latter are tyrannies. However, as Montesquieu noted:

**“One can kill by laws as surely as one kills by swords. In a period of 150 years the Roman emperors destroyed all the old Roman families. One of Rome’s greatest tyrannies was that of its laws.”**

(« On peut exterminer par les lois, comme on extermine par l’épée. En 150 ans de temps, les Empereurs romains détruisirent toutes les anciennes familles romaines. Une de leurs plus grandes tyrannies fut celle de leurs lois. ») Charles de Montesquieu, Dossier de l’esprit des lois, in Œuvres complètes II, op.cit., p. 1,054. See also De L’Esprit des lois, p. 397 (Book XI, Chapter VI), p. 558 (Book XIX, Chapter IV), p.564 (Book XIX, Chapter XIV).

Would-be campaign reformers, take note: Montesquieu did not stop there in demystifying laws:

**“An abuse can become the law, and the correction can become an abuse.”**

 (« un abus peut devenir la loi, et la correction, devenir un abus ».) Dossier de l’esprit des lois, ibid., p. 1,111.

Tocqueville found “tyrannies of laws” in America’s treaties with Indians and the treatment of slaves. Alexis de Tocqueville, De La Démocratie en Amérique I, in Œuvres, Volume II, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1992, pp. 377-8, 388-90, 393, 407. (Part II, Chapter X).

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref5) We presented the official numbers in Chapter 10.

[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref6) Aristotle, The Politics of Aristotle, translated and edited by Ernest Barker, Oxford University Press, New York, 1962, op.cit., p. 186. (Book IV, Chapter XII). Brackets made by the translator.

Tocqueville foresaw exactly the same crossroad. We cited it in the Introduction.

[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref7) You think no adult would engage in such disputes? I personally witnessed them. No capitol building is spared.

[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref8) Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, Harper Collins, republished in1975, ad passim.

[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) Adam Smith, op.cit., pp. 429-30. There are indications that, as a result of the Internet, Smith’s menial servants could become what Smith said the servants were not -- *productive* in the sense that their work can be the source of profit:

**“New York. The first wave of slicing up services work and sending it abroad has been all about business. Computer programming, call centers, product design and back-office operations like accounting and billing have all migrated abroad to some degree, and mainly to India. The Internet makes it possible, while lower wages in developing nations make it desirable for corporate America.**

**The second wave, according to some entrepreneurs, venture capitalists and offshoring veterans, will be the globalization of consumer services…** **[They predict] a market that will one day include millions of households in the United States and other nations. They foresee a host of potential services beyond tutoring and personal assistance like health and nutrition coaching; personal tax and legal advice; help with hobbies and cooking; learning new languages and skills; and more. Such services, they say, will be offered for affordable monthly fees or piecework rates.”**

Steve Lohr, “E-mail to India: ‘Reserve table for 2’,” International Herald Tribune, October 31, 2007.

[[x]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) *Unproductive* labor should not be confused with unnecessary labor. Policemen provide necessary services; however; in and of themselves, those services are unproductive because they do not add value.

[[xi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref11) Adam Smith, op. cit., pp. 430-1.

[[xii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref12) Ibid., pp. 268-9.

[[xiii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref13) David Cay Johnston, “Should burger-flipping be a heavy industry?,” International Herald Tribune, February 21/22, 2004.

[[xiv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref14) William Shakespeare, “A Midsummer-Night’s Dream,” in William Shakespeare, The Comedies of Shakespeare, Random House, New York, undated, p. 533.

[[xv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref15) V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, in V.I. Lenin, Selected Works, Volume 2, International Publishers, New York, 1967, p. 304. To which one can respond: all that suffering and all those sacrifices, all those famines, all those purges, imprisonments, tortures, firing squads, hangings, beatings, wars, in order to have…a post office. V.I. Lenin: an archetypical backdoor man.

In 1994, I saw V.I. Lenin, or rather his mummy, appropriately attired in a formal black suit -- an attendee at his own funeral, hence still alive?-- reposing in his cathedral-quiet, air conditioned tomb on Red Square. He remains in death what he was in life: a vintage middle class rebel (Father was a bureaucrat).

Surprisingly, a large percentage of Russians have never been in the tomb. Not surprisingly, the Lenin mummy is adored mainly by other middle class rebels, for whom -- when the dust settles -- the only good revolutionary is a dead one.

[[xvi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref16) The All Directions cover already exists albeit in embryonic form:

Arnold Schwarzenegger was first elected Governor of California in 2003:

**“Los Angeles. Rarely has a person assumed so high an office with so little known about his political philosophy and so few clues to his governing style…**

**In his first post-election visit to Sacramento in late October [2003] a reporter asked Schwarzenegger what to expect from his first days in office.**

**‘Action, action, action, action,’ Schwarzenegger said, repeating a word he must have heard often during his movie career. ‘That’s what people have voted me into the office for.’**

**But action toward what end?…**

**[T]he new governor’s agenda is rather vague. The clearest indication of the direction in which he intends to lead the state is the 20 appointees to senior posts in his administration he announced over the last three weeks. The nominees were from across the political spectrum.**

**For example, Schwarzenegger nominated Terry Tamminen, a Democrat and a staunch environmentalist, as head of the California Environmental Protection Agency. But on the same day, he nominated James Branham, a Republican timber company executive, as Tamminen’s deputy.**

**‘The obvious lesson is that he will govern the way he has appointed, the way he campaigned and the way he came into politics -- from left, right and center,’ said Bill Whalen, a research fellow at the Hoover Institution and a former speechwriter for Pete Wilson, the former Republican governor…**

**‘You will see a blend of ideologies -- that’s Arnold in a nutshell,’ said Whalen, who is [among] close former Wilson aides who have been advising Schwarzenegger. ‘…Like a sailing ship on the ocean, he will tack left and right but ultimately try to find a course down the middle.’”**

John M. Broder, “Testing time begins for Schwarzenegger,” International Herald Tribune, November 18, 2003.

There is no better representative of the emerging All Directions politics than Barack Obama:

**“After eight weeks in Office, Mr. Obama has managed to satisfy or outrage nearly everyone on the ideological spectrum. But his once-murky governing philosophy is coming into sharper…**

**Obamaism…appears to be an amalgam of philosophies -- a strong belief in the role of an activist government in shaping the economy and redistributing wealth, and a more centrist view of national security and at least some cultural issues…**

**He has rallied liberals behind efforts to overhaul health care, tackle climate change and raise taxes on the rich. But he has challenged liberal orthodoxy on issues like linking teacher play to performance and has won Republican support for sending 17,000 more troops to Afghanistan and pulling out of Iraq more gradually than the left wanted…**

**‘He’s not an ideologue,’ said David Axelrod, his senior White House adviser. ‘He’s a pragmatist. He’s someone who’s interested in ideas that will work. Some may have their roots in one doctrine; some may have roots in another. But he’s not concerned about that.’**

**In a recent interview with The Times, Mr. Obama rejected the ‘socialist’ tag, arguing that he was only returning top tax rates to where they were before Mr. Bush. Asked if ‘liberal’ or ‘progressive’ better defined his philosophy, he said, ‘I’m not going to engage in that.’”**

Peter Baker, “Obama defies easy political labels by melding philosophies,” International Herald Tribune, March 16, 2009. For more on Obamism, see Appendix 2.

[[xvii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref17) William Shakespeare, “A Midsummer-Night’s Dream,” Act V, Scene 1

[[xviii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref18) Adam Smith, op.cit., pp. 430, 431.

[[xix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref19) Daniel Levitin, This Is Your Brain on Music: The Science of a Human Obsession, Dutton, London, England, 2006, p. 7.

CHAPTER 13. The Arena of The Heart And Head

 *All production is for the purpose*

 *of ultimately satisfying a consumer.*

-- John Maynard Keynes[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref20) --

With remedy 5, significant changes in capitalism, (Chapter 12) we enter the thorny borderland separating *fate* from *destiny*.

Fate is what happens to you. Destiny is what you make happen to fate.

Fate involves neither awareness nor conscious intervention. Destiny requires both.

Hence, remedy 5 *could* qualify as a destiny, depending on which changes are made and with what degree of awareness.

