



Broad incorruptible Democracy

Here is a new 1,300-page design for a new and incorruptible form of democracy. It includes a new proposed 100,000 word (230 page) national constitution.

This new constitution was designed to be incorruptible, in contrast to the 1789-era US constitution which was designed to have as many backdoors to Arab power as possible. This while appearing fair and reasonable.

1/ Our democracy's representation ratio is far too narrow

The representation ratio is by far the most fundamental aspect of a democracy. What is the ratio of citizens to leaders? Narrow democracies, with too few elected leaders, suffer from many of the same problems as broad oligarchies.

Problem #1 Intelligence: Which democracy will have an expert in every subject? The one with 50 lawmakers, or the one with 50-thousand lawmakers? Which brain is smarter, the one with 50 cells or the one with 50-thousand cells?

Problem #2 Isolation: Which democracy is more accessible and can better hear the voice of the people? The one with 50 lawmakers, or the one with 50-thousand?

Problem #3 Elitism: Which democracy is less elitist, and more like the common man? The one with 50 lawmakers or the one with 50-thousand?

Problem #4 Ease of seizing power: Is it easier to seize power from 50 lawmakers or 50-thousand? Also, broad democracies can be decentralized, meeting in multiple cities— This makes a violent seizure of power harder to pull off.

Problem #5 Vote value: Lawmakers in a 50-man legislature cast very powerful and very valuable votes — votes that are definitely worth buying and selling. But if the legislature has 50,000 men in it, each vote is worth 1,000 times less and the cost of corruption rises at least 1,000-fold.

Also, the ability to profit from one's position in a 50-man or 500-man legislature offers a powerful incentive for crooks to fight for election. In fact, such a valuable thing to sell, apparently draws crooks to elected office like bees to honey.

Problem #6 Lobbying: It is easy to visit 50 lawmakers. But is hard to visit 50,000 lawmakers. Thus broad democracies are About 1,000 times less vulnerable to lobbyists.

Problem #7 Appointees: What a huge error of scale we make. There is no way that 536 elected people (435 representatives +100 senators +1 president) can adequately manage a government for 305 million people. There is no way that a few hundred decision makers (no matter how brilliant) can manage the affairs of a few hundred million people. At one-in-a-million, there simply are not enough democratically elected people to properly run our huge nation.

As a result, our democracy is under-staffed with elected decision makers. So, most work is done by non-elected appointees. Today these appointees are our democracy's, eyes, ears, analysts, and report writers. In fact, these non-elected appointees even undertake the all-important job of writing laws for our legislatures, as well as doing just about everything for our 4-year presidential monarchs.

Thus an appointee bureaucracy not only frames every issue our democracy votes on, it writes the solutions, and manages the implementation — just as it did under the

figurehead monarchies we supposedly got rid of in 1776. Our one-in-a-million lawmakers only decide between the plans the

non-elected bureaucracy comes up with. That is, when they are not distracted by campaigning for re-election — as 43% of our national lawmakers must do in any given year.

So the 7th vulnerability of narrow democracy is that too many important duties fall on appointees. By contrast, if we made our democracy broader, we could easily exclude non-elected people from all top positions in government.

Now isn't democracy based on a presumption that elections provide us with the best leadership? How come our democracy isn't managed through and through by elected officials? How come we only have a thin coating of 536 elected officials spray-painted on the surface of an immense appointee bureaucracy?

Problem #8 Campaign money: The average US representation ratio between our two legislatures is 1-in-1.54 million voters. (the weighted average of 1:580,000 & 1:2.5 million). Therefore, our congressional candidates literally have to reach voters by-the-million. And because our democracy has strangely—quite strangely—not kept even one media channel open for campaigning, our candidates have come to rely on expensive ads in the commercial media.

Now because of the effectiveness of these media ads in reaching voters by-the-million, the candidates that run lots of ads tend to win elections. And the candidates that get lots of campaign contributions can afford to run lots of ads. So basically, we have a democracy where election success tends to be purchased with campaign contributions. In other words, we have a corrupt democracy.

But we all know this, and we allow it anyway. We consider this corrupting money (and the influence it buys) a necessary evil of democracy. Essentially, we use an admittedly corrupt democratic design: One where campaign contributions routinely sway who gets elected, and which platforms are supported. It is a corrupt democracy where the will of the people is often subservient to the will of the big campaign contributors.

But let's say we changed the representation ratio of our democracy. Let's say that each neighborhood of 250 voters elected one part-time Sub-Senator, and then these met and elected 1/10th of their members to a Main-Senate. How could the media sway a million Sub-Senate elections when people know each other from their neighborhoods? And how could the media figure-out, let alone sway a 100,000 Main-Senate elections when people know each other from meeting together in the Sub-Senate?

Here is a democracy where media coverage, campaign advertising, and campaign contributions will give little if any benefit to the people running for elected office in our land. Here is a significantly less corrupt form of democracy.

2/ But don't make your democracy too broad

Problem #9 Intelligence: If we take our 1:2,500 best, and make them our group decision makers, we are going to get smarter decision makers that if we take our 1:25 best.

Problem #10 Cost: If everyone is taking time to get informed about society's decisions, who is going to work? And if our 1:100 best are working as decision makers, it will cost at least 1% of GDP, and probably more like 3% to 5% of GDP, because these are often our most productive people. So full-time 1:100

democracies and too broad and too costly. And even 1:250 full-time democracies are a bit too costly.

Problem #11 Supply and demand: If we only "confirm" 1:500 people as Senators each year, demand for the status will certainly exceed supply, and people will work hard for the honor of being a Senator and serving the public for a year. If we confirm 1:50, we may have trouble finding enough good people after some time — especially if we have annual elections and sensible incumbency restrictions.

Problem #12 Media corruption: When everyone votes, many people fail to take enough time to properly inform themselves. Many of these people then base their decisions on something they saw in the openly corrupt paid commercial media. Thus media corruption gains sway over our democracy.

3/ The representation sweet spot

Assuming a US electorate of 250-million

Modern democracy is an illusion, a matrix

1. 2.5± leaders	1-in-100,000,000 democracy
2. 25 leaders	1-in-10,000,000 democracy
3. 250 leaders	1-in-1,000,000 democracy
4. 2,500 leaders	1-in-100,000 democracy
5. 25,000 leaders	1-in-10,000 democracy
6. 250,000 leaders	1-in-1,000 democracy
7. 2,500,000 leaders	1-in-100 democracy
8. 25,000,000 leaders	1-in-10 democracy
9. 250,000,000 leaders	1-in-1 democracy

1,2,3 and 4 all have too few leaders and suffer from the problems caused by excessive concentration of power. On the other hand 7, 8 and 9 all have too many leaders and suffer from the problems caused by excessively diffused power. The sweet-spot therefore lies near 5 and 6. The new form of democracy, and new 230-page constitution I propose straddles the sweet-spot where corruption is inherently lowest. It uses:

A 1:250 SUB-SENATE of 1,000,000 that elects 1:10 to a
A 1:2,500 MAIN-SENATE of 100,000 that elects 1:10 to a
A 1:25,000 OVER-SENATE of 10,000

4/ A brief introduction to the proposed democracy

We assume an electorate of 250 million

Sub-Senate: This part-time body of 1,000,000 once-elected people will:

1. Listen to the people and elevate worthy ideas.
2. Determine the truth independently of the openly-corrupt paid commercial media.
3. Assemble information for the Senate.
4. Administer government in a granular way.
5. Serve as a staffing pool for election to the higher Senates, and for judicial duty, and as government managers.

Main-Senate: This full-time body of 100,000 twice-elected people will both make the nation's laws and administer them. We need so many people because our Main-Senate is divided into 10 specialized legislative channels called SLUICES. Thus our democracy's main legislative and executive body will have 10 parallel channels and operate at 10-times the speed of our current legislature.

Over-Senate: This full-time body of 10,000 thrice-elected people sets the overall course of government. It also divides powers and budgets among the other Senates and sluices. However, the Over-Senate makes no laws, and spends almost no money itself. Thus, the other Senates and Sluices are restrained ("checked and balanced") in their spending. The 10,000-man Over-Senate also interprets the constitution and acts as the supreme judge of constitutionality — replacing our current 9-man supreme court of lifetime appointee oligarchs.

5/ Freedom of speech is for real people

Our one-share, one-vote fictional citizens like Exxon are openly corrupt in how they sell votes by the share. These will no longer have the right to use their immense cash flows to dilute and drown-out the voice of real people. Under the proposed new constitution, the first amendment will not apply to corporations and other non-human entities.

6/ The new design makes democratic revolutions easy

The democracy gives the people a way to elect a new government and a new constitution without the approval of the current government. It has a system for staging structured protests that elect temporary Sub-Senators. When the people muster the required number in structured protest, the new constitution they have mustered under is then automatically elected into force. Then, their duly elected formation Sub-Senators become a temporary 7-day mustering Senate for the nation.

To oust a dictatorship or monarchy, a majority shall be only 10% of the people. To oust a narrow democracy, a majority shall be defined as half of the largest voter turn-out in the past 4-years. If there has not been a real election in that nation in the last 4-years, then that percentage will be easy to reach.

Everyone, everywhere, it is time to muster up. Go now and hopefully we can even provoke even the North Koreans and Iranians to muster up.

7/ The illusion of democracy

Today, US style democracy has a single decision making channel that uses 3 groups of mono-elected people in succession. First a house of 435 lawmakers votes. Then their decisions are double checked by a house of 100 lawmakers. Then everything is triple checked by our totally overworked 4-year elected monarch and his appointee administration.

But in many ways, a democracy is only as broad as its narrowest law-making, or law-vetoing house. So in many ways the US government is a monarchy.

Now of course, if both oligarchic legislatures vote 2:1, they can override the immense power of our presidential monarch. But fundamentally, unless our 1:1-million oligarchic (Malarchic) lawmakers all really want something by a 2:1 margin, the administration of our 4-year monarch rules over our entire democracy.

Thucydides, d. 400BC, History, 2.65

"In theory, Athens was a democracy, but in practice it was ruled by just one leader." [The desperate land of no resources has been quietly struggling or 'jihading' against democracies for thousands of years. That will now stop. We will move ALL the people and institute TWO TICKETS TO PARADISE.]

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"There is to be a great and mighty president, with very extensive powers; the powers of a king."

[Patrick Henry had the immense distinction of being the first speaker before the incipient US Congress in 1774. This honor was probably not given lightly by the smart men that existed before the war killing, and the purges under cover of war started. Also, it must be noted that Thomas Jefferson said that Patrick Henry was the true leader of the American Revolution.

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"There is to be a great and mighty president, with very extensive powers; the powers of a king."

[It is the strangest darn thing that the true leader of the American Revolution said this about our current constitution, and it is never talked about in our schools.]

Thucydides, d. 400BC, History, 2.65

"In theory, Athens was a democracy, but in practice it was ruled by just one leader."

Theodore K. Rabb, Last days of the renaissance, Ch. 5

"On the surface, Parliament in England certainly seemed supreme, as impervious to outside influence as the absolutist monarchy in France. For both, however, the first impression disguised the reality that the true ruler of the land was an alliance between [the Arab-fronting] elite and monarchy."

Everyone knows the right direction here

We all know that we don't want kings and dictators and oligarchies. And we all know we want to go a long way in the other direction — with a very large group of elected people that is too big for anyone to sway. Why do we have 4-year elected monarchs in the land of the free. Why do we have these appointed cabinet secretaries administering our nation?

Broadening a democracy is generally good, Narrowing a democracy is generally bad

What is the harm of having many thousands of elected officials? Isn't this the opposite of monarchy, tyranny and oligarchy? Now I may be wrong, but I believe that no modern nation (with the exception of the United States between 1777 and 1789) has ever had a broad form of democracy with even a 1:50,000 representation ratio. Why has this never even been tried? And again, what is the downside of broadening the decision making base in our democracy? Don't people the world over trust the decisions of large bodies more than small ones? And aren't we all willing to change anything in our democracies that looks like a big source of corruption?

One king, one president, one monarch.

The easiest form government to corrupt is when one figurehead is

in charge of a giant Arab bro•cracy. And not far behind comes olig•archy (Gr. ligos=ligaments, ligatures, strings + Gr. archi=rulers) where a few men are in charge of a giant bro•cracy.

And it doesn't matter that much if these are omnipotent

king for life, or they have been elected to serve for four years with limited power. Whenever one man or a small group is in charge, the government is most reliant on the non-elected bureaucracy or bro•cracy, the metaphorical "horse" carrying those leaders.

Hence, whenever we hear of monarchies, presidents, energy tsars, drug tsars, or chancellors, they are all frontmen,

or figureheads of the Arabs. And over thousands of years, the people from the land of no resources have evolved ways to manage these figureheads and govern the world.

Cassius Dio, 52.9

"in democracies, the greater the number of men who are endowed with wealth and courage, the more they compete for honor, and thereby strengthen the state."

Gustavus Meyers, History of Great American Fortunes, 1.5

"The Constitution of the United States was so drafted as to take as much direct power from the people as the landed and trading interests [fronting for the Arabs] dared [take]."

The 1st US Constitution

From 1777 until 1789, the United States had a 1st constitution with over 2,000 lawmakers. In 1789 a new constitution (our current constitution) was instituted by 39 men without the authority of the others. This new constitution had only 65 representatives, 26 senators, and a single 4-year elected monarch with extensive veto powers over the other 91 people.

On top of narrowing of our democracy by 30:1 towards oligarchy, these 39 men also sent the new 2nd US constitution for ratification without a bill of rights. Clearly, by these two facts, these 39 men did not have the best interests of the people in mind. Clearly they staged a sort of constitutional coup with the world's prototype democracy. Clearly our democracy was designed to be corruptible while appearing fair and honest.

8/ Why no bill of rights?

[The current U.S. constitution of 1789 was written by 39 men who sent it to the state legislatures for ratification without a bill of rights. This was not only intentional — it was "struggled" for. Here on 1787.10.06, (Federalist Papers) James Wilson, one of the 37 men who produced the current constitution argued against including a bill of rights. Note the confusing and obscuring words he used. Note how hard it is to understand what he was saying.

Here we see a lawyer-type defending an indefensible position. People arguing for a valid cause struggle to be clear. Also here we see the sort of lawyer who produced our current prototype constitution. Here is why the constitution of the land of the free allowed for slavery. Here is how the government of the land of the free was narrowed from over 2,000 congressmen to only 91 congressmen, vetoed by a presidential monarch and his offices 9 supreme court appointees.]

[In] "answer to those who think the omission of a bill of rights [is] a defect in the proposed Constitution; for it would have been superfluous and absurd to have stipulated with a federal body of our own creation, that we should enjoy those privileges of which we are not divested [deprived from], either by the intention or the act that has brought the body into existence. For instance, the liberty [freedom] of the press, which has been a copious [abundant] source of declamation [public address] and opposition. What control can proceed from [possibly originate in] the Federal government to shackle or destroy that sacred palladium [safeguard] of national freedom?"