Two destinies present themselves as remedies to the capsizing of the middle class and of Western civilization. Neither is possible today because of prevailing values. More on this subject shortly.

(6) There is a fundamental change in the creation of economic value.

Adam Smith noted that water, an absolute necessary, cost little or nothing, but a diamond, which was useless, cost a lot:

**“The word VALUE, it is to be observed, has two different meanings, and sometimes expressed the utility of some particular object, and sometimes the power of purchasing other goods which the possession of that object conveys. The one may be called ‘value in use’; the other, ‘value in exchange’. The things which have the greatest value in use have frequently little or no value in exchange and, on the contrary, those which have the greatest value in exchange have frequently little or no value in use. Nothing is more useful than water: but it will purchase scarce anything; scarce anything can be had in exchange for it. A diamond, on the contrary, has scarce any value in use; but a very great quantity of other goods may frequently be had in exchange for it.”**[**[ii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn20)

Smith’s observation that water as has little or no exchange value is about to become as obsolete as his notion of the unproductive musician’s tune. In 2007, the United Nations released its fourth Global Environment Outlook. Among its conclusions:

**“Available freshwater resources are declining; by 2024, 1.8 billion people will live in countries with absolute water scarcity…Globally, contaminated water remains the greatest single cause of human disease and death.”**[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn21)

Most Americans are unaware that a water crisis is approaching in their nation:

**“ATLANTA. For more than five months, the lake that provides drinking water to almost five million people here has been draining away in a withering drought…**

**Scientists have warned of impending disaster.**

**And life, for the most part, has gone on just as before.**

**By September, with Lake Lanier forecast to dip into the dregs of its storage capacity in less than four months, the state imposed a ban on outdoor water use…**

**Between 1990 and 2000, water use in Georgia increased 30 percent. But the state has not yet come up with an estimate of how much water is available during periods of normal rainfall, much less a plan to handle the worst-case scenario: dry faucets.”**[**[iv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn22)

Safe, plentiful drinking water is not the only water problem. A lower level of water in one place is already creating higher costs everywhere:

**“Oswego, New York. Water levels in the Great Lakes are falling: Lake Ontario, for example, is about 7 inches, or 18 centimeters, below where it was a year ago. And for every inch of water the lakes lose, the ships that ferry bulk materials across them must lighten their loads by 270 tons or risk running aground…**

**As a result, more ships are needed, adding millions of dollars to shipping companies’ operating costs…**

**On average, 240 million tons of cargo travel across the Great Lakes every year. The U.S. fleet circulating in the Great Lakes has 63 ships, which have lost a total of 8,000 tons of cargo capacity for every inch of water the lakes have fallen below normal this year, said James Weakley, president of the carriers’ association. Those 8,000 tons, he said, correspond to enough iron ore to produce 6,000 cars or enough coal to provide electricity to the Detroit area for three hours, or enough stone to build 24 houses…**

**‘If the low levels in the Great Lakes are a result of global warming, I don’t know,’ said [Jonathan Daniels, director of the Oswego Port Authority]. ‘What I know is that we can’t control nature. All we do is hope for rain.’”**[**[v]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn23)

We can’t control nature flies in the face of *Yes, we can*. Where do such values come from? Which will prevail? The question is of key importance: values, it turns out, are at the bottom of economics.

No value exists in a vacuum. Values always have a context -- social and historical, factual and ideological.

*It is context that counts*. It is seldom, if ever, affected by pure reason or pious wishes. To alter context requires transformations on the order of changes in the earth. One such transformation -- the greatest of all – is just over the horizon.

With a transformation of context, values change (for better or worse.)

In what is the top selling, university economics textbook of all times, Paul Samuelson implicitly acknowledged the key importance of values. He defined economics as

 **“the study of how men and society choose, with or without the use of money, to employ scarce productive resources to produce various commodities over time and distribute them for consumption, now and in the future, among various people and groups in society.”**[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn24)

Usually, context is latent. Samuelson’s definition makes it manifest. Note carefully that he assumed having a *choice* about employing scarce resources. Obviously,

(i) Samuelson’s scarce resources were not absolutely scarce. That is to say, they were scarce only at a specific price offered. If you paid more for them, the scarcity disappeared.

(ii) His scarce resources were not absolute necessities. Samuelson was writing in a time when water, food, etc, were not scarce on a global scale. That situation is changing, however, and most likely forever. Wherever an absolute necessity is absolutely scarce, *there is no choice*.

But what is an economic necessity?

Until now, necessity has been largely culturally determined. A car is a necessity in some places -- many employers won’t hire you without one -- a bicycle (as Vittorio De Sica showed) in others.

As water and other absolute necessities become absolutely scarce, the cultural determination of necessity will lose its dominance. In a sort of genetic throwback, necessity will be increasingly defined in terms of raw physical requirements for life, e.g., daily caloric intake.

In a world of necessities so defined, Western economics will confront a new era unlike anything before it. Two roads will emerge, diametrically opposed but ending at the same place:

(i) If Samuelson’s definition is accepted, economics in the future will become post-economics relative to the economics taught today -- including Samuelson’s. Among other things, the market will be seen not as THE determinant of value, as a God-like, self-evident truth -- The Invisible Hand -- but simply for what it is: a convenient medium of exchange.

(ii) If Samuelson’s definition is rejected because absolute scarcities of absolute necessities create absolutely no choice, economics on a global scale will be forced to become actually, finally, truly … economical. John Adams’ recommendation to Thomas Jefferson, “as We our poor We ought to be Œconomists,”[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn25) will assume its full value. And René Char’s plea (Chapter 11)[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn26) will be answered in the affirmative: economics will finally change, for better if consciously constituted and managed, for worse if unconsciously controlled and endured.

The coming era of absolute scarcities of absolute necessities will be the greatest change of context in recorded history. Could that transformation generate values which give birth to

(i) a major new economic service?

President Rafael Correa of Ecuador discussed the possibility of a new service created by … doing nothing, i.e., leaving the earth alone:

**“The nations of the Amazon basin are the lungs of the world, without which life on earth would be extinguished...Because fresh air is a good with free access, those nations do not receive just compensation for the service they generate. The idea of compensating for avoiding deforestation is only part of a larger concept, which is to compensate for the net contamination avoided. If the incentives of the Kyoto agreement are expanded to include the net contamination avoided, a revolutionary change in international exchanges could take place, permitting many nations -- above all, the developing ones -- to become exporters of environmental services.”**[**[ix]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn27)

(ii) A fourth economic sector? The primary sector is the extraction of raw materials, e.g., mining and fishing; the secondary sector is production, notably manufacturing; the tertiary is services (doctors, lawyers). [[x]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn29) I suspect the fourth sector already exists but is marginalized in modern capitalist economies. See below.

More spectacular than (i) or (ii), could emerging absolute scarcities of absolute necessities create

(iii) a fourth source of the creation of economic or exchange value?

Adam Smith identified land, labor and capital as

**“the three original sources of all revenue as well as of all exchangeable value. All other revenue is ultimately derived from some one or other of these.”**[[xi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn29)

Obviously, a new service, a fourth sector or a fourth source of economic value could have a momentous impact on the decline of the middle class, hence on the disaster menacing the Western world.

The idea that one or more of the three possibilities already exist is based on fact, not fancy:

Among historical precedents is the service sector, which today employs over 80% of the American population versus only 60% in 1960. The service sector as we know it originated in the nascent cities of feudal Europe. In the agricultural economies of the epoch, that sector was minuscule. Its explosive growth, which nobody foresaw, saved the middle class. Doctors and lawyers took up where small farms and factories left off.

But The Third American Revolution does not begin by looking *out* *there* somewhere for solutions. Most remedies -- viz., a new service, a fourth sector or a fourth source -- are less than an arm’s length away.

\* \* \*

None of the remedies mentioned so far will permanently stop the middle class decline. The reason is that none changes the process of *how* *economic value is created*. As long as that process stays in place, as long as capitalism is capitalism (be it private or state), any new scientific or technological development, any new service, any new economic sector or a fourth source of economic value -- all will eventually undergo the same division of labor and simplification of tasks we are seeing today. In other words: the same erosion of the middle class.