[Again, this is someone defending an indefensible position. People arguing for a cause struggle to be clear.]

9/ Written to restrain freedoms

James Wilson was one of the 39 men who produced the current US constitution — the prototype constitution for the modern world. Just above, he was explaining why those 37 men sent their new 2.0 U.S. constitution of 1789 for ratification without a national bill of rights. Clearly this man was not on the side of freedom. Clearly this man struggled to restrain our freedoms rather than assure them.

But more importantly, our current 2.0 constitution was produced by 37 men who were mostly on Wilson's side. After all, there had to be a majority to send the new constitution for ratification without a bill of rights.

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"The founders of your own [1777] Constitution made your Government changeable: But the power of changing it is gone from you! whither [to where] is it gone?" [The current 1789 US constitution is famously hard and expensive to change. In fact, it is rather a thing written in stone, almost impossible to change. Once the Arabs get institutions exactly the way they want them, they struggle to make them sacred and unchangeable. The new constitution is not so incredibly hard to change.]

The illusion of democracy

Please believe me when I say that the so-called "free world" uses the weakest and easiest to corrupt form of democracy the Arabs could get away with back in the 1780s, after the war purges of the 1770s.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.40

"If you want a monarchy but fear the accursed title, you can avoid the title by ruling as a Caesar... In this way you can enjoy the reality of a monarchy without the stigma that is attached to the name."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.2

"he [emperor Augustus] gave sums of money to a number of senators. This was because many of them had become so poor that they could not take on even the office of aedile, because of the large expenditures demanded of the office holder."

[Thus the emperor fronting for the Arabs was able to pick senators in the legislature supposed to watch over him.]

Book title: 1777, The year of the hangman, by John S. Pancake

The title of this book speaks of revolutionary war purges, but the subject matter of the book is a revolutionary war battle history. Perhaps a book was talked about, and then replaced with another. Here is why you should spread this message offline via Sneaker-net.

How could our democracy repeatedly work in the most Way possible?

**Your democracy is deeply flawed.
It must be fixed immediately.**

10/ We do voting secrecy all backwards

Our lawmakers not only vote out in the open, but their billion dollar votes are recorded by the system. This way, the people bribing them can see if their money worked.

Meanwhile, when we the people go to the polls and

micro-vote, that takes place in secrecy. Then ballot secrecy serves as an excuse for countless boxes of anonymous ballot cards, and the corruption that they introduce. And clearly, an act of ballot box tampering is potentially thousands of times more powerful than an act of vote buying.

Instead, when our lawmakers mega-vote, we should do that under strict rules of secrecy, so the people corrupting them can't really tell if their bribes actually worked. And when we the people micro-vote, it should be on video, because ballot box tampering is a much greater risk than vote selling.

But how could we have voting secrecy backwards on both sides? Did the ancient land of no resources help design our prototype democracy to be corrupt back in 1787?

Someone else was there shaping your democracy

A foreign interest was quietly struggling to modify our new prototype constitution of the free world. And then when they got their new constitution the way they wanted, they pulled, they struggled, they bribed, they begged, they kidnapped, they killed, and they haunted us into its doing things their easy to corrupt way.

Anti-Federalist Papers, Centinel #1, 1787.10.5

"Our situation is represented to be so critically dreadful, that, however reprehensible and exceptionable the proposed plan of government may be [the 2nd US constitution], there is no alternative, between the adoption of it and absolute ruin. My fellow citizens, things are not at that crisis, it is the argument of tyrants."

Pauline Maier, Ratification, Introduction

the Federalists also controlled the documents on which historians depend. They owned most of the newspapers. They sometimes paid those who took notes on the convention debates or subsidized the publication of their transcripts. In some places, above all Connecticut, Federalists forcibly blocked the circulation of literature critical of the Constitution. In Pennsylvania, as one little-known letter in the DHRC proves, they even tried to suppress evidence that anyone had anything negative to say about the Constitution, and so suggest that everyone was simply shouting 'huzzah'.

Anti-Federalist Papers, John DeWitt, 1787.11.5

"Knowing the danger of frequent applications to the people, they ask for the whole at once. And [they] are now by their conduct, teasing and absolutely haunting you into a compliance. If you choose all these things should take place, [then] by all means gratify them. Go, and establish this Government which is unanimously confessed imperfect, yet incapable of alterations."

Gustavus Meyers, History of Great American Fortunes, 1.5

"The Constitution of the United States was so drafted as to take as much direct power from the people as the landed and trading interests [fronting for the Arabs] dared [take]."

Anti-Federalist papers 1787.06.28

[Speaking here is Gunning Bedford, one of the 39 men who stayed to the end and produced the 2nd US Constitution of 1787. Here we see how the parasite instituted its new "democratic" constitution that had elections, but also had numerous backdoors to power.]

"what have the people already said? We find the confederation [of 13 states] defective — go and give additional powers to the confederation — give to it the imposts [the power

to tax], regulation of trade, power to collect the taxes, and the means to discharge our foreign and domestic debts.' Can we not then, as their delegates, agree upon these points? As their ambassadors, can we not clearly grant those powers? Why then, when we are met [meeting] must entire, distinct, and new grounds be taken, and a government, of which the people had no idea, be instituted? And are we to be told, if we won't agree to it, it is the last moment of our deliberations? I say, it is indeed the last moment, if we do agree to this assumption of power. The states will never again be entrapped into a measure like this. ... Let us then do what is [with]in our power -- amend and enlarge the confederation [of the 13 state legislatures, with over 2,000 law makers], but not alter the federal system [by which those 13 states cooperate]. The people expect this, and no more."

The US began as a 1:1,200 democracy

Under the 1st constitution of 1777 the United States (plural) had over 2,000 state lawmakers for 2.4 million free men. Then in 1787, 4-years after the Revolutionary War ended, a call was made for delegates to discuss ways to make the congress or union of 13 states work better. 74 Men were selected as delegates, but only 55 went to Philadelphia in May of 1787. Of these, only 39 delegates actually stayed until the 2nd US constitution was completed in September. Thus only 39 men "drafted" the paradigm for modern democracy. This was barely over half of the 74 men delegated to go. The other half either boycotted or walked out of what is today celebrated as the US constitutional convention.

Under this 2nd constitution, all of America's 2,000 or so state legislators were put under the power of their new federal government which consisted of 65 representatives, 26 senators, and a 1 four-year elected monarch with immense power over the rest of government. Needless to say, this was a huge narrowing of our nation's broad democracy. Thus it is not a real democracy we use today — It is the clever illusion of democracy, an oligarchic monarchy, just like with the Romans and Athenians.

Thucydides, d. 400BC, History, 2.65

"In theory, Athens was a democracy, but in practice it was ruled by just one leader."

James Madison Architect of the U.S. Constitution

It is important to realize that the current US constitution was substantially written before-hand by James Madison. It doesn't seem to have changed much at the "constitutional convention".

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.05, Anti-Federalist Papers

"There is an ambiguity, Sir, a fatal ambiguity; an ambiguity which is very astonishing. In the clause under consideration, there is the strangest thing that I can conceive. I mean, when it says, that there shall not be more Representatives, that one for every 30,000. Now, Sir, how easy is it to evade this privilege [restriction]? 'The number shall not exceed one for every 30,000'. This may be satisfied by one Representative from each State. Let our numbers be[come] ever so great; this immense continent, may, by this artful expression, be reduced to have but 13 Representatives. I confess this construction is not natural; but the ambiguity of the expression lays a good ground for quarrel. Why was it not clearly and unequivocally expressed, that they [the American people] should be entitled, to have [a representation ratio of] one for every 30,000? This would have obviated all disputes; and was this difficult to be done? What is the inference?"

The US Constitution mentions a 1:30,000 representation ratio.

[Article I, Section 2 of the current 2.0 version of the US Constitution, the 1789 version states:]

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within this union, according to their respective numbers... The number of representatives shall not exceed one for every 30,000 but each state shall have at least one representative..."

[Look at the last 9 words above:] "but each state shall have at least one representative". [How on earth did such an oligarchic clause get into the US Constitution? Why on earth did our great and wise "Founding Fathers" narrow US democracy from over 2,000 legislators to potentially as few as 13? Did Americans do this by themselves after rebelling against the English king? Or did the Arab parasite race quietly help America to narrow its House of Representatives into an easy-to-manage oligarchy with potentially as few as 13 state representatives? It certainly looks like the desperate (foreign) constituency from the land of no resources had a hand in writing the US constitution, doesn't it?]

America's democracy is a broad oligarchy

Look at American-style democracy on the true continuum of democracy — that of the representation ratio. With respect to our Congress, America's narrow democracy is one of the more highly leveraged, least democratic, and easiest to corrupt variations of democracy. It is a form of democracy with roughly a one-in-a-million representation ratio. It is a democracy only one order of magnitude broader than oligarchy. Or maybe it still is a sort of oligarchy — a broad oligarchy, double-checked by a 100-man oligarchy, and then triple checked by a completely over-worked 4-year monarch.

Now of course the foregoing is with respect to legislative power. America's executive (implementation) branch of government exists as a periodic monarchy. Its entire invisible administration, whoever they really are, is appointed by one man, or actually his non-elected political party.

And let's not forget the Judiciary: This is a narrow oligarchy of 9 lifetime appointees. Here 5 of 9 appointees can veto the acts of our legislature for any plausible conflict they can dream up with our US constitution, a document that is not only terse to the point of vagueness, but it is also absurdly hard-to-change, and thus perennially out-of-date.

These 9 supreme court appointees can use any conflict with our uber-vague and uber-terse 8-page constitution to halt our democratic legislature. So yes, we sort-of have a narrow democracy, but it is "checked and balanced" by an elected monarch and a 9-man court of appointees.

Paragraph 5 from the 1st U.S. constitution, The Articles of Confederation (1777-1789)

"For the most convenient management of the general interests of the United [13] States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each state shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to each state to recall [all] its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead for the remainder of the year.

No state shall be represented in Congress by less than two, nor more than seven members; and no person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than three years in any term of six years; nor shall any person, being a delegate,

be capable of holding any office under the United States, for which he, or another for his benefit [on his behalf] receives any salary, fee or emolument [profit from holding a public office] of any kind.

Each state shall maintain its own delegates in a meeting of the states, and while they act as members of the committee of the states. In determining questions in the United States in Congress assembled, each state shall have one vote."

The United States were a 1-in-1,200 democracy under their 1st constitution of 1777-1789.

The word delegate is used 5-times above. These delegates were not autonomous lawmakers empowered to make their own decisions. They were messengers conveying 13 votes from 13 state legislatures with over 2,000 legislators. If the delegates didn't vote the way they were directed by their state legislature, they would be recalled and replaced, and perhaps there would be a recount of the 13 state votes.

Now it is vital that everyone realize that there were over 2,000 state-lawmakers in these 13 state legislatures. And given how the 13 States at that time had a population of 2,400,000 the United States began with a hard-to-corrupt 1:1,200 representation ratio under its first constitution, the Articles of Confederation.

Today, the US has an easy-to-corrupt 1-in-1.54-million representation ratio. How did that change happen? How is it that our prototype democracy now has a representation ratio almost a thousand times narrower than our real founding fathers instituted in 1777-1789?

6. Melancton Smith speech, 1788.06.25. New York ratifying convention of America's 2nd constitution of 1789, Anti-Federalist Papers

"An honorable gentleman from New York [arch Federalist Alexander Hamilton] observed yesterday, that the states would always maintain their importance and authority, on account of their superior influence over the people. To prove this influence, he mentioned the aggregate number of the state representatives throughout the continent. But I ask him, how long the people will retain their confidence, for two thousand representatives who shall meet once in a year to make laws for regulating the height of your fences and the repairing of your roads? Will they not by and by be saying -- Here, we are paying a great number of men for doing nothing: We had better give up all the civil business of our state with its powers to Congress, who are sitting all the year round: We had better get rid of that useless burden. That matters will come to this at last, I have no more doubt that I have of my existence. The state governments, without object or authority, will soon dwindle into insignificance." [Read those words again: "two thousand representatives"]

The Federal Farmer 1787.10.08, Anti-Federalist Papers

"Instead of being 13 republics, under a federal head, it is clearly designed to make us one consolidated government. ... This consolidation of the [13 united] states has been the object[ive] of several men in this country for some time past." [These men were the Federalists lead by Alexander Hamilton.]

The Arab struggle works in baby steps

The Arabian parasite race got rid of America's broad and problematic 1:1,200 representation ratio (and 2,000

lawmakers) by working in steps. First it got us to institute a second constitution that had a 1:30,000 limit on its representation ratio. This was 80 lawmakers in a nation of 2.4 million. It was probably as narrow as they could get away with, without risk of provoking a reaction.

But then our parasite did something very confusing. It got us to institute this 1:30,000 limit as an upper limit on the number of senators — meaning that the US could have no more than 80 senators for 2.4 million free citizens.

Instead we should have used 1:30,000 as a lower limit on the number of senators — meaning that the land of the free could have no fewer than 80 senators for its 2.4 million free citizens.

Today, the US democracy still uses no more than a 1:30,000 representation ratio — It uses around a 1:580,000 representation ratio. Today we have 435 representatives — a number that is much lower than the 10,200 representatives we are allowed under the current US Constitution — about 23x fewer representatives.

Anyway, this is how our parasite got rid of America's 1st broad, 1:1,200 democracy and set things up so it could institute a totally, but quietly corrupt 1:1,540,000 democracy in its place.

Narrower and narrower

In 1789, the United States started with 2.4 million free people and 65 Representatives, a 1:37,000 ratio. Today under the same constitution, we have 305 million people and 435 Representatives, a 1:701,000 ratio. How come we don't have 8,243 Representatives, the same ratio as in 1789?

What a rotten constitution we have. It doesn't even protect our democracy from being turned into an oligarchy of 13 representatives.

Lilly Tomlin

"98% of the adults in this country are decent hardworking honest Americans. It's the other lousy 2% that get all the publicity. But then, we elected them." [Actually 0.000176% of Americans are elected officials in the national government at any one time. Tomlin's remark overstates our representation by 11,363:1.

The Anti-Federalist Papers, 21 June 1787

"One Gentleman alone (Colonel Hamilton) in his [animadversions on](#) [criticism of] [the plan of New Jersey](#), [boldly and decisively contended for an abolition of the State Governments](#). Mr. Wilson and the gentlemen from Virginia who also were adversaries of the plan of New Jersey held a different language. They wished to leave the States in possession of a considerable, though a subordinate jurisdiction."

Sates rights is a cover story

Think about all the junk we Americans learn about state's rights in high school. This is our parasite's propaganda for how America's all critical representation ratio was narrowed from 1:1,200 to 1:580,000. You see, the Arab ministry of Truth (concerned primarily with telling lies) gets us while we are young and our minds are pliant.

Thomas Paine, Common Sense p.38-39

"I likewise mentioned the necessity of a large and equal representation; and there is no political matter which more deserves our attention. A small number of electors, or a small number of representatives are equally dangerous. ...Those

who would fully understand of what great consequence a large and equal representation is to a state, should read Burgh's political disquisitions."