No matter how many reprieves and new leases on life are granted, then, the triple-edged sword remains in place, swinging, lowering.

The Third American Revolution in no way suggests that palliative measures -- tax relief and stimulus masures for small enterprices -- should not be applied; some relief is better than none. The Revolution insists, however, that those measures be accompanied with a full admission that they are palliative, nothing more.

That admission has never been made.

(7) We come to the second destiny -- the last remedy.

The only long term solution to the middle class decline is a post capitalist economic system. *A change in how exchange value is created*.

Karl Marx defined a commodity as “an object of human wants, a means of existence in the widest sense of the term.”[[xii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn31) Adam Smith gave greater specificity to widest sense: the “necessaries, conveniences, and amusements of human life.”[[xiii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn32) From Adam Smith to Karl Marx to John Maynard Keynes to Paul Samuelson, then, there is a fundamental agreement that the key to economics is what people *value*.

That agreement clears away the lies and mystifications, mistakes and obfiscations of oligarchs and their cultural maximizers. Try as they may, the foundation of economics will not go away: What do you want? A *democratic* question, if there ever was one.

Which is why they do not ask it.

To the oligarchs and their spokesmen who say that a new economic system -- as well as a new service, fourth economic sector or a fourth source of economic value -- are all preposterous ideas, all I can say is, given prevailing values, which are *your* values, you are right. I couldn’t agree with you more.

\* \* \*

Is there no alternative to the oligarchy’s Happiness House (Chapter 11)? To the caring, gently-violent state despotism Tocqueville dreaded? To the stupor Rimbaud predicted? To the empty, thing-filled lives President Carter deplored? To All Directions politics straddling an All Directions economy of, by and for the richest 5% of all American households?

Let’s take a parting look at remedy 7, a post capitalist economic system.

First, as the 2008-2009 meltdown showed, there is precious little that is economical about the economics of oligarchs. We look elsewhere.

Again, the secret to economics is no secret at all: human values.[[xiv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn33) They are ultimately where the remedy is found -- in the mirror.

With the dawning of a new epoch of absolutely scarce absolute necessities, it is reasonable to suppose that capitalism will continue for a period.

* “Twilight Zone” viewers, there’s a signpost up ahead. Oxygen tanks. $200. “Wha’cha’ askin there, buddy’?” the one-eyebrowed salesman asks, taking your money. “Ya’ wanna new mask too? 100 bucks extra, pal. Take it or leave it. I’m kinda busy right now.”

You don’t see him? Too bad -- he’s just around the corner.

America won’t be the only nation to have outdated economic principles and practices hanging around. Their presence explains why the hallmark of the new epoch will likely be endless wars over endless scarcities of necessities (Fate 2). Nothing new there:

If Hitler had used the same mobilization of resources for peacetime purposes instead of preparing for war; if Bush and Obama had spent the same money on life at home instead of on death abroad … such what-ifs will remain what-ifs as long as the *values* needed to convert them into realities do not prevail.

If human history has shown anything, it is that *to date* economic values have been impervious to pure logic or reason, to faith or good will.[[xv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn34) You may think that high school teachers “should” be paid more or that high flying PDGs of failing companies “should” be paid less. You also know that in today’s world, “it” does not work that way.

Such is less the case with political values, which in special circumstances and for brief periods, e.g., post-revolutionary 1780s America, allow for the conscious creation of better systems (Chapter 9).

The equivalent today of the political change rendered by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and other Founding Fathers is The Third American Revolution. It is the resurrection of the **политей** or polity with greater power for democracy, less for oligarchy.

The values needed to enact that Revolution do not exist. That is not to say, however, they never will. The challenge is to be ready when the opportunity, always rare and fleeting, arises. For the all-important question of timing, see Appendix 3.

We come to the key question of this book:

Would the greater power of the democratic element of a polity solve the catastrophe of the middle class decline? Can an authentic *political* revolution lead to an *economic* one?

(1) A polity with the powerful democratic component installed by The Third American Revolution has never existed in a large, economically developed nation. What is known is the dismal and deteriorating performance of the middle and lower classes under the status quo oligarchy. Known, too, is the disastrous record of the earth’s ecology

The Third American Revolution does not waste a single second preaching to the archi-rich to be less covetous, to develop a social consciousness, etc. The elemental truth lies elsewhere: *even if it wanted to,* the American oligarchy could not remove the triple-edged sword lowering over America. It doesn’t have the power.[[xvi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn35)

What does?

(2) Paul Samuelson noted that the choice of using productive resources can be made with or without the use of money.

Without the use of money. Ultimately, the economic realm is not as separate and autonomous as it has been throughout recorded history. They don’t call it *political economy* for nothing.

To those who believe otherwise, who say the economy now and forever will be independent of human plans and dreams, The Third American Revolution has a three word response:

John Maynard Keynes.

The end to a sovereign and autonomous economics with recessions and depressions that hit with the uncontrolled fury of tornadoes, hurricanes and other natural disasters: that is not only what Keynes hoped and worked for -- in 1945, he predicted it.

**"The day is not far off when the economic problem will take the back seat where it belongs, and the arena of the heart and the head will be occupied or reoccupied, by our real problems -- the problems of life and of human relations, of creation and behaviour and religion."**[[xvii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn36)

What went so terribly wrong?

Keynes made his prediction when a polity still existed. And nobody incarnated a polity more than the president Keynes knew personally, Franklin Roosevelt. Keynes, FDR and the polity are gone, and we are now farther away from removing economics from the driver’s seat than when Keynes made his prediction a half century ago. I seriously doubt he would disagree with that statement and the cause/effect hypothesis it contains; indeed, Keynes himself indicated why no oligarchy can be ever expected to put economics in the back seat. [[xviii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn37) To so is against their immediate self-interest.

Keynes did not foresee The Second American Revolution and the change of political systems from polity to oligarchy. Based on hard experience, we will verbalize here what he did not: *Solving “the economic problem” requires first solving the political one.*

If that is true, then the gateway to the arena of the heart and the head Keynes cherished is The Third American Revolution. Oligarchs, of course, want you to believe that no such option exists, that the only choice is them or chaos. Since The Third American Revolution is not them, they equate it with chaos.

The Third American Revolution of course has a different understanding: to choose the oligarchy today is to choose chaos tomorrow.

What it comes down to:

*The oligarchs do not want any choices made without money*. The oligarchy thereby makes manifest the latent conflict in the two alternatives Samuelson observed: (1) with and (2) without money. The oligarchy thereby makes something manifest something else: wherever decisions are made without money, the oligarchy loses control.

We end where we began --- in the Introduction with Toqueville’s fatal question. Democracy or oligarchy? Which will win?

An oligarchy legitimized by All Directions politics sitting astride an All Directions economy is rapidly consolidating its rule. Daily life, viz., where it counts, under oligarchic rule was characterized in 1873, by Arthur Rimbaud:

**“One must be absolutely modern. Keep up the pace. No religious hymns. Hard night.”**[[xix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn38)

Only The Third American Revolution calls that forced-pace, hard night what it is:

Fascism as we know it. The Fourth Reich.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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(« Une religion est un système solidaire de croyances et de pratiques relatives à des choses sacrées […]. ») Émile Durkheim, Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 2007, p. 65.

How does a thing come to be sacred? Durkheim:

**“It is relative to a totem that things are classified as sacred or profane. The totem is the prototype of something sacred.”**

(« c’est par rapport à lui [le totem] que les choses sont classées en sacrées et en profanes. Il est le type même des choses sacrées. ») Ibid., p. 167.

Durkheim observed of various Australian aboriginal tribes that it was forbidden for them to eat the plant or animal which was the group’s totem except under exceptional circumstances and with *economy*, i.e.,

**“whenever it is permitted to eat the plant or animal that is the totem, the consumption is not entirely free; one cannot eat it except in small quantities at a time [sic]. To eat too much constitutes a ritual fault that can have grave consequences.”**
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Marine Corps General Anthony C. Zinni, former commander in chief of the U.S. Central Command, reflected on the meaning of being a military officer 1960-2000:

**“The Cold War was a 40-year attempt to refight World War II if ever the need arose. We were energized to engage in a global conflict against the evil Red Menace. The problem was that we never could figure just how this particular war would actually start…**

**The Cold War was ever present, and it was great for justifying programs, systems and force structure -- but no one seriously believed that it would actually happen. Still, it drove things. It drove the way we thought, it drove the way we organized and equipped, and it drove the way we developed our concepts of fighting.”**

Anthony C. Zinni, “For The U.S. Military, War Isn’t What It Used To Be,” International Herald Tribune, July 21, 2000.