The Anti-Federalist Papers, 1787.06.16

"It is a lesson we ought not to disregard, that the smallest bodies [with the narrowest representation ratios] in Great Britain are notoriously the most corrupt. Every other source of influence must also be stronger in small than large bodies of men."

Amendment proposed by the Massachusetts ratifying convention

"That there shall be one representative to every 30,000 persons according to the Census mentioned in the Constitution until the whole number of the Representatives amounts to two hundred."

Proposed amendment to the current U.S. constitution, 1788.06.27, Anti-Federalist Papers

"...there shall be [one representative for every 30,000](#) according to the enumeration or census mentioned in the Constitution, until the whole number of representatives amounts to two hundred: after which, that number shall be continued or increased, as Congress shall direct, upon the principles fixed in the Constitution, by apportioning the representatives of each state to some greater number of people, from time to time, as population increases."

Proposed amendment to the current U.S. constitution, 1787.08.06, Anti-Federalist papers, 4.4

"As the proportions of numbers in different States will alter from time to time; as some of the States may hereafter be divided; as others may be enlarged by addition of territory; as two or more States may be united; as new States will be erected within the limits of the United States, the Legislature shall, in each of these cases, regulate the number of representatives by the number of inhabitants, according to the provisions hereinafter made, [at the rate of one for every 40,000.](#)"

10,200 Representatives anyone?

According to Article 1, Section 2 of the current US constitution, the US government can simply vote in an ordinary bill to widen the roll in the House of Representatives by 23-fold. Thus we can have to around 10,200 representatives, and this requires no constitutional amendment. It is already permitted by the US constitution. Why has this never even been discussed? It would certainly make it harder for the forces of corruption to sway the vote of America's congress if there were 10,200 representatives elected every two years.

Perhaps the big problem is that then, we might wonder why we allow only 100 men in our secondary house to veto the 10,200 men in our primary house. We might also wonder why we allow one 4-year presidential monarch (along with his unelected administration) to have a veto on the laws of the 10,200 that we base our government upon.

A corrupt Supreme Court

To see the corruption of the current US Supreme Court, simply look at the timing of the Roe vs. Wade decision, and how it preceded the 1973-77 Arab oil embargo by mere months. Regardless of how you stand on abortion, you must admit that this decision caused many more people to be more distracted by sex just before the oil embargo hit.

David Hume, Political Discourses, 1715

"These people were extremely fond of liberty; but seem not to have understood it very well."

Percy Shelley

"The unacknowledged legislator of the world"

T.E. Lawrence, Seven Pillars of Wisdom, Ch. 69

"We on the Arab front were very intimate with the enemy. Our Arab officers had been Turkish officers, and knew every leader on the other side personally."

Machiavelli, The Prince, Ch. 7, 1513AD

"He was able if not to make whom he liked Pope, at least to prevent the election of any whom he disliked... as I have said already, though he could not secure the election he desired, he could have prevented any other." [Who is talking here? Who would care about such a thing?]

Herman Melville, Moby Dick, 1851, Ch. 44

[In the following Ahab=the Arabs, and the White Whale=the U.S.]

"Ahab, the scheming, unappeasably steadfast hunter of the white whale.

Herman Melville, Moby Dick, 1851, Ch. 41

"Ahab's quenchless feud [jihad] seemed mine. With greedy ears I learned the history of that murderous monster [America, the rebel base] against whom I and all the others had taken our oaths of violence and revenge"

In 1777-1789, the United States were a congress of 13 independent states

We learn so little about the government of this period, that many people think that the United States was without a "real" constitution between 1777 and 1789.

25.6% of delegates didn't go to the "convention" Then 21.6% of delegates then walked out of the "convention"

Technically, there was no US "Constitutional Convention" convened in 1787 to write a 2nd US constitution. 74 men were delegated to discuss specific problems facing the meta-democracy of the 13 independent states acting together in concert, or congress. 19 delegates did not go, and then 16 delegates walked out of what would later be called the US Constitutional Convention. Only 39 of 74 men (52.7%) stayed to the end, and participated in the discussion/writing of the 2nd US Constitution of 1787/1789.

Many great men did not attend. Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, John Adams, John Jay, and George Mason, among others did not go. How come so many important men did not go to such an important event? Well, it seems that many were like Patrick Henry, who did not go because he "smelled a rat". His words, not mine.

Most of the people who stayed were either Arab moles or delegates from the 3 under-populated southern states. These 3 southern states had about 6% of the nation's free population. And they were about to suffer a big financial hit from a legislative tide against slavery in the land of the free. So these were people that would accept any bargain to save slavery.

There can be no doubt that these men led by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison exceeded their authority in drafting an entirely new constitution, a 2nd constitution for the 13 independent states. This new constitution narrowed the old democracy of over 2,000

legislators into one of 65 Representatives, 26 Senators, and 1 four-year monarch.

Our current constitution was written by our parasite

- 1) It narrowed the U.S. democracy from over 2,000 legislators into one of 65 Representatives, 26 Senators, and 1 four-year monarch.
- 2) It permits an oligarchy of 50
- 3) They tried to get it ratified without a national bill of rights.
- 4) It permitted slavery in the land of the free.
- 5) It counts slaves in the calculation of representation.
- 6) Its government is run by a 4-year elected monarch. This monarch's decision can only be overridden with a 2:1 vote in both legislatures.

The song remains the same

The monarch's bro•cracy still runs our nation.

Only 37 of 74 delegates actually participated all the way through

We read that Benjamin Franklin then age 81 is on record as saying practically nothing, and convention chair George Washington contributed not one idea until the last day of the convention when he made a vague speech of encouragement. Thus Benjamin Franklin and George Washington had practically no input in drafting the constitution.

A new constitution was needed

Basically, under its 1st constitution, the 13 United State legislatures had 2,000 lawmakers organized as a meta-democracy, (a democracy of 13 sub-democracies). Here, in the congress of 13 state legislatures, if 7 states voted one way, it was considered a majority.

However, due to the inherent problems of meta-democracy for decision making, (i.e. a majority in 7-of-13 states could be had with as little as 26.9% of the popular vote), the government of the 13 United States only worked well on the state level. On the inter-state level, it was simply too 'wobbly'. It was too easy to pass legislation and then to cancel it. In fact, in the years leading up to 1789, we hear that many laws were passed and then repealed right after they were passed. This in turn led to many of the inter-state laws being ignored for some time to see if they would actually be left to stand for enforcement. This then lead to everyone ignoring the government when they did not want to do what they were told to do — for example, paying taxes.

The parasite designed modern democracy

That the 2nd U.S. Constitution would become the prototype for all modern democracies was probably obvious to the Arabs at the time.

America's legislatures are 483x and 2,083x narrower today

Under the 1st US constitution, the confusingly named "Articles of Confederation." we had a representation ratio of around 1:1,200. The 2nd US constitution began with a Senate representation ratio of 1:92,307, 77x times narrower. Today, our House-of-Representatives has a representation ratio of 1:580,000 and our Senate a representation ration of 1:2.5 million. So one of our legislatures is 483 times narrower and the other 2,083 times narrower today.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.17

"Through this process, the power of both the people and the Senate was entirely transferred into the hands of Augustus.

And it was at this time that a monarchy, to use the correct term, was established. It would certainly be most truthful to describe it as a monarchy even if two or three men held supreme power at the same time. It is true that the Romans hated the actual word monarch so vehemently that they did not refer to their emperors either as dictators or kings or anything similar. But since the final decision in the government process is referred to them, it is impossible that they should be anything other than kings.

[Where the people will not allow kings, the Arabs give them temporary kings called by another name. Then they eternally struggle, or jihad to expand the powers of those kings.]

The truth has a ring to it

Anti-Federalist Papers, The minority report of the Pennsylvania delegates to the US Constitutional Convention, 1787.12.18

"It was [in 1783] that the want [lack] of an efficient federal government was first complained of. And that the powers vested in [the] Congress [of the 13 states] were found to be inadequate to the procuring of the benefits that should result from the union [of the 13 States]. The impost [a Congressional tax on states] was granted by most of the states, but many refused the [requests for] supplementary funds [extra money]. The annual [automatic] requisitions were set at nought [zero] by some of the states [these would vote each year how much to contribute to the cause of the states united.] while others complied with them by legislative acts, but were tardy in their payments, and Congress found themselves incapable of complying with their engagements [promises to pay], and supporting the federal government. [Thus the government of the united 13 states thus couldn't pay for its obligations]. It was found that our national character was sinking in the opinion of foreign nations [which were all monarchies fronting for the Arab]. The Congress [of 13 states] could make treaties of commerce but not enforce the observance of them. We were suffering from the restrictions of foreign nations, who had shackled our commerce, while we were unable to retaliate: And all now agreed that it would be advantageous to the union to enlarge the powers of Congress; that they should be enabled in the amplest manner to regulate commerce, and to lay and collect duties on the imports throughout the United States. With this view, a convention was first proposed by Virginia, and finally recommended by Congress for the different states to appoint deputies [mere deputies with limited powers] to meet in convention, 'for the purposes of revising and amending the present articles of confederation, so as to make them adequate to the exigencies [urgent needs] of the union'. This recommendation the legislatures of twelve states complied with so hastily as not to consult their constituents on the subject; and though the different legislatures had no authority from their constituents for the purpose, they probably apprehended the necessity would justify the measure; and none of them extended their ideas at that time further than "revising and amending the present articles of confederation." Pennsylvania by the act appointing deputies [and it] expressly confined their powers to this object[ive]; and though it is probable that some of the members of the assembly of this state had at that time in contemplation to annihilate the present confederation, as well as the constitution of Pennsylvania, yet the plan was not sufficiently matured to communicate it to the public... [important text of the speech seems to be missing here.]

The Continental convention met in the city of Philadelphia at the time appointed. It was composed of some

men of excellent characters; [and] of others who were more remarkable for their ambition [willingness to go either way] and cunning, than their patriotism; and some who had been opponents to the independence of the United States. The delegates from Pennsylvania were, six of them, uniform and decided opponents to the [1st] constitution of this commonwealth [of 13 independent states]. The convention sat upwards of four months. The doors were kept shut, and the members brought under the most solemn engagements of secrecy. Some of those who opposed their going so far beyond their powers, retired, hopeless, from the convention, others had the firmness to refuse signing the plan altogether; and many who did sign it, did it not as a system they wholly approved, but as the best that could be then obtained, and notwithstanding the time spent on this subject, it is agreed on all hands to be a work of haste and accommodation.

Whilst the gilded chains were forging [being forged] in [side] the secret conclave, the meaner instruments of despotism without [outside], were busily employed in alarming the fears of the people with dangers which did not exist, and exciting their hopes of greater advantages from the expected plan than even the best government on earth could produce... [more text missing]

We entered on the examination of the proposed system of government, [the 2nd US Constitution] and found it to be such as we could not adopt, without, as we conceived, surrendering up your dearest rights. We offered our objections to the convention, and opposed those parts of the plan, which, in our opinion, would be injurious to you, in the best manner we were able; and closed our arguments by offering the following propositions to the convention... [most of which are in the US Bill of Rights]

During the discussion we met with many insults, and some personal abuse. We were not even treated with decency, during the sitting of the convention, by the persons in the gallery of the house. However, we flatter ourselves that in contending for the preservation of those invaluable rights, you have thought proper to commit to our charge, we acted with a spirit becoming free men. And being desirous that you might know the principles which actuated [caused] our conduct, and being prohibited from inserting our reasons of dissent on the minutes of the convention, we have subjoined [added them at the end] them for your consideration [they are missing today], as to you alone we are accountable. It remains with you whether you will think these inestimable privileges, which you have so ably contended for [during the revolutionary war], should be sacrificed at the shrine of despotism, or whether you mean to contend for them with the same spirit that has so often baffled the attempts of an aristocratic faction, to rivet the shackles of slavery on you and your unborn posterity." [This is also known as: "The Address and Reasons of Dissent of the Minority of the Convention of Pennsylvania to their constituents 1787.12.18"]

What American-style democracy really is

It is a "democracy" designed to maximize the power of the figurehead monarch president and his appointees, and minimize the power of the democratic legislature.

Anti-Federalist Papers, Alexander Hamilton, The farmer refuted

"The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for, among old parchments, or musty records. They are written, as with a sun beam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of the divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured

[by mortal power."](#)

[translation: There's no need to study history and read about the failures of those that have gone before you. In truth, these rights are not at all obvious, and they can easily be obscured by a poor democratic design, viz. the 2nd US constitution of 1789. Alexander Hamilton was, as many Americans know, the arch Federalist, the man who lead the charge to narrow America's prototype democracy.]

Abraham Lincoln, 1861.07.04

"Our popular government has often been called an experiment."

[US style democracy seems to be particularly broken these days. Maybe it is time we all give up on the current experiment in narrow democracy.]

Anti-Federalist Papers, Letters from the Federal Farmer, 1787.10.08

"A general convention for mere commercial purposes was moved for. The authors of this measure saw that the people's attention was turned solely to the amendment of the federal system. And that, had the idea of a total change been stated, probably no state would have appointed members to the convention. The idea of destroying ultimately, the state government, and forming one consolidated system, could not have been admitted. A convention, therefore, merely for vesting in congress powers to regulate trade was proposed. This was pleasing to the commercial towns, and the landed people had little or no concern about it. [In] September, 1786, a few men from the middle states met at Annapolis, and hastily proposed a convention to be held in May, 1787, for the purpose, generally, of amending the confederation. This was done before the delegates of Massachusetts, and of the other states arrived. Still not a word was said about destroying the old constitution, and making a new one. The states were still unsuspecting, and not aware that they were passing the Rubicon, appointed members to the new convention, for the sole and express purpose of revising and amending the confederation -- and, probably, not one man in 10,000 in the United States, till within these [past] 10 or 12 days, had an idea that the old ship was to be destroyed, and [a]... new ship presented... The states, I believe, universally supposed the convention would report alterations in the confederation, which would pass an examination in [the] congress [of the 13 independent state legislatures]. And after being agreed to there, would be confirmed by all the legislatures, or be rejected. Virginia made a very respectable appointment, and placed at the head of it the first man in America [George Washington, who chaired the constitutional convention]. In this appointment there was a mixture of political characters; but Pennsylvania appointed principally those men who are esteemed [regarded as] aristocratical. Here the favorite moment for changing the government was evidently discerned by a few men, who seized it with address [skill or dexterity]."