*Fear*, then, is America’s prevailing value. But what is “wrong” with using fear -- even if in the unreal, *as-if* sense Zinni described-- as a mobilizing force for a country?

Answer: the means become the end. Anthropologist Jules Henry:
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CHAPTER 14. Conclusion

 *Only men, because they were made*

 *to live in society,*

 *do not lose anything they share.*

-- Montesquieu[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) --

With its frank, public admission that America had a polity and NOT a democracy, and that to resurrect the polity requires strengthening its democratic component, The Third American Revolution steps into the ring with a powerful insight:

In Western societies, power expands only to the extent it is shared.[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn9)

That recognition is the *sine qua non* for what the West needs -- not a second Renaissance, but a re-evolution of the previous Renaissance that gave birth to, among other things, the American Revolution, the Constitution and the American polity.

It was that Renaissance that replaced the age-old, dead and deadening Great European Illusion, Nec Plus Ultra (“There Is Nothing Beyond”), with Plus Ultra (“There Is More Beyond”).

The catalyst for change was Columbus’ discovery of the Americas. After 1492, The Great European Illusion that the world was flat and you would fall off if you sailed too far out, sank beneath the waves. The time has come for The Great American Illusion to join it.

It took a new world to discard one word. The Third American Revolution has a new word to replace it: *Re-evolution*. More on that shortly.

What happened to the Renaissance? The same thing that happened to the polity. Tocqueville’s fatal question that opened our book is *fatal* because it contains a deadly answer. The democratic movement, which was inseparable from the Renaissance, which had *destroyed feudalism and defeated kings*,was marginalized and destroyed by *the rich*.

Although never verbalized and seldom actualized, the insight that power expands by sharing was the heart of the Renaissance, viz., of Europe’s re-evolution.

*Re-evolution*… The Third American Revolution word is easily misunderstood:

(1) Evolution is not used here in its standard, purely biological sense. The paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould:

**“[A]lthough Darwinism surely explains many universal features of human form and behavior, we cannot invoke natural selection as the controlling cause of our cultural changes since the dawn of agriculture -- if only because such a limited time of some ten thousand years provides so little scope for any general biological evolution at all. Moreover, and most importantly, human cultural change operates in a manner that precludes a controlling role for natural selection. To mention the two most obvious differences: first, biological evolution proceeds by continuous division of species into independent lineages that must remain forever separated on the branching tree of life. Human cultural change works by the opposite process of borrowing and amalgamation. One good look at another culture’s wheel or alphabet may alter the course of a civilization forever...**

**Second, human cultural change runs by the powerful mechanism of Lamarckian inheritance of acquired characters. Anything useful (or alas, destructive) that our generation invents can be passed directly to our offspring by direct education. Change in this rapid Lamarckian mode easily overwhelms the much slower process of Darwinian natural selection, which requires a Mendelian form of inheritance based on small-scale and undirected variation that can then be sifted and sorted through a struggle for existence.”**[**[iii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn10)

In short, Gould saw not a separation but a unity of biology and culture. For humans, *culture is a biological necessity*. How can that be?

To survive, humans must predict. That necessity is the result of limited genetic inheritance for coping with the outside world. Antelopes are ready to run within hours of birth; humans take years to walk. Culture fills the genetic gap by providing bases for prediction.

Paraphrasing Montesquieu, then, man was genetically made to be in society. Sharing -- far from sapping -- completes him, makes him more human.

The issue, then, is how to evolve culturally in a way that is useful, not alas destructive. That way makes true, realistic predictions -- not false, fantasy ones such as The Great American Illusion offers, which divert rather than direct. Involved therein are culturally acquired traits that can be passed on in a single generation.

(2) The word re-evolution does not mean necessarily the prevailing notions of “novelty, beginning, and violence”; not an irresistible, “mighty undercurrent”; not an evolution in reverse as in a restoration or “swinging back into a preordained order” of some early time before things supposedly went wrong,[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn11) but literally “re”evolving -- that is, evolving once more, over again, culturally, into a non-preordained order.

To those who object to that nontraditional definition, The Third American Revolution responds: how can any revolution be a real without evoking a revolution in the meaning of the word revolution?

The re-evolution offered by The Third American Revolution builds on Kant’s maxim, sapere aude,[**[v]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn12) of the Renaissance by creating the economic environment and values necessary to actualize another dictum: Noli imitari alios at contra te ipsum rege[**[vi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn13) On a practical level, that actualization implies a sharing of power in the daily world where we live and work, an expansion made mostly outside history books.[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn14)

*The sharing of power is the strengthening of the democratic component of the polity.* That strengthening is the rebirth of the American system.

The art of creating new institutions and customs to share power would be to our epoch what the first American Revolution was to the 1700s.[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn15) The Third American Revolution is exactly that -- not something else.

The urgency for that art is visible daily in the poor stewardship of human and natural resources displayed by governments and businesses around the world. If the present degradation continues, Live Free or Die soon will be a necessity, not a phrase.

To share power, however, is not to give power. *Power cannot be given*. In truth, the very act of giving power only reinforces the power of the giver.[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn16) That is the timeless secret of men in power: he that giveth can taketh away, and probably will.

Given that reality, The Third American Revolution asks nothing of the president, Congress, The Rockefeller Foundation, the Supreme Court, NBC, Bill Gates, Harvard, George Soros, the C.I.A. They literally *have nothing to offer*.

To date, the sharing of power -- small, incremental -- has been the result of wars. Those who fought with gun and sword demanded more citizenship for risking their lives. Are there nonviolent ways to achieve the same result? New institutions? New customs? Only The Third American Revolution asks that question.

The alternative to that Revolution is already here.

It is easier to despair than to inquire. Instead of asking questions, American oligarchs are sticking to what they know best: fear (Chapter 13). Fear is how Washington’s subordination of policy to war[[x]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn17) finally arrived at its ultimate destination: rule of, by and for the lowest Uncommon denominator.

Remember LUD the next time you see Obama on TV. His Republican challenger, too. All the others, for that matter.

We’ll say it again. The acid test for the sharing of power was aptly presented by Alexis de Tocqueville:

**“The remedy is above all else, outside constitutions. In order for democracy to govern, there must be *citizens*, i.e., people who are interested in public affairs, who have the capacity and the desire to participate in them. One must always return to this fundamental point.”**[**[xi]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn18)

**We extrapolated:**

**“The remedy. An increase in the (i) capacity and (ii) desire to participate on the part of the populace: may any government agency or employee, any political candidate or party, any policy, law or regulation be judged accordingly.”**

The Third American Revolution, too.

If you are ever with an American oligarch, ask him what he thinks about increased public participation. You’ll see an audible shrug. When it comes to ideas, he is anemic, washed out. Caught in the spell of The Great American Illusion, he wears the same button everywhere, even when he sleeps, makes love, dies: So?

To see what’s underneath it all, turn the button over.

You’ll discover the oligarchy’s Golden Rule: *Me First*.

\* \* \*

A strong people does not need a strong man.[[xii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn19) John Steinbeck, Alexis de Tocqueville and Mexico’s Zapatistas at the turn of the 20th century recognized that fundamental truth. The Third American Revolution is based on it.

A strong people, however, means a sharing of power. The two cannot be separated.

In America that sharing recently passed a critical crossroad. Tocqueville foresaw it (see Introduction). Aristotle quantified it:

 **“…where the number of the members of the middle class outweighs that of both the other classes -- and even where it only outweighs that of one of the others -- a ‘polity’ can be permanently established.”**[[xiii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn20)

Official data show unequivocally that in the latter part of the 1900s, the first barrier fell.[[xiv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn21) Was the unknown moment the middle class slipped below 50% of American households the beginning of a fate that is only too well known?