Anti-Federalist Papers, John Dawson's Fears for the future, 1788.06.24

"Sir, an opinion is ~~gone abroad~~ [circulating] (From whence [where] it originated, or by whom it is supported, I will not venture to say) that the opponents of the paper on your table, are enemies of the Union. It may not therefore be improper for me to declare that I am a warm friend to a firm, federal [federation of independent states], energetic government; that I consider a confederation of the States on republican principles, as a security to their mutual interest, and a disunion as

injurious to the whole: But I shall lament exceedingly, when a confederation of independent States shall be converted into a consolidated Government; for when that event shall happen, I shall consider the history of American liberty as short as it has been brilliant, and we shall afford on more proof to the favorite maxim of tyrants, 'that mankind cannot govern themselves.' "

Anti-Federalist Papers, John DeWitt, 1787.11.5

"Knowing the danger of frequent applications to the people, they ask for the whole at once. And [they] are now by their conduct, teasing and absolutely haunting of you into a compliance. If you choose all these things should take place, by all means gratify them. Go, and establish this Government which is unanimously confessed imperfect, yet incapable of alterations."

Anti-Federalist Papers, The minority report of the Pennsylvania delegates to the US Constitutional Convention, 1787.12.18

"The legislature of a free country should be so formed as to have a competent knowledge of its constituents, and enjoy their confidence. To produce these essential requisites, the representation ought to be fair, equal, and sufficiently numerous, to possess the same interests, feelings, opinions, and views, which the people themselves would possess, were they all assembled; and so numerous as to prevent bribery and undue influence. And [a]lso responsible to the people, by frequent and fair elections, [so] as to prevent their neglecting or sacrificing the views and interests of their constituents, to [over] their own [selfish] pursuits.

We will now bring the legislature under this constitution to the test of the foregoing principles, which will demonstrate, that it is deficient in every essential quality of a just and safe representation.

The house of representatives is to consist of [a mere] 65 members. That is one for about every 50,000 inhabitants, to be chosen every two years. 33 members will form a quorum for doing business; and 17 of these, being a majority, determine the sense of the house.

The senate, the other constitutional branch of the legislature, consists of 26 members being two from each state, appointed by their legislatures every six years [with no right of recall if they don't vote the way the 2000 state senators wish]. 14 senators make a quorum; the majority of whom, 8, determines the sense [vote] of that body...

Thus it appears that the liberties, happiness, interests, and great concerns of the whole United States, may be dependent upon the integrity, virtue, wisdom, and knowledge of 25 or 26 men. How inadequate and unsafe a representation! Inadequate because the sense and views of 3 or 4 millions of people diffused over so extensive a territory comprising such various climates, products, habits, interests, and opinions, cannot be collected in so small a body: And besides, it is not a fair and equal representation of the people even in proportion to its number, for the smallest state has as much weight in the senate as the largest and from the smallness of the number to be chosen for both branches of the legislature; and from the mode of election and appointment, which is under the control of Congress; and from the nature of the thing, men of the most elevated rank in life, will alone be chosen. The other orders of the society, such as farmers, traders, and mechanics, who all ought to have a competent number of their best informed men in the legislature, will be totally unrepresented.

The representation is unsafe, because in the exercise of such great powers and trusts, it is so exposed to corruption

and undue influence, by the gift of the numerous places of honor and emoluments at the disposal of the [administration of the lone] executive; by the arts and address of the great and designing; and by direct bribery.

The representation is moreover inadequate and unsafe, because of the longer terms for which it is appointed, and the mode of its appointment, by which Congress may not only control the choice of the people, but may so manage as to divest the people of this fundamental right, and become self-elected.

The number of members in the house of representatives MAY be increased to one for every 30,000 inhabitants [100 men at the time]. But... we are persuaded that this is a circumstance that cannot be expected. On the contrary, the number of representatives will probably be continued at 65, although the population of the country may swell to treble what it now is..." [Actually, the US population swelled to 100x what it was and Congress is only 4.7x larger]

Anti-Federalist Papers, The minority report of the Pennsylvania delegates to the US Constitutional Convention, 1787-12-18

"This large state [Pennsylvania] is to have but ten members in that Congress which is to have the liberty, property and dearest concerns of every individual in this vast country at absolute command and even these ten persons, who are to be our only guardians; who are to supercede the [entire] legislature of Pennsylvania, will not be of the choice of the people, nor amenable to them. From the mode of their election and appointment they will consist of the lordly and high-minded; of men who will have no congenial feelings with the people, but a perfect indifference for, and contempt of them..."

Anti-Federalist Papers, Melancton Smith, 1788.6.20

"He understood from the [new 2nd US] Constitution, that 65 members were to compose the House of Representatives for 3 years. That after that time, a census was to be taken, and the number... shall never exceed 1:30,000. If this was the case, the first Congress that met might reduce the number below what it now is; a power inconsistent with every principle of a free government, to leave it to the discretion of the rulers to determine the number of the representatives of the people. There was no kind of security except in the integrity of the men who were entrusted. And if you have no other security, it is idle [a waste of time] to contend [argue] about Constitutions. ... [now] supposing Congress should declare that there should be one representative for every 30,000 ... it would [still] be incompetent to the great purposes of representation..."

[in spite of] all the experience we had from others [nations trying different types of government], it had not appeared that the experiment of representation had [yet] been fairly tried. ... There was something like it in the ancient republics, in which, being of small extent [scale], the people could easily meet together, though instead of deliberating, they only considered of those things which were submitted to them by their magistrates [These legislatures voted yes or not on the agenda set by their lone figurehead magistrates. It was a government where the critical agenda setting primary house was a figurehead mono-arch and the comparatively weak secondary house was a somewhat broad democracy.] America was the only country, in which the first fair opportunity [to test the idea of a broad representation ratio] had been offered. When we were Colonies, our representation [ratio] was better [broader] than any that was then known. Since the revolution, we had advanced still nearer to perfection. He considered it as

an object[ive], of all others [objectives] the most important ... the representative should be chosen from small districts. This being admitted, he would ask, could 65 men, for 3,000,000, or 1 for 30,000, be chosen in this manner? Would they possess of the requisite information to make happy the great number of souls that were spread over this extensive country? -- There was another objection to the clause: If great affairs of government were trusted to a few men, they would be more liable to corruption. Corruption, he knew, was unfashionable among us, but he supposed that Americans were like other men. And thought they had hitherto displayed great virtues, still they were men. And therefore such steps should be taken as to prevent the possibility of corruption [in later times]. We were now in that stage of society, in which we could deliberate with freedom. How long it might continue, God only knew! Twenty years hence, perhaps, these maxims might become unfashionable. We already hear, said he, in all parts of the country, gentlemen ridiculing that spirit of patriotism and love of liberty, which carried us through all our difficulties in times of danger. [Our parasite's media at work?] When patriotism was already nearly hooted out of society, ought we not to take some precautions against the progress of corruption."

Anti-Federalist Papers, Melancton Smith, 1788.06.25

"We have no reason to hold our state governments in contempt, or to suppose them incapable of acting wisely. I believe they have operated more beneficially than most people expected, who considered that those governments were erected in a time of war and confusion, when they were very liable to errors in their structure. It will be a matter of astonishment to all unprejudiced men hereafter, who shall reflect upon our situation, to observe to what a great degree good government has prevailed. It is true [that] some bad laws have been passed in most of the states; but they arose more from the difficulty of the times, than from any want of honesty or wisdom. Perhaps there never was a government, which in the course of ten years did not do something to be repented of."

Anti-Federalist Papers, Melancton Smith, New York ratifying convention, 1788.6.20

"In so small a number of representatives, there is great danger from corruption and combination. [vote selling/swapping and political parties]. A great politician has said that every man has his price: I hope this is not true in all its extent -- But I ask the gentlemen to inform, what government there is, in which it has not been practiced? Notwithstanding all that has been said of the defects in the Constitution of the ancient Confederacies of the Grecian Republics, their destruction is to be imputed more to this cause than to any imperfection in their forms of government. This was the deadly poison that effected their dissolution.

This is an extensive country, increasing in population and growing in consequence. Very many lucrative offices will be ~~in-grant-of~~ [granted by] the government, which will be the object of avarice and ambition. How easy will it be to gain over a sufficient number, in the bestowment of these offices, to promote the views and purposes of those who grant them! Foreign corruption is also to be guarded against. A system of corruption is known to be the system of government in Europe. It is practiced without blushing. And we may lay it to our account [assume that] it will be attempted amongst us. The most effectual as well as natural security against this, is a strong [broad]...-legislature frequently chosen... Does the [proposed] house of representatives answer this description? I

confess, to me they hardly wear the complexion of a democratic branch -- they appear the mere shadow of representation. The whole number in both houses amounts to 91 -- of these 46 make a quorum; and 24 of these being secured, may carry any point. Can the liberties of three millions of people be securely trusted in the hands of [a mere] 24 men? Is it prudent to commit to so small a number the decision of the great questions which will come before them? Reason revolts at the idea.

The honorable gentleman from New York [Alexander Hamilton] has said that 65 members in the house of representatives are sufficient for the present situation in the country, and taking it for granted that they will increase as one for 30,000, in 25 years they will amount to 200. It is admitted by this observation that the number fixed in the Constitution, is not sufficient without [unless] it is augmented. [However] It is not declared [anywhere in the constitution] that an increase shall be made, but is left at the discretion of the [congressional] legislature, by the gentleman's own concession; therefore the Constitution is imperfect. We certainly ought to fix in the Constitution those things which are essential to liberty. [and] If anything falls under this description, it is the number of legislature [legislators]. To say, as this gentleman does, that our security is to depend upon the spirit of the people, who will be watchful of their liberties, and not suffer them to be infringed, is absurd. It would equally prove that we might adopt any form of government."

Anti-Federalist Papers, John DeWitt, 1787.10.22

"Their proceedings are now before us for our approbation. The eagerness with which they have been received by certain classes of our fellow citizens, naturally forces upon us this question: Are we to adopt this Government without an examination? Some there are, who, literally speaking, are for pressing it upon us at all events. The name of the man who but lisps a sentiment in objection to is, is to be handed to the printer, by the printer to the public, and by the public he is to be led to execution. They are themselves stabbing its reputation. For my part, I am a stranger to the necessity for all this haste! Is it not a subject of some small importance? Certainly it is. Are not your lives, your liberties and your properties intimately involved in it? Certainly they are. Is it a government for a moment, a day, or a year? By no means -- but for ages -- Altered it may possibly be, but it is easier to correct before it is adopted. Is it for a family, a state, or a small number of people? It is for a number no less respectable than 3 millions. Are the enemy at our gates, and have we not time to consider it? Certainly we have. Is it so simple in its form as to be comprehended instantly? [but] Every letter, if I may be allowed the expression, is an idea. [Every letter is an idea: that sounds just like bro•lingo.]. Does it consist of but few additions to our present confederation... Far otherwise. It is a complete system of government, and armed with ever power, that a people in any circumstances ought to bestow. It is a path newly struck out, and a new set of ideas are introduced that have neither occurred or been digested. A government for national purposes ... it ought to undergo a candid and strict examination... Which are but yet in infancy; and we had better proceed slow that too fast. I is much easier to dispense powers, than recall them. ... Some are heard to say, 'When we consider the men [Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Madison] who made it, we ought to take it for sterling, and without hesitation that they were the collected wisdom of the States, and had no object but the general good...

That the citizens of Philadelphia are running mad after

it, can be no argument for us to do the like: Their situation is almost contrasted with ours; they suppose themselves a central State; they expect the perpetual residence of Congress, which of itself alone will ensure their aggrandizement. [the cover story at least]...

We are told by some people, that upon the adopting [of] this New Government, we are to become everything in a moment: Our foreign and domestic debts will be as a feather; our ports will be crowded with the ships of all the world, soliciting our commerce and our produce: Our manufactures will increase and multiply."

Anti-Federalist Papers, John DeWitt, 1787.11.05

"Who are this House of Representatives? A representative Assembly, says the celebrated Mr. Adams... Can this Assembly be said to contain the sense of the people? Do they resemble the people in any one single feature? ... Have you a right to send more than one for every 30,000 of you? Can he be presumed [to know] your different, peculiar situations - your abilities to pay public taxes, when they ought to be abated, and when increased? Or is there any possibility of giving him information? All these questions must be answered in the negative. But how are these men to be chosen? Is there any other way than by dividing the senate into districts? May not you as well at once invest your annual Assemblies [the state senators only served for one year] with the power of choosing them -- where is the essential difference? The nature of the thing will admit of none. Nay, you give them the power to prescribe [determine] the mode [of election]. ... If you choose them yourselves, you must take them upon credit, and elect those persons you know only by common fame. Even this privilege is denied you annually, through fear that you might withhold the shadow of control over them. In this view of the System, let me sincerely ask you, where is the people in this House of Representatives? Where is the boasted popular part of this much admired System?

Are they not cousins-german [of the same family] in every sense to the senate? May they not with propriety [rightly] be termed an Assistant Aristocratical Branch, who will be infinitely more inclined to cooperate and compromise with each other, than to be the careful guardians of the rights of their constituents? Who is there among you would not start [be shocked] at being told, that instead of your present [State] House of Representatives, consisting of members chosen from every town [in your state], your future House were to consist of but ten in number, and these to be chosen by districts?

... In the one case, [under the 1st US constitution] the election would be annual, the persons elected would reside in the center of you, their interests would be yours, they would be subject to your immediate control [recall], and nobody to consult in their deliberations. But in the other, [the proposed 2nd US constitution], they are chosen for double the time [two years], during which, however, well disposed, they become strangers to the very people choosing them, they reside at a distance from you, you have no control over them, you cannot observe their conduct, and they have to consult and finally be guided by twelve other States, whose interests are, in all material points, directly opposed to yours.

Let me again ask you, What citizen is there in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, that would deliberately consent laying aside the mode proposed, that the several senates of the several States, should be the popular Branch, and together, form one National House of Representatives? -- And yet one moment's attention will evince [make plain] to you, that this 'blessed' proposed 'Representation of the People',

this apparent 'faithful Mirror', this 'striking Likeness [of the people]', is to be 'still further refined, and [made]' more Aristocratical four times told'." [Single quotation marks added, along with the suggestion of sarcasm. It is just a hunch, but it certainly seems that someone's chorus or rumor mill was saying something like, 'I hear that the new constitution is a 'blessing and a faithful mirror of the people', that they 'started over from scratch four times, making the thing more democratical each time.']

Anti-Federalist Papers, Patrick Henry, 1788.06.05

[Here Patrick Henry talks about the 2nd US constitution of 1789.]

- 1) "Is it necessary for your liberty, that you should abandon those great rights by the adoption of this system?"
- 2) "Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel."

Franklin D. Roosevelt

"Let us never forget that government is ourselves and not an alien power over us. The ultimate rulers of our democracy are not a president and senators and congressmen and government officials, but the voters of this country."

Anti-Federalist Papers, Centinel #1, 1787.10.05

"Our situation is represented to be so critically dreadful, that, however reprehensible and exceptionable the proposed plan of government [the 2nd 1787 US constitution] may be, there is no alternative, between the adoption of it and absolute ruin. My fellow citizens, things are not at that crisis, it is the argument of tyrants."