Immediately after noting the key importance of the **“man in the middle”** as a neutral arbitrator, Aristotle concluded: **“The better, and the more equitable the mixture in a ‘polity,’ the more durable it will be.”**

*More* durable. Implicit in that observation is that no polity is eternal. What, then, makes the mixture less equitable and destroys a polity?

We repeat here a point mentioned previously. Aristotle warned that the major menace is not outside enemies, not the poor, not the middle class, but the wealthy:

**“[Forgetting the claims of equity], they not only give more power to the well-to-do, but they also deceive the people [by fobbing them off with sham rights]. Illusory benefits must always produce real evils in the long run; and the encroachments made by the rich [under cover of such devices] are more destructive to a constitution than those of the people.”**[**[xv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn22)

It is exactly that avarice and illusory benefits -- adult fairytales about “unity” and “rights” given as gifts and hence not accompanied by power -- that characterize America today.

Adam Smith’s Invisible Hand doled out those gifts. In the process, itbecame only too visible.

That fall of the polity is creating a crisis of legitimacy plaguing not only the American government but also families, businesses, schools, neighborhoods. Megabucks piling up in Switzerland and crackhead daughter home from Swiss prep school hysterically screaming -- through pierced lips -- at Mommy and Daddy to go to hell; gorgeous yacht moored in Monaco and courageous trophy wife sleeping with her analyst; business profits doubling and thefts by VP nephew tripling: no oligarch yet has made the connection.

From France to Canada, from Brazil to England: all Western nations are under the spell of The Great American Illusion. They are unable to admit they do not have democracies, much less recognize that power is increased by sharing it. As long as that admission and recognition do not exist, a re-evolution of political values -- and of economic values inextricably tied to them -- is impossible.

No re-evolution, no Third American Revolution. No Third American Revolution, no polity. No polity, no democracy, and no solution to the economic crisis.

We arrive at the close.

Take out your binoculars. No Third American Revolution is on the horizon.

So, get ready. Paraphrasing Madison, because the American oligarchy cannot promote the welfare of all, it cannot give security to each, i.e., to those with and without property. Rich richer; poor poorer; middle class smaller: do not reduce the three-edged sword to ill will. Even if they wanted to, the oligarchs running the country could not promote the general welfare. Unable to share power, they don’t have the power.

Today, not a single person in Western governments knows how to increase power. Until they take the first step and admit they do not have a democracy, they will sink ever deeper in the quicksand that is power without power.

The cause of that sinking: power is not created mechanically by elections or laws, by organization charts or military force, by artificial audiences prepackaged for TV showing enraptured citizens listening to their fearless leader. *Power must be exercised -- shared -- in order to exist.*

Where the oligarchs’ power without power leaves us:

With its uncompromising position of sharing power, of including and not excluding, The Third American Revolution is the only way to create real power. It, alone, replaces *as-if* with *could be*.

Without that Revolution, gradually but inevitably the triple-edged sword will continue to swing lower.

Gradually but inevitably, the middle class will be forced economically to give up its place on the quiet side of the fire.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) (« Les hommes seuls, faits pour vivre en société, ne perdent rien de ce qu’ils partagent. ») Charles de Montesquieu, Dossier de l’esprit des lois, in Œuvres complètes II, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1994, p. 1,094.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) We are looking at a very American, but forgotten, tradition. Tocqueville:

 **“Europeans believe that in order to achieve liberty it is necessary to diminish the power of he who has it, and they thereby arrive at disorder. Americans do not diminish power but share it.”**

 (« Les Européens croient que pour arriver à la liberté il faut diminuer le pouvoir dans les mains de celui qui le tient et ils arrivent au désordre. Les Américains ne diminuent pas le pouvoir mais le partagent. ») Alexis de Tocqueville, Notes et variantes, in Œuvres, op.cit., p. 961.

He further observed that

**“in sharing power, one renders, it is true, its action less irresistible and less dangerous, but one does not in any manner destroy it...”**

(« partageant ainsi l’autorité, on rend, il est vrai, son action moins irrésistible et moins dangereuse, mais on ne la détruit point. ») Alexis de Tocqueville, De La Démocratie en Amérique I, op.cit., pp. 77-8. (I, V).

That Renaissance viewpoint goes directly against the Roman Empire formula, which has dominated the West for 2,000 years. Romulus killed his brother, Remus, thereby ridding himself of a troublesome competitor. Tacite formulated the event this way: insociabile regnum -- **“Power Is Not Shared.”**  Lucien Jerphagnon, Histoire de la Rome antique, Hachette, Paris, 2002, p. 23. See also pp. 241-2, 279, 364, 395, 502. For more on Rome and how it was outsmarted, see Appendix 3.

The axiom that power expands only to the extent it is shared, then, is no eternal truth; rather, it is a relatively recent development that owes its existence to Renaissance values.

The Roman Empire versus the Renaissance: what, really, is the difference? Is it all not in the end just a question of ideology, of brain-washing?

Antoine Destutt de Tracy invented the word *ideology* (*Eléments de l’idéologie*, 1801). Michel Foucault noted of Tracy’s original meaning:

**“Ideology does not inquire about the basis, the limits or the root of representation; ideology traverses the domain of representations in general and fixes the necessary successions that appear in it, defines the connections forged in it, and makes manifest the laws of composition and decomposition that control it…”**

(« L’Idéologie n’interroge pas le fondement, les limites ou la racine de la représentation ; elle parcourt le domaine des représentations en général ; elle fixe les successions nécessaires qui y apparaissent ; elle définit les liens qui s’y nouent ; elle manifeste les lois de composition et de décomposition qui peuvent y régner [...].. ») Michel Foucault, *Les Mots et les choses*, Gallimard, Paris, 2004, p. 253.

Because The Third American Revolution questions its own assumptions and values -- its roots -- it is non-ideological. Such is its decisive difference from The Great American Illusion.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) Stephen Jay Gould, “A Tale of Two Work Sites,” in Stephen Jay Gould, The Richness of Life: The Essential Stephen Jay Gould, W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 2007, pp. 551-2.

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref11) Hannah Arendt, On Revolution, The Viking Press, New York, 1965, pp. 40, 42, 18, 36, 38.

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref12) “Have the courage to use your own intelligence.”

[[vi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref13) “Be your own role model.”

[[vii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref14) A concrete example is a phenomenon that, if it continues, could be decisive for the future. It involves, perhaps, the very origin of power, viz., the power over one’s own body:

**“United Nations, New York: For decades, experts assumed that the largest developing countries, the home of hundreds of millions in big families, would push the global population to a precarious 10 billion people by the end of this century.**

**Now, there are indications that women in rural villages and the teeming cities of Brazil, Egypt, India and Mexico are proving those predictions wrong. This week, demographers from around the world will meet at the United Nations to reassess the outlook and possibly lower the estimate by about a billion people this century. In India alone, by 2100 there may be 600 million people fewer than predicted.**

**The decline in birthrates in these nations defies almost all conventional wisdom. Planners once said -- and some still argue -- that birthrates would not slow until poverty and illiteracy gave way to higher living standards and better educational opportunities. It now seems that women are not waiting. Furthermore, a few demographers are venturing to say that neither government policies nor foreign aid in family planning was a critical factor….**

**In India, Gita Sen, professor of economics at the Indian Institute of Management in Bangalore, said there were important cultural factors at work.**

**‘Fertility in India is declining, and it is declining faster than many people had expected,’ she said. One reason is ‘that with increasing awareness on the part of women, they are being able to control their own fertility much better.’**

**‘It seems to start in one village and then spread to other place around that area,’ she said. ‘Attitudes are changing, and people are watching what their neighbors are doing.’…**

**With declining infant mortality, mothers become more confident that their babies will survive, she added, and so they can have fewer children. She and other experts say that urbanization also eases some familial controls on women, and makes contraceptive pills or devices easier to find.…**

**In Brazil, women have reduced fertility levels without a national family planning policy, Ana Maria Goldani of the department of sociology and Latin American studies at UCLA wrote in a paper for the conference this week. Brazil’s fertility rate has tumbled, to 2.27 from 6.15 in the last half-century, and it continues to fall for reasons that Goldani says are only now being analyzed.”**

Barbara Crossette, “Birthrates declining in developing countries,” International Herald Tribune, March 11, 2002.

The Third American Revolution, like the first, is not limited to America.

[[viii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref15) We presented numerous examples, e.g., a constitutional amendment to provide for national referenda (Chapter 2).

[[ix]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref16) The same is true for human rights. Tocqueville: **“A right is only born by exercising it.”**

(« Le droit ne naît que par l’exercice. ») Alexis de Tocqueville, *Notes et variantes*, op.cit., p. 957.

Montesquieu identified the underlying dynamic:

**“Peace cannot be purchased, because he who sold it is only thereby rendered even more in a position to make it be purchased again.”**

(« la paix ne peut point s’acheter, parce que celui qui l’a vendue n’en est que plus en état de la faire acheter encore. ») Charles de Montesquieu, Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence, in Œuvres complètes II, op.cit., p. 171. (Chapitre XVIII).

How is a giver, by giving, rendered more powerful?

The answer lies in the nature of the gift:

The ethnologist and sociologist Marcel Mauss wrote in a pioneering study that a gift establishes between the giver and the receiver a fundamental hierarchy.

**“To give is show superiority, to be more, higher, magister; to accept without giving or not giving more than one received, is to become a client and servant, to become small, to fall to a lower station (minister).”**

(« Donner, c’est manifester sa supériorité, être plus, plus haut, magister ; accepter sans rendre ou sans rendre plus, c’est se subordonner, devenir client et serviteur, devenir petit, choir plus bas (minister). ») Marcel Mauss, Essai sur le don (1925), in Marcel Mauss, Sociologie et anthropologie, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 2004, pp. 269-70.

Contemporary researchers have analyzed the hierarchy created by a gift:

(1) The sociologist Jacques Godbout enunciated a basic tenet:

**“The gift is horrified by equality. It searches an alternating inequality.”**

(« Le don a horreur de l’égalité. Il recherche l’inégalité alternée. »):

**"The debt created by a gift is never ‘paid off’; the debt is diminished or inverted by a bigger gift than the debt. If nature is horrified by a vacuum, the gift is horrified by equilibrium … In other words, equivalency is the death of a gift. Equivalency is a way of ‘fixing a limit’ to a chain of gifts, to take from a gift the tension that makes it dynamic. Conversely, the absence of equilibrium terminates a relationship based on commodities…**

**Equality introduces a rivalry that the gift, on the contrary, evacuates in making alternately partners who are superior and inferior.”**

(« [Une] dette de don n’est jamais « réglée » ; elle est diminuée ou renversée (inversée) par un don plus grand que la dette. Si la nature a horreur du vide, le don a horreur de l’équilibre […]. Or, l’équivalence, c’est la mort du don. C’est une façon de « mettre un terme » à une chaîne de don, d’enlever au don la tension qui le dynamise. Inversement l’absence d’équilibre met fin à un rapport marchand.

 […] L’égalité introduit la rivalité que le don, au contraire, évacue en faisant alternativement des partenaires des « supérieurs » et des « inférieurs ». ») Jacques T. Godbout, L’Esprit du don, La Découverte, Paris, 2000, pp. 51, 252-3.

(2) The anthropologist Maurice Godelier observed that the gift creates a relationship that has more dimensions than naked power alone:

**"the fact that to give obliges others without having a need of resorting to violence. The gift…creates solidarity between the two partners and at the same time causes one of them (the receiver) to be obligated to the other (the giver), placing the receiver in a socially inferior and dependent condition until he gives, in his turn, more than he received."**

(« [Le] fait que donner oblige les autres sans qu’il soit besoin de recourir à la violence. Le don […] rend solidaires les deux partenaires et en même temps fait de l’un d’eux (le donataire) l’obligé de l’autre (le donateur), l’installe dans une position socialement inférieure et dépendante tant qu’il ne pourra donner à son tour plus qu’il n’a reçu. ») Maurice Godelier, L’Enigme du don, Librairie Arthème Fayard, Paris, 2004, p. 207.

(3) The ethnologist Henri Courau:

**“to give creates an obligation by creating a lack of equilibrium between the giver and receiver.”**

(« donner oblige en créant un déséquilibre entre donateur et donataire. »)

The practical consequences are sometimes as tragic as they are avoidable.

**"In emergency humanitarian aid, the two-sided relationship of the gift, formed by the international employees and the receivers of the aid -- receivers determined by the employees -- does not build the essential space for a dignified reception and an honorary counter-gift. The receiver ends up losing his self-respect. In giving without receiving, the givers deprive themselves of the creation of a connection and also deprive the receivers of a social and cultural self-construction…**

**The giver conserves the possibility of taking advantage of his gift and of the debt contracted to him by the receiver. The latter enters into a tie of dependency with regard to the giver; he signs an alliance of obligation. One is close here to important political and economic stakes."**

(« Dans l’aide humanitaire d’urgence, la dyade du don, formée par les employés internationaux et par les récipiendaires -- déterminés par ces employés --, ne construit pas l’espace essentiel à une réception digne et à un contre-don honorifique. Le donataire finit par perdre l’estime de soi. En donnant sans recevoir, les donateurs se privent de la création du lien et privent les récipiendaires d’une auto-reconstruction sociale et culturelle.

 […] Le donateur conserve la possibilité de se prévaloir de son don et de la dette contractée à son égard par le bénéficiaire. Celui-ci entrera dans un lien de dépendance à l’égard de son bienfaiteur ; il signe une alliance d’obligation. On est proche ici d’enjeux politiques et économiques importants. ») Henri Courau, « Un Ethnologue à Sangatte », in « Lévi-Strauss et la pensée sauvage », Le Nouvel observateur, Hors série numéro 51, Le Nouvel Observateur du Monde, Paris, juillet/août 2003, pp. 74, 76, 77.

[[x]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref17) **“The subordination of the political point of view to the military would be contrary to common sense, for policy has declared the War; it is the intelligent faculty, War only the instrument, and not the reverse.”**

Carl Von Clausewitz, On War, Penguin Books, London, England, 1982, p. 405.

[[xi]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref18) (« Le remède est surtout en dehors des constitutions. Pour que la démocratie puisse gouverner il faut des citoyens, des gens qui prennent intérêt à la chose publique, aient la capacité de s’en mêler et le veuillent. Point capital auquel il faut toujours revenir. ») Alexis de Tocqueville, Notes et variantes, op.cit., p. 1,019.

[[xii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn19) Or a strong, despotic state.

[[xiii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn20) Aristotle, *The Politics of Aristotle*, translated and edited by Ernest Barker, Oxford University Press, New York, 1962, p. 185. (Book IV, Chapter 12).

[[xiv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn21) Chapter 10 placed the date at 1992-3. A different calculation produces a different year:

In September 2000, the United States Government published a summary of the national annual revenue by households, 1967 to 1999. The households were divided into three groups: (1) less than $24,999; (2) from $25,000 to $74,999, and (3) $75,000 and higher. If *middle class* is defined as group (2), the data show that between 1980 and 1990 that class declined from 51.7% to 49.7% of total households.

The turning point may have been the proverbial year, 1984, when group (2) comprised 50.0% of all households; in 1985, the figure was 49.6% and to date has not gone above 50%. United States Bureau of The Census, *Current Population Reports, Series P60-209,* *Money Income in the United States: 1999*, “Table B-2. Households by Total Money Income, Race, and Hispanic Origin of Householder: 1967 to 1999,” Appendix B, B-3, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 2000.

[**[xv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_edn22) Aristotle, op.cit., p. 186. (Book IV, Chapter XII). Brackets made by translator.

Tocqueville foresaw the same crossroad. In citing it, we end where we began.

**“Is it possible that, after having destroyed feudalism and defeated kings, that democracy will retreat before the bourgeoisie and the rich? Will democracy stop now that it has become so strong and its adversaries so weak?”**

(« Pense-t-on qu’après avoir détruit la féodalité et vaincu les rois, la démocratie reculera devant les bourgeois et les riches ? S’arrêtera-t-elle maintenant qu’elle est devenue si forte et ses adversaires si faibles ? ») Alexis de Tocqueville, *De La Démocratie en Amérique I*, op.cit., pp. 6, 7. (« Introduction »).