Anti-Federalist Papers, Patrick Henry, Virginia ratifying convention, 1788.06.07

"I have thought, and still think, that a full investigation of the actual situation of America, ought to precede any decision on this great and important question [the adoption of the 2nd US constitution of 1789]... If it be demonstrated that the adoption of the new plan is a little or a trifling evil, then, Sir, I acknowledge that adoption ought to follow. But, sir, if this be a truth that its adoption may entail misery on the free people of this country, I then insist, that rejection ought to follow.

Gentlemen strongly urge its adoption will be a mighty benefit to us: But, Sir, I am made of such incredulous materials that assertions and declarations, do not satisfy me. I must be convinced, Sir. I shall retain my infidelity [lack of Latin fides=faith] on that subject, till I see our liberties secured in a manner perfectly satisfactory to my understanding.

The Honorable Gentleman [Governor Randolph] has said, that it is too late in the day for us to reject this new plan: That system which was once execrated [loathed, ex-sacred] by the Honorable member, must now be adopted, let its defects be ever so glaring. ... It is too late in the day? Gentlemen [you] must excuse me, if I should think differently. I never can believe Sir, that it is too late to save all that is precious. If it [the 2nd US constitution] be proper, and independently of every external consideration, wisely constructed, let us receive it. [welcome it]. But, Sir, shall its adoption by eight States induce us to receive it, if it be replete with [full of] the most dangerous defects? They urge that subsequent amendments are safer than previous amendments, and they will answer the same ends. At present we have our liberties and privileges in our own hands. Let us not relinquish them. Let us not adopt this system till we see them [our liberties] secured. ...

Let us recollect the awful magnitude of the subject of

our deliberation. Let us consider the latent consequences of an erroneous decision — and let not our minds be led away by unfair misrepresentations and un-candid suggestions. ...

The Honorable member advises us to adopt a measure which will destroy our Bill of Rights. For [but] after hearing his picture of nations, and his reasons for abandoning all the powers retained to [by] the States by [in] the confederation, I am more firmly persuaded of the impropriety of adopting this new plan in its present shape.

I had doubts of [about] the power of those who went to the Convention. But now we are possessed of it, let us examine it. When we trusted the great object[ive] of revising the Confederation to the greatest, the best, and most enlightened of our citizens, we thought their deliberations would have been solely confined to that revision. Instead of this, a new system, totally different in its nature and vesting the most extensive powers to Congress, is presented. ...

The Honorable member then observed that nations will expend millions for commercial advantages. That is, they will deprive you of every advantage if they can. Apply this another way, their cheaper way. Instead of laying out millions in making war upon you... [they] will... corrupt your senators. I know that if they are not above all price, they may sacrifice our [nation's] commercial interests ... Sir, if our senators will not be corrupted, it will be because they will be good men; and not because the Constitution provides [any check] against corruption, for there is no real check [against corruption] secured in it [the 2nd US constitution], and the most abandoned and profligate acts may be committed by them with impunity.

Congress being the paramount supreme power, much not be disappointed. Thus Congress will have an unlimited, unbounded command over the soul of this Commonwealth. After satisfying their uncontrolled demands, what can be left for the States? Not a sufficiency even to defray the expense of their internal administration. They must therefore glide imperceptibly and gradually out of existence. This, Sir, must naturally terminate in a consolidation. If this will do for other people, it never will do for me.

If we are to have one Representative for every 30,000 souls, it must be by implication. The Constitution does not positively secure it. [They] Even say it is a natural implication, [but] why not give us a right to that proportion in express terms, in language that could not admit [permit] evasions or subterfuge? If they can use implication FOR us, then they can also use implication AGAINST us. We are GIVING power, they are GETTING power. Judge then, on which side the implication will be used. Once we put it in their option to assume constructive power, danger will follow. Trial by jury and liberty of the press, are also on this foundation of implication.

Mr. Henry then declared a Bill of Rights indispensably necessary. That a general positive provision should be inserted in the new system, securing to the States and the people, every right which was not conceded to the General Government, and that every implication should be done away [with]."

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"The founders of your own Constitution made your Government changeable: But the power of changing it is gone from you! whither [to where] is it gone?" [Isn't the prototype US constitution far too hard to change? They Arabs got it the way they wanted and then instituted a policy super-hard changes.]

Gore Vidal

"Our form of democracy is bribery, on the highest scale."

Woodrow Wilson

"If there are men in this country big enough to own the government of the United States, they are going to own it."

Andrew Jackson

"It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their own selfish purposes."

Anti-Federalist Papers, John DeWitt, 1787.10.27

[This new Constitution] "was not a mere revision and amendment of our first Confederation, but a complete System for the future government of the United States, and I may now add in preference to, and in exclusion of, all others heretofore adopted. It is not TEMPORARY, but in its nature, PERPETUAL. It is not designated that you shall be annually called either to revise, correct, or renew it; but that your posterity shall grow up under, and be governed by it, as well as ourselves. It is not so capable of alterations as you would at the first reading suppose; and I venture to assert, it never can be, unless by force of arms. The fifth article in the proceedings, it is true, expressly provides for an alteration under certain conditions [quotes 2nd US constitution] ... Notwithstanding which, such are the 'heterogeneous materials from which this System was formed', such is the difference of interest, different manners, and different local prejudices, in the different parts of the United States, that to obtain that majority of three-fourths to [make] any one single alteration, essentially affecting this or any other State, amounts to an absolute impossibility.

...The want of a [national] Bill of Rights to accompany this proposed System, is a solid objection to it, provided there is nothing exceptionable in the System itself. ... Language is so easy of explanation, and so difficult is it by words to convey exact ideas, that the party to be governed cannot be too explicit. The line cannot be drawn with too much precision and accuracy. The necessity of this accuracy and this precision increases in proportion to the greatness of the sacrifice and the numbers who make it. That a Constitution for the United States does not require a Bill of Rights, when it is considered, that a Constitution for an individual State would, I cannot conceive."

Anti-Federalist Papers, John DeWitt, 1787.11.5

"You are told, that the rights of the people are very amply secured, and when the wheels of it are put into motion, it will wear a milder aspect than its present one. Whereas the very contrary of all this doctrine appears to be true. Upon an attentive examination you can pronounce it nothing less, than a government which if a few years, will degenerate to a complete Aristocracy, armed with powers unnecessary in any case to bestow, and which in its vortex swallows up every other Government upon the Continent. In short, my fellow-citizens, it can be said to be nothing less than a hasty stride to Universal Empire in this Western World, flattering, very flattering to young ambitious minds, but fatal to the liberties of the people. The cord is strained to the very utmost. There is every spice of the SIC. JUBEO possible in the composition. [is the underlined a palimpsest?] Your consent is requested, because it is essential to the introduction of it; [however] after having received confirmation, your complaints may increase the whistling of the wind, and they will be equally regarded."

James Madison to George Washington, Madison Papers, 9.383

"a consolidation of the whole into one simple [to manage] republic would be as inexpedient as it is unattainable, I have sought for some middle ground, which may at once support a due supremacy of the national authority, and not exclude the local authorities whenever they can be subordinately useful." [Note the foreigner English, or "FE"]

James Madison

"There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power, than by violent and sudden usurpations." [Is this a warning to freedom lovers or something for freedom haters to keep in mind?]

Anti-Federalist Papers, 1787.06.16

"Mr. Wilson: ...He could not persuade himself that the State Governments and Sovereignities were so much the idols of the people, nor a National Government so obnoxious to them, as some supposed. Why should a National Government be unpopular? Has it less dignity? Will each Citizen enjoy under it less liberty or protection? Will a Citizen of Delaware be degraded by becoming a Citizen of the United States" [Note the hollow sound of our parasite's propaganda. Where are the facts? Where is the logic?]

Anti-Federalist Papers, Patrick Henry, Virginia ratifying convention 1788.06.12

"It has been said by several Gentlemen that the freeness of elections would be promoted by throwing the country into large districts. I contend, Sir, that it will have a contrary effect. It will destroy that connection that ought to subsist [exist] between electors and the elected. If your elections are by [large voting] districts instead of counties, the people will not be [personally] acquainted with the candidates. They must therefore be directed in the election by those who know them. So that instead of a confidential connection between the electors and the elected, they will be absolutely unacquainted with each other. A common man must [therefore] ask a man of influence how he is to proceed, and for whom he must vote. The elected, therefore, will be ~~careless of~~ [not care about] the interest[s] of the [ir] electors. It will be a common [easy] job to extort [twist-out] the suffrages [vote] of the common people for the most influential characters. [It will thus be normal for the most influential characters to twist/sway the vote of the common man.] The same [men] may be repeatedly elected by these means. This, Sir, instead of promoting the freedom of elections, leads us to an Aristocracy. Consider the mode of elections in England. Behold the progress of an election in an English shire. A man of an enormous fortune will spend 30,000£ to 40,000£ to get himself elected. This is frequently the case. Will the Honorable Gentleman say, that a poor man, as enlightened as any man in the island, has an equal chance with a rich man to be elected? He will stand no chance though he may have the finest understanding of any man in the shire [county]. It will be so here [in America]. Where is the chance that a poor man can come forward with the rich? The Honorable Gentleman will find that instead of supporting Democratical principals, it goes absolutely to [wards] destroy[ing] them.

The State Governments, he says, will possess greater advantages than the General [Federal] Government, and will consequently prevail. His opinion and mine are diametrically

opposite. Bring forth the Federal allurements [allure= the quality of being powerful and mysteriously attractive or fascinating], and compare them with the poor contemptible things that the State Legislatures can bring forth [will have the power to enact]."

Anti-Federalist Papers, James Madison replies to Patrick Henry, Virginia ratifying convention 1788.06.12

[Madison says other things and completely ignores the legitimate claims of Patrick Henry. Here I am reminded of a saying in the legal profession: "If the facts support your case, argue the facts. If the facts don't support your case, argue something else." Clearly the "great" James Madison is arguing something else on behalf the parasite]

"Mr. Chairman. Pardon me for making a few remarks on what fell from the Honorable Gentleman last up [Patrick Henry]. I am sorry to follow the example of Gentlemen in deviating from the rule of the House. But as they have taken the utmost latitude in their objects, it is necessary that those who favor the Government should answer them. But I wish as soon as possible to take up the subject regularly. I will therefore take the liberty to answer some observations which have been irregularly made, though they might be more properly answered when we came to discuss those parts of the Constitution to which they respectively refer. I will, however, postpone answering some others till then.

If there be that terror in direct taxation, that the States would comply with requisitions to guard against the Federal Legislature; and if, as Gentlemen say, this State will always have it in her power to make her collections speedily and fully, the people will be compelled to pay the same amount as quickly and punctually as if raised by the General [Federal] Government. It has been amply proved, that the General Government can lay taxes as conveniently to the people as the State Governments, by imitating the State systems of taxation..."

Anti-Federalist Papers, Melancton Smith, 1788.06.21

"A few years ago we fought for liberty. We framed a general government on free principles. We placed [put in place] the state legislatures, in whom the people have a full and fair representation, between Congress and the people. We were then, it is true, too cautious; and too much restricted the powers of the general government. But now it is proposed to go into the contrary, and a more dangerous extreme; to remove all barriers; to give the new [federal] government free access to our pockets, and ample command of our persons; and that without providing for a genuine and fair representation of the people."

[See, our parasite pulled the pendulum too far to one side so it could later swing it too far to the other side.]

Special ratifying conventions approved the US Constitution

It is worth repeating that the US constitution was not ratified by the Confederation Congress then in power. It was not ratified by the various state legislatures. It was not ratified by a vote of the people in the various states. In 8 of the 13 states, it was ratified by small bodies of appointees from the various state legislatures. Here is how America's over-centralized constitution, with its lone presidential figurehead monarch was passed so soon after America had gotten rid of the British figurehead monarchy. (search ratification controversy).

Decision in Philadelphia

"Feeling against the Constitution was, thus, genuine and widespread. It is probable that, at the outset, a majority of the people in many states were opposed to it."

Anti-Federalist Papers, Farmer Jonathan Smith's speech at the Massachusetts ratifying convention.

"Mr. President [chairman], I am a plain man and get my living by the plow.... I had been a member of the Convention to form our own state constitution, and had learnt something of the checks and balances of power, and I found them all there. I did not go to any lawyer to ask his opinion. [This makes it sound like people were asking "expert" lawyers to advise them about the new constitution.] We have no lawyers in our town, and we do well enough without. I formed by own opinion, and was pleased with this [2nd 1787 US] Constitution. ... I never had any post, nor do I want one. But I don't think worse of the Constitution because lawyers and men of learning, and moneyed men are fond of it. I don't suspect that they want to get into Congress and abuse their power ... Some gentlemen think that our liberty and property are not safe in the hands of moneyed men, and men of learning. I am not of that mind... Some gentlemen say, don't be in a hurry. Take time to consider, and don't take a leap in the dark. I say, take things in time, gather fruit when it is ripe. There is a time to sow and a time to reap. We sowed our seed when we sent men to the Federal Convention. Now is the harvest. Now is the time to reap the fruit of our labor. And if we don't do it now, I am afraid, we shall never have another opportunity."

Decision in Philadelphia book

"When the 9th state ratified, all across the union there were enormous celebrations, parades, fireworks, bonfires, huge ship models 20 or 30 feet long towed through the streets, speeches, joy. There was a sense everywhere among Americans that they had done something grand and glorious, something that would endure and light a lamp for the rest of the world to follow." [Thus Arab moles created the proto-type democracy of the modern world in 1789.]

Edgar Allen Poe, Ligeia

"And the will therein lieth, which dieth not. Who knoweth the mysteries of the will, with its vigor? For God is but a great will pervading all things by nature of its intentness. Man doth not yield him to the angels, nor unto death utterly, but only through the weakness of his feeble will."

Barack Hussein Obama

"If the people cannot trust their government to do the job for which it exists, to protect them and to promote their common welfare, all else is lost." [Is this a warning or a strategy?]

Vladimir Lenin

"The oppressed are allowed once every few years to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class are to represent and repress them in parliament."

If you are reading these words just after they came out, scroll down about 6 pages to the next mention of the term " facebook ", where the new democratic design is explained.

Anti-Federalist papers, 1787.07.23

"Taking a respite from the unsettled question of the executive department, the Convention considered how the proposed

Constitution might be ratified. Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut supported ratification by the state legislatures [with over 2,000 elected officials], while Mason and Madison of Virginia favored special conventions [narrow bodies of people appointed] in each state for that purpose. [As follows is the nonsense rationalization for how the 2nd US Constitution was ratified by a small number of appointee delegates. If you don't understand what you are reading, don't worry, it a nonsensical argument.]

Colonel Mason considered a reference of the plan to the authority of the people as one of the most important and essential of the Resolutions. The Legislatures have no power to ratify it. They are mere creatures of the State Constitutions, and can not be greater than their creators. As he knew of no power in any of the Constitutions, he knew there was no power in some of them, that could be competent to this object. Whither then must we resort? To the people with whom all power remains that has not been given up in the Constitutions derived from them. It was of great moment he observed that this doctrine should be cherished as the basis of free Government. Another strong reason was that admitting the legislatures to have a competent authority, it would be wrong to refer the plan to them, because succeeding Legislatures having equal authority could undo the acts of their predecessors; and the National Government would stand in each State on the weak and tottering foundation of an Act of Assembly. [Not so. The State legislatures could have simply voted irrevocably to increase the range of powers given over to the national government.] There was a remaining consideration of some weight. In some of the States the Governments were not derived from the clear and undisputed authority of the people. This was the case in Virginia. Some of the best and wisest citizens considered the Constitution as established by an assumed authority. A National Constitution derived from such a source would be exposed to the severest criticisms...

Mr. Madison thought it clear that the Legislatures were incompetent to the proposed changes. These changes would make essential inroads on the State Constitutions, and it would be a novel and dangerous doctrine that a Legislature could change the constitution under which it held its existence. [but the proposed US Constitution 2.0 does just that with its amendment process.] There might indeed be some Constitutions within the Union, which had given a power to the Legislature to concur in alteration of the federal Compact. But there were certainly some which had not; and in the case of these, a ratification must of necessity be obtained from the people. [The people yes, not some bunch of appointees carefully selected for their pre-existing inclinations.] He considered the difference between a system founded on the Legislatures only, and one founded on the people, to be the true difference between a league or treaty, and a Constitution. The former in point of moral obligation might be as inviolable as the latter. [However] In point of political operation, there were two important distinctions in favor of the latter [Constitutions]. 1. A law violating a treaty ratified by [under] a pre-existing law, might be respected by the Judges as a law, though an unwise or perfidious one. A law violating a constitution established by the people themselves, would be considered by the Judges as null and void. 2. The doctrine laid down by the law of Nations in the case of treaties is that a breach of any one article by any of the parties, frees the other parties from their engagements. In the case of a union of people under one Constitution, the nature of the pact has always been understood to exclude such an interpretation.

Comparing the two modes in point of expediency, he thought all the consideration which recommended this Convention in preference to Congress for proposing the reform were in favor of State Conventions in preference to Legislatures for examining and adopting it." [Madison's conclusion has nothing to do with his baffling argument. Clearly we are being baffled with nonsense.]

Spiro Agnew, US Vice President 1969-1973

"A tiny and closed fraternity of privileged men, elected by no one, and enjoying a monopoly sanctioned and licensed by government."

Ammianus Marcellinus on Roman Emperor Valens d. 378 AD

"He was better at choosing between different options than coming up with them."

[The Arab Menu is a classic technique that Arabs use to manipulate their flock. In 1789, America was given a choice between a totally dis-functional meta-democracy, and a periodic constitutional monarchy disguised as a democracy. The new government would at least work so long as the Arabs didn't lean too hard and too continually on the ship of state. People chose the better of the two Arab choices, and this became the prototype democracy for the world. It is vitally important to realize that both systems, both menu choices were created by the Arab.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 56.47

"These were the decrees which were passed...nominally by the Senate, but in fact by Tiberius... This was because some men made one suggestion and some another, and finally the Senate decreed that Tiberius should be sent the Senate proposals in writing and he should select whichever he preferred." [Tiberius was the 3rd in a long string of increasingly awful Roman emperors fronting for the desperate land of no resources.]

The Federal bill of rights

The most important ideas about the federal bill of rights are:

- 1) That each of the 13 states had their own bill of rights prior to 1789. These varied a bit, but they were all close to the bill on rights in the 2.0 version of the US constitution from 1789.
- 2) That without a federal bill of rights, the narrow and easy to corrupt federal democracy could have made any law it chose to, regardless of what the various state bills of rights said. So not having a federal bill of rights would have served to effectively void the various state bills of rights.
- 3) The same people pushing for a single, narrow, and easy to corrupt federal government (the Federalists) were also saying that there was no need for a federal bill of rights. Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Adams, James Wilson, John Jay and the rest of the "Federalist" party (actually our parasite's "founding Brothers") tried quite hard to say there was no need for the people to have a federal bill of rights.
- 4) We the people owe ourselves BOTH a powerful bill of rights and a broad democracy.
- 5) Having a bills of rights makes it much harder for our parasite to enslave its colonists totally. They can't easily control the press, they can't arrest people for little cause, and they can't search for untaxed spices/drugs, among other things.

What, no bill of rights?

The 2nd US Constitution of 1787 was sent to the states for

ratification without a bill of rights. On 1787.10.06, Federalist James Wilson, on of the 37 at the convention gave the following hard to understand and illogical explanation for why that was:]

"[To] answer to those who think the omission of a bill of rights a defect in the proposed Constitution; for it would have been superfluous and absurd to have stipulated with a federal body of our own creation, that we should enjoy those privileges of which we are not divested [currently deprived from], either by the intention or the act that has brought the body into existence. For instance, the liberty [freedom] of the press, which has been a copious source of declamation [public address] and opposition. What control can proceed from [possibly originate in] the Federal government to shackle or destroy that sacred palladium [safeguard] of national freedom?"

Thomas Jefferson

"A Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government and what no just government should refuse."

Who on Earth?

Who on earth except for the Arabs, would bother to struggle to keep the American people from having a national bill of rights?

Special ratifying conventions approved the US Constitution

It is worth repeating that the US constitution was not ratified by the Confederation Congress then in power. It was not ratified by the various state legislatures. It was not ratified by a vote of the people in the various states. In 8 of the 13 states, it was ratified by small bodies of appointees from the various state legislatures. Here is how America's over-centralized constitution, with its lone presidential figurehead monarch was passed so soon after America had gotten rid of the British figurehead monarchy. (search ratification controversy).

The worst form of democracy our parasite could pass off

You know, American-style democracy was the best our parasite could come up with — while still maintaining a "democracy" that appeared to be "of the people by the people and for the people." I mean look at the the major flaws it has.

And please, I beg you all not to judge democracy by way the US runs. This is not democracy at work. It is our parasite's ultra-corrupt version of democracy.

We were never alone

You think that your national dialogue is between the people of your nation alone. This is simply not so. Your parasite race is always at the table pretending to be real constituencies among your people.

Gustav Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"History in the main [mostly], thus far, has been an institution for the propagation of lies. The truth is that for thousands of years back, since the private property system came into existence, an incessant, uncompromising warfare has been going on between oppressors and oppressed..."

In this struggle the [Arab fronting] propertied classes had the great advantage from the start. Centuries of rulership had taught them that the control of Government was the crux of the mastery. By possession of Government they had the power of making laws; of the enforcement or non-enforcement of those laws; of the directorship of the police, army, navy,

courts, jails, and prisons—all terrible instruments for suppressing any attempt at protest, peaceful or otherwise.

Notwithstanding this massing of power and force, the working class has at no time been passive or acquiescent. It has allowed itself to be duped. It has permitted its ranks to be divided by false issues. It has often been blind at critical times, and has made no concerted as yet to get intelligent possession of the great strategic point,—governmental power.

Nevertheless, despite these mistakes, it has been in a state of constant rebellion; and the fact that it has been so, that its aspirations could not be squelched [forcefully silenced] by jails, prisons and cannon nor by destitution or starvation, furnishes the sublimest [most awesome] record in all the annals of mankind."

Constitutional coup

The figurehead monarchies of the ancient land of no resources have mostly run the world throughout human history—much to the detriment of humanity (eu•man•idi). Sometimes, the good spirit of the host civilization got loose, but mostly the evil ex•pull spirit of the Mideast parasite race has run the world according to the diametrically-opposed agenda of the parasite.

The good spirit of mankind wrote the first US constitution of 1777. But then 10 years later in 1787, the other spirit, the parasite spirit staged a constitutional coup when it wrote a new constitution. After two years of debate, this new constitution was ratified and went into effect in 1789.

Patrick Henry

[Patrick Henry's Opening speech to the Virginia Ratifying Convention June 2-27, 1788. Titled: A wrong step now and the Republic will be lost forever. Anti-Federalist Papers]

"The public mind, as well as my own is extremely uneasy at the proposed change of government. [Allow me to be one of the many who wants] to be thoroughly acquainted with the reasons of [for] this perilous and uneasy situation and why we are brought hither [here] to decide on this great national question. I consider myself as the servant of the people of this Commonwealth, as a sentinel [watching] over their rights, liberty, and happiness. I represent their feelings when I say, that they are exceedingly uneasy, being brought from that state of full security, which they enjoyed to [until] the present delusive appearance of things. A year ago, the minds of our citizens were at perfect repose. Before the meeting of the late Federal Convention in Philadelphia, a general peace, and an universal tranquility prevailed in this country. — But since that period, they are exceedingly uneasy and disquieted. When I wished for an appointment to this Convention, my mind was extremely agitated for the situation of public affairs. I conceived the republic to be in extreme danger. ...

Is it possible that we shall abandon all our treaties and national engagements? And for what? I expected to have heard the reasons of an event so unexpected to my mind, and many others. Was our civil polity, or public justice, endangered or sapped? Was the real [very] existence of the country threatened — or was this preceded by a mournful [sad] progression of events? This proposal of altering our Federal Government is of a most alarming nature... You ought to be extremely cautious, watchful, and jealous of your liberty. For instead of securing your rights, you may lose them forever. If a wrong step be now made, the republic may be lost forever. ...

It will be necessary for this Convention to have a faithful historical detail of the facts that preceded the secession of the Federal Convention, and the reasons that actuated its members in proposing an entire alteration of Government

[Here it seems that arch-Federalist James Madison's record of the 37-man 'Constitutional Convention' was not published for the ratifying conventions to consider. This document which should have been called something like the "constitutional record" is still confusingly known as "The Anti-Federalist Papers. And apparently this was published some years later to maximize someone's ability to change history.] — and to demonstrate the dangers that awaited us: If they were of such awful magnitude, as to warrant a proposal so entirely perilous as this, I must assert, that this Convention has an absolute right to thorough discovery of every circumstance relative to this great event. And here I would make this inquiry of those worthy characters who composed a part of the late Federal Convention. I am sure they were fully impressed with the necessity of forming a great consolidated Government, instead of a confederation [of 13 independent states]. That this is a consolidated Government is demonstrably clear, and the danger of such a Government, is, to my mind, very striking. I have the highest veneration for those Gentlemen, — but, Sir, give me leave to demand, what right had they to say, We the People.? ...

[Also,] I wish to hear the real actual existing danger, which should lead us to take those steps so dangerous in my conception."

[Reader: If there is one place where you should be looking for something I missed, it is in the anti-Federalist papers. I only read the smallest fraction of this huge body of hard-to-read material. It is by far the best work on democratic design 'democracy in America' that I have come across.]

OPTIONAL READ

In the first month after revelation day, the things marked as OPTIONAL READ should be skipped over.

OPTIONAL READ

Anti-Federalist Papers, Centinel, #1, 1787.10.05

[Here we see a Brotherly gazette, an intelligence briefing published right out in the open. Note how hard this is to read. Read it 3 or 6 times, per•use or bro•use it]

"...that frenzy of enthusiasm, that has actuated the citizens of Philadelphia, in their approbation of the proposed plan [the 2nd US constitution of 1789], before it was possible that it could be the result of a rational investigation into its principals. It ought to be dispassionately and deliberately examined, and its own intrinsic merit the only criterion of your patronage [support]. If ever free and unbiased discussion was proper or necessary, it is on such an occasion. [So all the Brothers needs to get out and support it] All the blessings of liberty and the dearest privileges of free [Rumi] men are now at stake and dependent on your present conduct. [he said conduct, not decision] Those who are competent to the task of developing the principles of government, ought to be encouraged to come forward, and thereby the better enable the people to make a proper judgment. For the science of government is so abstruse, that few are able to judge for themselves. Without such assistance, the people are too apt to yield an implicit assent to the opinions of those characters, whose abilities are held in the highest esteem, and those in whose integrity and patriotism then can confide. Not considering that the love of domination is generally in proportion to talents, abilities and superior acquirements; and that the men of the greatest purity of intention may be made instruments of despotism in the hands of the artful and designing. If it were not for the stability and attachment which time and habit gives to forms of government,

it would [already] be in the power of the enlightened and aspiring few, if they should combine, at any time to destroy the best establishments and even make the people the instruments of their own subjugation.

The late revolution having effaced in a great measure all former habits, and the present institutions are so recent, that there exists not that great reluctance to innovation, so remarkable in old communities, and which accords with reason, for the most comprehensive mind cannot foresee the full operation of material changes on civil polity, it is the genius of the common law to resist innovation.

The wealthy and ambitious, who in every community think they have a right to lord it over their fellow creatures, have availed themselves, very successfully, of this favorable disposition [situation]; for the people thus unsettled in their sentiments, have been prepared to accede [agree] to any extreme of government; all the distresses and difficulties they experience, proceeding from various causes, have been ascribed to the impotency of the present confederation, and thence they have been led to expect full relief from the adoption of the proposed system of government; and in the other [alternate] event [eventuality], immediately ruin and annihilation as a nation. These characters... have lulled all distrust and jealousy of their new plan, by gaining the concurrence [support] of the two men in who America has the highest confidence, and now triumphantly exult [rejoice] in the completion of their long meditated schemes of power and aggrandizement. I would be very far from insinuating that the two illustrious personages alluded to, have not the welfare of their country at heart; but that the unsuspecting goodness and zeal of the one, has been imposed on, in a subject of which he must be necessarily inexperienced, from his other arduous [L. ardor= burn, burningly hot] engagements; and that the weakness and indecision attendant on old age, has been practiced on the other." [in 1787, George Washington was 55 and Benjamin Franklin was 81.]

OPTIONAL READ

Anti-Federalist Papers, 1787.09.17

[This account is from the signing of the 2nd US constitution only 41 days after the first draft constitution was completed.]

"Mr. [Benjamin] Franklin: ...the older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgement, and to pay more respect to the judgement of others [the more likely he was to go with the flow]. Most men indeed as well as most sects in Religion, think themselves in possession of all truth, and that wherever others differ from them it is so far error. [Mr.] Steele, a Protestant, in a Dedication tells the Pope, that the only difference between our Churches in their opinions of the certainty of their doctrines is [that], the Church of Rome is infallible and the Church of England is never in the wrong.... [A joke that says much about mentalities, as well as attitudes about religions]

In these sentiments, Sir, I agree to this Constitution with all its faults, if they are such; because I think a general [centralized federal] Government necessary for us, and there is no form of Government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered, and believe farther, that this is likely to be well administered for a course of years, and can only end in Despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic Government, being incapable of any other. I doubt too whether any other Convention we can obtain, may be able to make a better Constitution. For when you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men, all their prejudices,

their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected? It therefore astonished me, Sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does. And I think it will astonish our enemies, who are waiting with confidence to hear that our councils are confounded like those of the Builders of Babel, and that our States are on the point of separation, only to meet hereafter for the purpose of cutting one another's throats. Thus I consent, Sir, to this Constitution because I expect no better. ...