APPENDIX 1. How To Steal An Election.

Did George W. Bush steal the 2000 election in Florida?

12 years later, the question is still hanging in the air. There may be a way to answer it.

To my knowledge, the election scam I will present here has never been revealed. [[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) Insider stuff.

First, three facts were known before the 2000 election took place:

(1) The closeness of the election. One election eve headline said it all:

**"Race for White House Is Seen by the Polls As Closest in 40 years."**[**[ii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9)

(2) The same article noted that George Bush

**"remained behind in some polls in Florida, a populous state where his brother, Jeb, is governor."**

(3) Florida held the key to the White House. A report published election morning noted that Al Gore

**"had waged an all-night blitz in Florida, which he told supporters, 'may very well be the state that decides the outcome of this election.'"**[**[iii]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10)

Close election; Bush in trouble in Florida; Florida the key. Clearly, there was a motive to cheat. But was there opportunity?

Election night, the Florida vote count dribbled in. There was

**"a double turnaround by television networks which, using computer projections, reported that Mr. Gore had won Florida before deciding that that was premature, and then gave the state and the presidency to Mr. Bush before deciding again that they had drawn a hasty conclusion."** [**[iv]**](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10)

What on earth (or elsewhere) was happening?

Forget the butterfly ballot; forget hanging chad. Or rather, do not forget, but look past them. They may have been diversions.

Starting in 1974, I directed many candidates' get-out-the-vote drives on Election Day. I saw many strange things. Among them: dead people voting.

The usual explanation: somebody collects names in cemeteries and registers those names to vote. Live people then appear at the polls using the dead people's names.

Frankly, I doubt that scam occurs to a significant degree:

First, it is too risky. All it takes is one flabbergasted precinct worker confronted with a would-be voter posing as the worker's dearly departed husband and the whole scheme is torn to shreds.

Second, the cemetery ploy relies on the live person to be honest and vote the way he is told. Well, we know about his honesty. Once the curtain closes, who knows what happens? Simply put: buying a person is one thing; will he stay bought is another.

And third, there is another way for dead people to vote without either of the disadvantageous just mentioned

I am not excluding the cemetery ploy -- just discounting it. How, then, do dead people vote?

Here is the scam I mentioned. So far, it has been 100% safe; otherwise, you would know about it and would not be reading these words. 100% reliable, too.

Being unmentionable, the scam has no name. I will call it **"The Long Count"** in honor of the 1927 heavyweight championship fight between Jack Dempsey and Gene Tunney.

To wit:

Election night. Their civic duty ended, the voters go home. The precinct officials search the building, lock the doors.

Alone at last, the officials change hats. An uncivic duty begins. They open voter rosters along with a bottle or two (optional). Forget upstream brew -- this is a Gatorade and bourbon crowd.

The roster is the document with names of registered voters that you sign immediately before you vote.

The night crew no longer cares about voters. Their attention is fixed on non-voters -- the names with no signatures.

Roster in hand, Crew Member 1 signs the name of a person who did not vote. He signals to Crew Member 2 standing in a voting machine. Crew Member 2 pushes the button for straight Democrat, straight Republican, George Bush, Al Gore -- whatever. More sophisticated election night crews pass the rosters around; otherwise, the similarity of signatures might attract attention.

Of course, when Crew Member 1 sees a blank space beside a name on a roster, he does not know if the person is alive. When he signs a name, guess what can happen?

Now you know how dead people vote. Lots of them. In the "right" way, too -- always.

Dead people who vote are Democrats and Republicans, men and women, old and young. Cheating is an equal opportunity employer.

The signing of rosters and button pushing takes time. That is why delayed reporting of election returns is the telltale heart of The Long Count.

How many votes are enough? In Florida 2000, Bush's margin was less than 600 votes. That question brings us to the second cause of The Long Count:

The final vote total is the topic of a fast and furious communications. The election crew boss passes the word up the line: we want this...we want that... He has every reason to drag out the talks, unlike the candidate. This leads to interesting -- if not always civil -- dialogue.

Theoretically, The Long Count is possible anywhere. However, the county clerk must be in on it, or at least be willing to look the other way. I know, I know: you think the clerk would not let candidates of his or her own party crash and burn. I hate to tell you, but I have known public officials who would sell out for a baked potato at the palace.

The Long Count leaves traces. They are so obvious they are overlooked.

To find them, go hunting where the ducks are.

Start with precincts in isolated, rural areas. Those are the easiest ones to control physically. In Florida that means the northern counties. Two facts about them: (i) Most of them voted for Bush in 2000. (ii) I spent six years there.

The traces:

(1) Precincts with unusually high turnouts. Look not only at 2000, but also prior elections. Either those precincts are full of good citizens or they are full of something else.

(2) Among the group of precincts with abnormally high turnouts, look for precincts with abnormally high percentages for Bush. If Republican candidates usually get 70% of the vote in a precinct but Bush got 90%, a red flag should go up.

(3) The clincher: dead people voted.

When all 3 traces are present, something was -- as we say in the political trade -- **"wired up."** Put The Long Count at the top of the list. A handwriting expert should be called in to examine signatures in any dubious precinct roster.

I must emphasize that even if the Bushes used The Long Count, that fact does preclude the possibility that Democrats, too, exercised it. Look at both sides, and not just in Florida.

The three-point Florida study outlined above would make an excellent political science master's thesis. And it might solve once and for all the mystery of did-he-or-didn't-he.

Whatever the study's findings, a 23-year-old graduate student will see his or her name in lights. Start with “60 minutes.”

I do not know if The Long Count took place in Florida. I do know it did not take place in Iran in 2009, when protestors took to the street denouncing electoral fraud.

Look out your window. You see the difference?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) A similar process took place in the 1988 presidential election in Mexico. The defrauded candidate, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas, and three researchers, José Barberán, Adriana Lopez Monjardín, and Jorge Zavala wrote an outstanding study, *Radiografía del fraude* (Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, Mexico, 1988). I interviewed three of the authors, including Cárdenas. When I informed him I was looking all over town for a copy of *Radiografia*, he laughed -- “and you couldn’t find it anywhere.” He called the publisher who set aside a copy.

José Barberán noted in a letter in 1989 that the truth “will eventually come out.” It did; today, nobody disputes that the PRI party stole the election. Given the present state of American scholarship and journalism -- both are limited cultural maximizers -- Bush need not fear the same outcome.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref9) Brian Knowlton, International Herald Tribune, November 7, 2000.

[[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) Brian Knowlton, "Exhausted Candidates in a Photo Finish," International Herald Tribune, November 8, 2000.

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) Florida has a history of prolonged ballot counts; hence the title of the article by John Vanocur, "Election may Seem Unusual, but in Some Ways It's Déjà vu all Over Again," International Herald Tribune, November 9, 2000.

I should note that I am an accredited expert witness on politics in federal court. If I were testifying in a lawsuit, I would say what you just read. I would also prepare the pertinent statistical exhibits.

APPENDIX 2. Barack Obama Defined

Liberal? Conservative? Moderate? Pragmatist? New Democrat?

What is Barack Obama anyway?

Here is his response after eight weeks in the White House:

**"Asked if 'liberal' or 'progressive' better defined his philosophy, he said, 'I'm not going to engage in that.'"**[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10)

In refusing to be categorized, Obama categorically categorized himself.

He is America's first *post modern* president.

Which calls for an explanation…

(1) Modernism.

In the Western world, the 1500s-1800s was a period of astonishing scientific and technological breakthroughs. They were simultaneously cause and consequence of the rise of the bourgeoisie and the nation-state.

Those breakthroughs were accompanied, stimulated and legitimized by a revolution in thought propagated by Copernicus, Galileo, Descartes, Kant, Lock, Spinoza, Newton and Montesquieu.

A new era, very unlike anything prior to it, dawned:

**"Man was alone, quite alone, in a vast and complex cosmic machine. Gone were the angelic hosts, gone the devils and their pranks, gone the daily miracles of supernatural intervention…"** [[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10)

This new constellation of people and facts, events and ideas, was *modernism*. It had a polar star:

**"The whole educated world in the eighteenth century was convinced, as never before or since, that the most beneficent and the most divine force in human life, man's supreme achievement and his brightest jewel, is science."** [[iii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10)

Science's triumph allowed for the creation and fructification of a new idea in the world: *progress*, a faith in an ascending future following knowable laws. Reasonable plans could be made. Goals could be envisioned, worked on, saved for. Dreams were even dreamed about the perfectibility of mankind and society.