Mr. Gorham [core·man] said if it was not too late, he could wish, for the purpose of lessening objections to the Constitution, that the clause declaring "the number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every forty thousand" which had produced so much discussion, might be yet reconsidered, in order to strike out 40,000 and insert "30,000". This would not he remarked establish that as an absolute rule, but only give Congress a greater latitude which could not be thought unreasonable. [At the last minute they limited the number of representatives to 100 instead of limiting it to 75. In America today, with 305 million people, these numbers are proportionate to around 10,166 and 7,625. Today we can have no more than 10,166 Representatives]

Mr. King and Mr Carrol seconded and supported the ideas of Mr. Gorham.

When the President [the famously quiet George Washington] rose, for the purpose of putting the question, he said that although his situation had hitherto restrained him from offering his sentiments on questions depending in the House, and it might be thought, ought now to impose silence on him, yet he could not forbear expressing his wish that the alteration proposed might take place. It was much to be desired that the objections to the plan recommended might be made as few as possible. The smallness of the proportion of Representatives had been considered by many members of the Convention and insufficient security for the rights and interests of the people. He acknowledged that it had always appeared to himself among the exceptional parts of the plan, and late as the present moment was for admitting amendments, he thought this of so much consequence that it would give much satisfaction to see it adopted. [This was the only occasion on which the George Washington entered at all into the discussions of the Convention. It was to give a tiny token concession on the all important issue of representation ratio in America's new democracy. Here we see what the great George Washington really was, a fine man little doubt, but also a figurehead like George Bush, Al Gore and a man who would do as advised.]

No opposition was made to the proposition of Mr. Gorham and it was agreed to unanimously. ...

Whilst the last members were signing it, Dr. Franklin looking towards the President's Chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, observed to a few members near him, that Painters [peh'n·ters] had found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising from a setting sun. I have said he, often and often in the course of the Session, and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting Sun." [for the Brotherhood, or the house of the rising son].

OPTIONAL READ

Melancton Smith and Alexander Hamilton debate representation, aristocracy and interests. 1788.06.21

"The honorable gentleman [Alexander Hamilton] says, that the clause by obvious construction fixes the representation. I wish not to torture words or sentences. I perceive no such obvious construction. I see clearly that on the one hand the representatives cannot exceed 1 for 30,000 inhabitants; and on the other that whatever larger number of inhabitants may be taken for the rule of apportionment, each state shall be entitled [under this new constitution] to send [only] one representative. Everything else appears to me in the discretion of the legislature. If there be any other limitation, it is certainly [only] implied. Matters of such moment [important, momentous] should not be left to doubtful construction [ambiguous wording].

It is urged [by some] that the number of representatives will be fixed at 1 for 30,000, because it will be in the interest of the large states to do it [so]. I [however,] cannot discern the force of this argument. [The argument doesn't make any sense to me.] To me, it appears clear that the relative weight of influence of the different states will be the same, with the number of representatives at 65 as at [or] 600. ... [However] each member's share of power will [definitely] decrease as the number of [men in] the house of representatives increases. Therefore, if this maxim be true: That men are unwilling to relinquish powers which they once possess, we are not to expect that the house of representatives will be inclined to enlarge the [its] numbers. The same motive will operate to influence the president and senate to oppose the increase of the number of representatives. For in proportion as the weight of the house of representatives is augmented, they will feel their own [power] diminished. It is therefore of the highest importance that a suitable number of representatives should be established by the constitution.

It has been observed by an honorable member, that the eastern states insisted upon a small representation on the principles of economy. [They insisted on a leveraged ratio to save money.] This argument must have [be given] no weight in the mind of a considerate person. The difference of expense, between supporting a house of representatives sufficiently numerous, and the present proposed one would be about 20 or 30,000 dollars per annum. The man who would seriously object to this expense, to secure his liberties, does not deserve to enjoy them. Besides, by increasing the number of representatives, we open a door for the admission of the substantial yeomanry [bourgeois] of your country; ~~who~~; [These] being possessed of the habits of economy, will be cautious of imprudent expenditures, by which means a much greater saving will be made of public money than is sufficient to support them. ...

...What [is] the proper number which ought to compose the house of representatives [?] ...-

————The idea that naturally suggests itself to our minds, when we speak of representatives is, that they resemble those they represent; the should be a true picture of the people; possess the knowledge of their circumstances and their wants; sympathize in all their distresses, and be disposed to seek their true interests. The knowledge necessary for the representatives of a free people, no only comprehends [includes, encompasses] extensive political and commercial information such as is acquired by men of refined education, who have leisure to attain to high degrees of improvement, but it should also comprehend that kind of acquaintance with the

common concerns and occupations of the people, which men of the middling class of life are in general much better competent to, than those of a superior class. To understand the true commercial interests of a country, not only requires just ideas of the general commerce of the world, but also and principally, a knowledge of the productions of your own country and their value, what your soil is capable of producing, the nature of your manufactures, and the capacity of the country to increase both. To exercise the power of laying taxes, duties and excises with discretion requires something more than an acquaintance with the abstruse parts of the system of finance.

...

The author of nature has bestowed on some greater capacities than others: birth education, talents and wealth create distinctions among men... In every society, men of this [upper] class will command a superior degree of respect. And of thing if the government is so constituted as to admit but a few to exercise its powers, it will according to the natural course of thing, be in their hands. Men of the middling class, who are qualified as representatives, will not be so anxious to be chosen as those of the first. When the number is so small the office will be highly elevated and distinguished. The style in which the members live will probably be high. Circumstances of this kind, will render the place of a representative not a desirable one to sensible, substantial men, who have been used to walk in the plain and frugal paths of life.

Besides, the influence of the great will generally enable them to succeed in elections. It will be difficult to combine a district of country containing 35 or 40,000 inhabitants, frame your election laws as you please in any one character, unless it be in one of conspicuous military, popular, civil, or legal talents. The great easily form associations, the poor and middling class form them with difficulty. If the election be by [a mere] plurality, as probably will be the case in this state, it is almost certain [that] none but the great will be chosen [elected] – for they easily unite their interest. The common people will divide, and their divisions will be promoted by the others. There will be scarcely a chance of their uniting, in any other but some great man, unless in some popular demagogue, who will probably be destitute of principle[s]. A substantial yeoman of sense and discernment, will hardly ever be chosen. From these remarks it appears that the government will fall into the hands of the few and the great. This will be a government of oppression.

I do not mean to declaim against [condemn] the great, and charge them indiscriminately with want [lack] of principle and honesty. The same passions and prejudices govern all men. The circumstances in which men are placed in a great measure give a cast to the human character. Those in middling circumstances, have less temptation. They are inclined by habit and the company with whom they associate, to set bounds to their passions and appetites. If this is not sufficient, the want [lack] of means to gratify them will be a restraint — they are obliged to employ their time in their respective callings — hence the substantial yeomanry of the country are more temperate, of better morals and [of] less ambition than the great [men of the nation]. The latter do not feel for the poor and middling class; the reasons are obvious. They are not obliged to use the pains and labor to procure property as the other. They don't feel the inconveniences arising from the payment of small sums. The great consider themselves above the common people — entitled to more respect — do not associate with them — they fancy themselves to have a right of pre-eminence in everything. In

short, they possess the same feelings, and are under the influence of the same motives, as an hereditary nobility. I know the idea that such a distinction exists in this country is ridiculed by some — But I am not the less apprehensive of danger from their influence on this account. Such distinctions exist all the world over — [And] have been taken notice of by all writers on free government — and are founded in the nature of things. It has been the principal care of free governments to guard against the encroachments of the great. Common observation and experience prove the existence of such distinctions. Will anyone say, that there does not exist in this country the pride of family, of wealth, of talents; and that they do not command influence and respect among the common people?"

OPTIONAL READ

Here Melancton Smith speaks specifically and Alexander Hamilton responds vaguely at the New York Ratifying Convention to the current US Constitution on 1788.6.21:

"Who would have thought ten years ago, that the very men who risked their lives and fortunes in support of republican principles, would not treat them as the fictions of fancy? A few years ago, we fought for liberty. We framed a general government on free principles. We placed the state legislatures, in whom the people have a full and fair representation, between Congress and the people. We were then it is true, too cautious; and too much restricted the powers of the general government. But now it is proposed to go into the contrary [opposite direction], and a more dangerous extreme; to remove all barriers; to give the New Government free access to our pockets, and ample command of our persons; and that without providing for a genuine and fair representation of the people. No one can say what the progress of the change of sentiment may be in 25 years. The same who now cry-up the necessity of an energetic government, to induce a compliance with the system, may in much less time reprobate [express disapproval of] this [new 2nd constitution] in as severe terms as they now do the confederation [the 1st constitution of 13 independent states] and may as strongly urge the necessity of going as far beyond this [2nd constitution], as this is beyond the Confederation. Men of this class are increasing. They have influence, talents and industry. It is time to form a barrier against them. And while we are willing to establish a government adequate to the purposes of the union, let us be careful to establish it on the broad basis of equal liberty.

Mr. Hamilton then resumed his argument. When, said he, I had the honor to address the committee yesterday, I gave a history of the circumstance which attended the Convention, when forming the plan before you, I endeavored to point out to you the principles of accommodation, on which this arrangement was made; and to shew that the contending interests of the States led them to establish the representation as it now stands. In the second place, I attempted to prove that in point of number the representation would be perfectly secure.

Sire, no man agrees more perfectly than myself to the main principle for which the gentlemen contend. I agree that there should be a broad democratic branch in the national legislature. But this matter, Sir depends on circumstance; It is impossible, in the first instance to be precise and exact with regard to the number; and it is equally impossible to determine to what point it may be proper in [the] future to increase it. On this ground, I am disposed to acquiesce. In my reasonings on the subject of government, I rely more on the interests and the [vague and equivocal] opinions of men, than on any

speculative parchment provisions whatever. I have found, that Constitutions are [always] more or less excellent as they are more or less agreeable to the natural operation of things. I am therefore disposed not to dwell long on curious speculations, or pay much attention to modes and forms; but to adopt a system, whose principles have been sanctioned by experience; adapt it to the real state of our country; and depend on probably reasonings for its operation and result. I contend that 65 and 23 in two bodies afford perfect security, in the present state of things; and that the regular progressive enlargement, which in the contemplation of the General Convention, will leave not an apprehension of danger in the most timid and suspicious mind. It will be the interest of the large states to increase the representation: This will be the standing instruction to their delegates. But, say the gentlemen, the Members of Congress will be interested not to increase the number [of representatives], as it will diminish their relative influence. In all their reasoning upon the subject, there seems to be this fallacy: They suppose that the representative will have no motive of action, on the one side, but a sense of duty; or on the other, but corruption [They suppose that representatives will have no motives but a sense of duty or corruption] They do not reflect, that he is to return to the community; that he is dependent on the will of the people, and that it cannot be his interest to oppose their wishes. Sir, the general sense of the people will regulate the conduct of their representatives. I admit that there are exceptions to this rule: There are certain conjunctures, when it may be necessary and proper to disregard the opinions which the majority of the people have formed: But in the general course of things, the popular views and even prejudices will direct the actions of the rulers.

All governments, even the most despotic, depend, in a great degree, on opinion. In free republics, it is most particularly the case: In these, the will of the people makes the essential principle of the government; and the laws which control the community, receive their tone and spirit from the public wishes. It is the fortunate situation of our country, that the minds of the people are exceedingly enlightened and refined: Here then we may expect the laws to be proportionably [proportionately] agreeable to the standard of perfect policy; and the wisdom of public measures to consist with the most intimate conformity between the views of the representative and his constituent. If the general view of the people be for an increase, it undoubtably [SIC] must take place: They have it in their power to instruct their representatives; and the States Legislatures, which appoint the senators, may enjoin it also upon them. Sir, if I believed that the number would remain at 65, I confess I should give my vote for an amendment; though in a different form from the one proposed.

The amendment [under consideration] proposes a [fixed] ratio of 1:20,000: I would ask, by what rule or reasoning it is determined that one man is a better representative for 20 than 30 thousand? At present we have 3 millions of people. In 25 years, we shall have 6 millions, and in 40 years, 9 millions: And this is a short period, as it relates to the existence of States. Here then, according to the ratio of 1:30,000, we shall have, in 40 years, 300 representatives. [for 9 million people. By this calculation, America in 2014 with 305 million people should have 10,166 representative, not 435. And notably, this is Alexander Hamilton saying this, using this argument to sell a 1:30,000 representation ratio.] If these be true, and if this be a safe representation, why be dissatisfied? Why embarrass the Constitution with amendments that are merely speculative and useless? I agree with the gentleman, that a very small number

might give some color for suspicion: I acknowledge, that 10 would be unsafe [It would be an obvious oligarchy, so the Brothers go for the next best thing, a narrow democracy of 65, checked by a democracy of 23 checked by an elected monarch and 9 monarch appointees in a Supreme Court.] On the other hand, a thousand would be too numerous. But I ask him, why will not 91 be an adequate and safe representation? This at present appears to be the proper medium [middle ground]. Besides, the President of the United States [the US monarch] will be himself the representative of the people. From the competition that ever subsists [always exists] between the branches of government, the President will be induced to protect their rights, whenever they are invaded by either branch. On whatever side we view this subject, we discover various and powerful checks to the encroachments of Congress [the only part of the US government that is an actual democracy. Here Hamilton is saying that America's presidential monarchs protect the people from their democratic legislature.] The true and permanent interests of the members are opposed to corruption: Their number is vastly too large for easy combination [obviously in hindsight this is not true]. Their rival-ship between the houses will forever prove and insuperable obstacle. The people have an obvious and powerful protection in their own State governments [obviously not true on the national level]. Should anything dangerous be attempted, these bodies of perpetual observation [the state governments] will be capable of forming and conducting plans of regular opposition [When has this ever happened?] Can we suppose the people's love of liberty will not, under the incitement of their [state] legislative leaders, be roused into resistance, and the madness of tyranny be extinguished at a blow? Sir, the danger is too distant; it is beyond all rational calculations.

It has been observed by an honorable gentleman, that a pure democracy, if it were practicable, would be the most perfect government. Experience has proved, that no position in politics is more false than this. The ancient democracies, in which the people themselves deliberated, never possessed one feature of good government. Their very character was tyranny; their figure deformity: When they assembled, the field of debate presented an ungovernable mob, not only incapable of deliberation, but prepared for every enormity. In these assemblies, the enemies of the people brought forward their plans of ambition systematically. [and] subjected themselves to be led blindly by one tyrant or by another.

It was remarked yesterday, that a numerous representation was necessary to obtain the confidence of the people. This is not generally true. The confidence of the people will easily be gained by a good administration. This is the true touchstone [by which the people foolishly make up their minds.] In Sparta, the Ephori were a body of magistrates, instituted as a check upon the senate, and representing the people. They consisted of only five men, but they were able to protect their rights, and therefore enjoyed their confidence and attachment. In Rome, the people were represented by three Tribunes, who were afterwards increased to 10. Every one acquainted with the history of that republic, will recollect how powerful a check to the senatorial encroachments, this small body proved. How unlimited a confidence was placed in them by the people whose guardians they were; and to what a conspicuous station in the government, their influence at length elevated the Plebeians. Massachusetts has 300 representatives; New York has 65. Have the people in this state less confidence in their representation than the people of that? [Tiny, minuscule] Delaware has 21. Do the inhabitants of

New York feel a higher confidence than those of Delaware? I have stated these examples to prove that the gentleman's principle is not just. The popular confidence depends on circumstances very distinct from considerations of number. Probably the public attachment is more strongly secured by a train of prosperous events, which are the result of wise deliberation and vigorous execution, and to which large bodies are much less competent than small ones. ...