In the late 1800s and early 1900s, Darwin and Einstein carried full speed ahead the absolute faith in science and progress.

But two world wars, racial and ethnic genocides, The Great Depression, psychoanalysis' illumination of the dark corners and corridors of the human mind, nuclear and bio-chemical attacks, famines and signs of impending environmental catastrophe: all deflated modernism's limitless optimism about science and progress.

Hence, the rise of

(2) *Postmodernism*.

The belief that higher eternal laws will someday be unfurled has been replaced by an acceptance of mundane statistical probabilities. Causation has been reduced to a hypothesis -- usually a null hypothesis -- implied by correlations which, when challenged, suddenly do not "prove" anything. Determinism of any sort has come to be viewed as a superstition at best, an outright lie at worst.

The hope for a unified theory, The Big Idea that will tie it all together, has been consigned to the appropriately-named "string theory."

The Age of Reason morphed into The Age of Ambiguity. How could it have been otherwise? In postmodernism, truths are not only multiple but parallel, serial but discontinuous, additive and not cumulative, and if conflicting, allowed to conflict. An unvoiced axiom is all truths are created equal (lies too), which poses this question: has culture been replaced by information?

In the arts, process and reality are no longer separate. *Process is reality*[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) -- the only reality. That reality consists of sensations -- a steady, Heraclitian shower of colors, tastes, touches, smells, sounds, sweat, sex, violence. Been to a movie lately?

Two book titles displayed an acute appreciation of process as the only reality: *The Medium Is The Message* (Marshall McLuhan, 1964) and *How Does A Poem Mean?* (John Ciardi, 1959).

In postmodernism, where relativity is the only absolute and only chance can be "pure" and "alone" -- in other words, where the unconditional truth of the conditions which condition truths goes completely unchallenged -- it is appropriate that the plurality of schools of thought (read: eclecticism) should expand exponentially by the hour.

Those minutes form an *endless present* with no beginning or end -- The Conveyor Belt Effect in which thoughts and things, structure and function, Flipper and feldspar, theory and shaving cream, sensations and adventures, chicken and chocolate milk, appear one-after-another on an endlessly-moving conveyor belt that carries them along and does not sort anything out or *go* *somewhere*.

You do not have to leave your chair to experience directly and immediately postmodernism and The Conveyor Belt Effect. Connect to any articles website and look around. You will see everything from "Cubic Zirconia Bracelets" to "Recapture Your Life After Bankruptcy."

Modernism's unbounded faith in progress has been replaced by the boundless faith in uncertainty. Writing on the wall I saw in 1992 in a Geneva train station gave simultaneously modernism's obituary and postmodernism's birth certificate: *No Future*.[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10)

So, where is America’s first post-modern president taking us?

Almost every city in France has a sign with an arrow pointing sometimes left, sometimes right. The sign says "Toutes Directions." All Directions. If you think it’s impossible to go in all directions at once, just follow the arrow.

It takes you where you… are right now.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[[i]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) Peter Baker, "Obama defies easy political labels by melding philosophies," *International Herald Tribune*, March 16, 2009.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) John Herman Randall, Jr., *The Making of The Modern Mind*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1976, p. 227.

[[ii]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) Ibid., p. 279.

[[iv]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) Alfred North Whitehead remarked in 1929, in reference to "that ultimate, integral experience" that "is the final aim of philosophy, the flux of things is one ultimate generalization around which we must weave our philosophical system." Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, Harper & Row Publishers, New York, 1960, p. 317.

[[v]](http://www.weebly.com/weebly/main.php#_ednref10) For an excellent discussion of postmodernism, see Leonard B. Meyer, *Music, The Arts, And Ideas*, The University of Chicago Press, New York, 1994.

APPENDIX 3. Waiting for Shapur II

Today’s quiz.

Shapur II was

1. A Russian spacecraft that crashed on the moon.

2. A Persian Emperor.

3. A famous sapphire that belonged to Elizabeth Taylor.

4. A Saudi Arabian oil minister.

5. Saddam Hussein’s Chief of Intelligence.

6. None of the above.

The envelope, please.

For the answer, ask any Iranian. Shapur II will show you how to take down a more powerful opponent.

How powerful? Try the Roman Empire.

The Third American Revolution has the mightiest opponent on earth. In 2008-2009, the American oligarchy succeeded where a civil war, two world wars, countless incompetencies and numerous conspiracies had failed. It destroyed the American system of government that was admired and imitated around the world.

Today, the oligarchy’s dominance extends far and wide. But how deep?

Which brings us to Shapur II. The history of ancient Rome furnishes a case study of what to do and not do. It is relevant today in more ways than one...

In the year 363, the Roman Army under the courageous Emperor Julian marched on Persia (Iran). Julian was killed in battle, and was replaced by Jovian.

Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of The Roman Empire* (Chapter XXIV), relates what happened next.

The Persian Emperor Shapur II

**"observed, with serious concern, that in the repetition of doubtful combats, he had lost his most faithful and intrepid nobles, his bravest troops, and the great part of his train of elephants: and the experienced monarch feared to provoke the resistance of despair, the vicissitudes of fortune, and the unexhausted powers of the Roman empire; which might soon advance to relieve, or to revenge, the successor of Julian.**

**The Surenas himself, accompanied by another satrap, appeared in the camp of Jovian; and declared, that the clemency of his sovereign was not averse to signify the conditions, on which he would consent to spare and to dismiss [Jovian], with the relics of his captive army. The hopes of safety subdued the firmness of the Romans; the emperor was compelled, by the advice of his council, and the cries of the soldiers, to embrace the offer of peace...**

**The crafty Persian delayed, under various pretences, the conclusion of the agreement; started difficulties, required explanations, suggested expedients, receded from his concessions, increased his demands, and wasted four days in the arts of negotiation, till he had consumed the stock of provisions which yet remained in the camp of the Romans.**

**Had Jovian been capable of executing a bold and prudent measure, he would have continued his march with unremitting diligence;...he might have safely reached the fruitful province of Corduene, at the distance of only one hundred miles. The irresolute emperor, instead of breaking through the toils of the enemy, expected his fate with patient resignation; and accepted the humiliating conditions of peace, which it was no longer in his power to refuse."**

The humiliating peace treaty Shapur II imposed was indeed humiliating:

**"The messengers of Jovian promulgated the specious tale of a prudent and necessary peace: the voice of fame, louder and more sincere, revealed the disgrace of the emperor, and the conditions of the ignominious treaty.**

**The minds of the people were filled with astonishment and grief, with indignation and terror, when they were informed, that the unworthy successor of Julian relinquished the five provinces, which had been acquired by the victory of Galerius; and that he shamefully surrendered to the Barbarians the important city of Nisibis, the firmest bulwark of the provinces of the East."**

The affair proved to be no isolated incident. Shapur II

**"enjoyed the glory and the fruits of his victory; and this ignominious peace has justly been considered as a memorable era in the decline and fall of the Roman Empire.**

**The predecessors of Jovian had sometimes relinquished the dominion of distant and unprofitable provinces: but, since the foundation of the city, the genius of Rome, the god Terminus, who guarded the boundaries of the republic, had never retired before the sword of a victorious enemy."**

The hour of The Third American Revolution is not at hand. Take away the Supreme Court’s unconstitutional power to determine the constitutionality of laws; allow national referenda; revolutionize campaign financing; make voting mandatory; close the Electoral College; switch to a unicameral legislature; make people’s votes have equal weight; get rid of The Great American Illusion; determine without money the use of human and natural resources: the oligarchy will not allow any of them.

In the meantime, what can The Third American Revolution do?

First, ask questions. Demand explanations.

No oligarch likes to be questioned because no oligarch can explain.

And second: wait.

Because conquest cannot wait, the oligarchy cannot win.

Pauses and delays, interruptions, intervals: The Third American Revolution creates nothing new. It only makes manifest what is latent:

The American oligarchy has power without power.