[The gentleman in opposition has observed] that a large representation is necessary to understand the interests of the people. This principle is by no means true in the extent to which the gentleman seems to carry it. I would ask, why may not [can't] a man understand the interests of 30 as well as 20? The position appears to be made upon the unfounded presumption, that all of the interests of all parts of the community must be represented. No idea is more erroneous than this. Only such interests are proper to be represented, as are involved in the powers of the General government. These interests come completely under the observation of one, or a few men; and the requisite information is by no means augmented in proportion to the increase in number."

If you are skipping to keyword facebook start again here

VOTING

The 3 main types of democratic corruption

There are 3 fundamental ways to make a democratic ship of state leak:

- 1) Corrupt the process of electing decision makers.
- 2) Corrupt the decisions the elected people make once elected.
- 3) Corrupt the execution of the things the elected people decide.

The main tool for preventing ELECTION CORRUPTION is an appropriate representation ratio that is not too narrow as to have organized campaigns, or too broad as to become subject to media corruption. The main tool for preventing LEGISLATIVE CORRUPTION is to have secret votes that can't be sold. The main tool for preventing EXECUTIVE CORRUPTION is to have a broad elected body executing our laws.

It doesn't hurt to outlaw vote buying

Today, if an ordinary person sells or swaps their insignificant little vote they are committing a terrible crime: But if our 400-odd lawmakers sell their massive nation swaying votes (for campaign money) it is neither a crime nor shameful in any way. How can it be?

Look, outlawing vote buying (and selling) is always a good idea. Partly this is because it always reduces the practice by some degree, and partly it is because it costs nothing to say the practice is wrong and illegal.

It hurts nobody except our parasite to outlaw vote buying everywhere: At the voting booth, in our legislatures and in our corporations, and other institutions. Basically, we are going universally raise the bar on our definition of democracy, and make all forms of vote buying/swapping a serious crime anywhere in our land.

And we should also probably say that it is not a democracy if gifts, donations, campaign contributions, share purchases, or employment considerations have any role at all in the decision making process. We are going to do this in all

our sub-democracies, even if the election appears to be insignificant, like in some stupid motion picture awards where the electors have a strong tendency to vote their resume.

We should take every precaution possible

Many aspects of this design exist to prevent corruption. Perhaps it is overkill to take so many precautions. Perhaps we don't need so many precautions. Then again, perhaps we should err on the side of doing all we can to prevent corruption, especially if these preventative measures are neither costly nor particularly troublesome — but merely conventions and rules.

SECRET VOTING

Secret voting 1: The plebiscite should not be secret

Secret voting has always offered one primary **BENEFIT**: It is hard to buy and sell secret votes, because the person voting can take the money and simply lie about who he voted for. However, today, given the availability of tiny video cameras, this reason is no longer valid in our general public elections, unless we carefully screen the people casting ballots for electronic recording devices, and that is big task for 250 million voters.

Now on the **COST** side of the secret voting for a public election, we have around 250 million secret ballots that are brought to other places and counted. This is a vast quantity of ballots. It is a number that is very hard to police and not too hard to corrupt by long-term democratic parasite. And certainly, in less democratic and more corrupt nations we frequently hear about election fraud. In these nations, secret voting often puts the outcome of an election in the hands of the people already in power, because they are normally in some way administering the election or helping to guard the ballots.

In fact, just having secret ballots lead to many kinds of voter fraud because the ballots are all by nature nameless, and in immense numbers; so the fraud is quite hard to detect, let alone prove. (See the "presidential election" on the Battlestar Galactica TV show for one of our parasite's heuristic educational guides on this subject.)

So given the marginal benefit of secret public voting in today's micro-video age, and the huge potential cost, we need to go in the opposite direction. Instead we will cast our tiny and insignificant 1-in-250-million votes out in the open for all to see. We will put everything out in the open so that voter fraud is impossible.

We will also make it a public duty for people to record the election. This will make miscounts and falsifications all but impossible to perpetrate. Under this system, we will never hear cries of voter fraud in the PLEBISCITE, where we elect our Sub-Senators, because the entire plebiscite vote will take place out in the open under video documentation.

Secret voting 2: Lawmaker voting must be secret

The Romans never used secret ballots as a way of preventing vote buying. In fact, Romans were allowed to sell their votes because it was thought (or merely said to be thought) that the outlawing of vote selling would change little. Strange how the Romans never thought of secret ballots. Stranger still is how America's great democracy never teaches its children that vote buying/selling is the real reason why we cast our ballots in secret. I mean, what an important and basic thing for a democracy to teach its people, right?

Anyway, Modern democracy does secret voting

backwards from how it should be done. See, when we cast our tiny little individual-citizen votes that don't matter much, we do that secretly. But when our 400-odd oligarch lawmakers cast their hugely important million-citizen votes, that is done out in the open, live on TV's C-SPAN, where each congressional vote is carefully tracked. This enables our parasite to make sure that its campaign contributions are actually buying the votes they are supposed to be buying. Otherwise, America's congressmen might just take the campaign contributions and vote any way they please, misunderstanding their true role in America's sham democracy.

What we are going to do now is flip the way we do secret voting. Our hard to buy and easy to falsify 1:500 NOME votes will take place out in the open, where then can be easily tallied. And our very sellable and hard to falsify lawmaker votes will be done in secret so they can't be sold.

Basically, if our lawmakers are voting secretly, how can anyone be sure that their campaign contributions or lobbying efforts, gift, bribe, or extortion activity had any effect? And how can political parties be sure that their member lawmakers are not taking their money/backing/whatever and then voting in some other way?

No vote talk

In the new government, lawmakers and judges will not be allowed to talk about how they will vote or the way they voted.

Aristophanes, d. 385 BC, Wasps

["He's so given to clutching his voting pebble..."](#)

[If he sees written on a \[toilet\] door:](#)

["Demos, son of Pyrilampes, is such an attractive boy",](#)

[He writes underneath: "So is the ballot box".](#)

[Keeping your votes secret prevents all forms of bribery, even sexual bribery.]

Plutarch, d. 120AD, Gaius Marius, 29

["anyone can do the right thing when there is no danger attached to it. What distinguishes the good man from others is that when danger is involved, he still does the right thing."](#)

[Keeping your votes secret keeps them from being dangerous and thus enables anyone to do the right thing — not just brave men.]

How secret congressional voting was ended by the 2nd US constitution of 1789

Under the 1st US constitution of 1777, the US Articles of Confederation voting was by state and the votes of the 13 states were recorded only as 13 votes. But under the 2nd US constitution of 1789 there are two separate mentions of how the vote of each congressman is to be tracked. Two mentions! You see, it is hugely important to the great corrupter that the votes of our congressmen are recorded. Otherwise, our parasite will have no way to know if our congressmen are voting the way "the system", or the "invisible hand" wants them to vote.

1st US constitution of 1777-1789,

The US Articles of Confederation, Section 9

["The congress of the United States... shall publish the journal of their proceedings monthly, except such parts thereof relating to treaties, alliances, or military operations, as in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the delegates of each state on any question shall be entered on the journal, when it is desired by any delegate."](#) [Under the articles of confederation, each of the 13 states only had one vote, no

matter how many delegates conveyed that one vote to the Congress or union of the 13 states.]

Current (2nd) US Constitution of 1789, Section 7

["in all cases the votes of both houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the person voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each house respectively."](#)

Current (2nd) US Constitution of 1789, Article 1, Section 5

["Each house shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgement require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the members of either house on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the journal."](#)

Secret voting: Voting cards

There will be a deck of cards with numbers 0 to 999 on them. They are thin cardboard discs 8cm in diameter. Each voting card/disc will have 3 perforated punch-outs, or chads. Each chad about the size of a US quarter (2.5cm). Each voting disc will have a 3-digit number and bar-code on one side of all three chads. The punch-outs will also say YES, NAY, or ABS on this side. They will also have braille bumps on the opposite side from the print. A dot is yes, a dash is no, and a colon mark is abstain.

These come out of the deck and are adequately shuffled in a Senate approved machine that involves multiple human card cuts. These will be done by a vote monitors that serve for only one day a year in front of everyone. The voting cards are spread out print-side down on a table. Each Senator will take a single Voting card from the table.

Secret voting: How

To cast a vote, our Senators will remove the appropriate punch-out from their ballot discs and cast the big part. They will keep the chad as a receipt until the vote is counted. Due to the randomization of the voting cards, only the Senator with the other half of the ballot will know his voting card number. This number shall be a matter of the utmost secrecy. It shall also be a matter of strictly enforced Senate voting secrecy rules.

The ballots are placed on a table where they are gathered up by the vote monitor and shuffled according to senate rules and placed in the vote counting machine.

The counting machine scans the bar codes and puts the vote for each number on the overhead LCD monitors in order 0 to 999. The Senators look at the digits of their stubs to make sure their number is accurately tallied. If any Senator comes forth at that voting center showing his stub as evidence of a miscount, the vote shall be cancelled.

Senate voting will be supervised by randomly drawn voting monitors. These shall serve for only one day a year. All their activities shall be out in the open and in front of everyone.

Every time our Senators leave the voting hall, they will pass by a table where they shall place their stubs face down and draw other stubs. This practice exists to make voting stubs meaningless as a way of proving how anyone voted.

Now it should be considered a matter of the highest importance that except where a vote is challenged (and subject to revote), our Senators must NEVER reveal how they actually voted. If we allow this at all, vote buying is the next step. So VOTE REVEALING must be a crime and something that is considered grounds for dismissal from the Senate.

Voting hall ceilings shall be 2.4m-2.5m above the floor. They shall be painted white, and there shall be no fixtures

mounted to the ceiling. Voting halls shall have white walls and white tile floors.

Decision in Philadelphia, Ch.23

"A second problem they did not fully understand is what we might call the "federal ambiguity". As we have seen, some of the delegates, such as Madison, Wilson, and Hamilton, would have reduced the powers of the states markedly; but the consensus of the Convention was that the states ought to be left a good deal of authority to run their own affairs, where no national interest was involved. The consequence has been a dual system in which congressmen are frequently torn between national and local interest. For example, regardless of what a congressman from Iowa believes about farm subsidies, he cannot possibly vote against them if he is to remain in office. A further consequence is that he may have to trade away his vote on, say, subsidies for [oil saving] mass transit, in order to get big-city congressmen to vote for his farm supports. He may thus be driven by the needs of his constituency to vote for a whole array of bills that he believes in his heart are not good national policy. The result is that Congress finds it very difficult to work out a consistent national policy on many basic issues, leaving a vacuum which most presidents are happy to fill." [In other words, anything that makes our legislature less likely to agree strengthens the presidential monarch and his appointee administration, for his administration is more likely to cast the deciding vote. Also, increasing legislative gridlock reduces the potential that the democratic part of our government will manage to override the veto of our presidential monarchs.]

A democracy based on personal acquaintance

There will only be one way to get into government

The candidate will have to get their neighborhood NOME of 250 voters to elect them to the Sub-Senate for one year. Then our Senators will meet in groups of 100 Nomes called CENTI-NOMES, and these Centi-Nomes will rank their membership each TENETH (36.5 days, or a tenth of a year). Each teneth, the top ranked man in each Sub-Senate Centi-Nome will be sent for one year of service in the MAIN-SENATE, the main law making body. Also in each teneth, the Main-Senate will do a similar thing with its membership. Thus at every step in this democracy, the people voting will know the candidate from personal acquaintance — either living more or less near them, or working with them in the Senate. This is a democracy designed to maximize the value of personal contact, and minimize, or even eliminate the value of media coverage and campaign spending.

Personal acquaintance trumps campaign spending

All our elections will be decided by direct personal contact with the candidates. At each level, people will learn about the candidates by living or working with them.

- A) How do you sway these votes?
- B) How do you campaign over this familiarity?
- C) How do you advertise over this familiarity?
- D) How can news reporting have much sway over this familiarity?
- E) How do you buy your way into a position of power?

They lobby congress because it really works (corrupts)

Do you think all those billion being spent to lobby Washington today are being spent for no reason? Of course they are corrupting our government. Here is a democratic design that will end all of that.

They can lobby all they want

Under this new system, extra-democratic interests will no longer hold much sway at all in our nation's decision making process. That is, unless they can convince our elected officials with their reasons and arguments. Thus we arrive at a much purer version of "government of the people, by the people and for the people".

Gr. Dienes, Deimos = terror

Gr. Dieno-saur = terrorizing-lizard

Gr. Deimo-cracy = terror-rule, rule by causing panic and frightening the herd this way or that. Here we understand why the media constantly seems to be trying to frighten our herd/society.

The arabs want our government subject to the will of the mob, the mob they control, just like we saw in Indonesia between around 1998 and 2004. Here we see the Arab mob at work.

Charles de Montesquieu

"The tyranny of a prince in an oligarchy is not so dangerous to the public welfare as the apathy of the citizens in a democracy."

Robert Hutchins

"The death of democracy is not likely to be an assassination from ambush. It will be a slow extinction from apathy, indifference, and undernourishment."

Bill Vaughn

"A citizen of America will cross the ocean to fight for democracy, but won't cross the street to vote in a national election."

Good Jurors don't listen to what people say outside the courtroom

In America, our tiny and relatively insignificant court trials have some truly fastidious information controls. In fact, they frequently make every effort to monopolize the information presentation role — even going so far as to sequester jurors at times. Now contrast this with the anything-goes way our all-important society-wide decisions are made. Don't we owe our huge society-wide decisions at least the same level of fairness we afford people in trial decisions? Shouldn't our democracy, like our court system strive to gather and present all relevant information within a special forum that was designed to be unbiased?

And isn't the overall health of our democracy more important than any microcosm fairness that exists within its domain? I mean, if we are going to agonize and mince over facts to get our decisions slightly more accurate, let it be with the overall health of our democracy, rather than with individual claims of injustice within our democracy.

Trial by paid advertising and PR corruption

Imagine if we had our jurors 'vote' based on expensive paid ads they saw on television, never having listened to the actual defendant. Or imagine if jurors 'voted' based on a half-page summaries run as paid advertisements, as many 'informed' American voters do today. Imagine if the prosecution and defense had to communicate with the jury through news coverage and paid advertising; then on the last day of the trial, the jurors show up check a guilty or not guilty box next to the

name of the accused.

In the interest of a fair trial, judges often go to absurd lengths to keep the information gathering role inside the justice system. Why don't we take this approach with respect to our society-wide decisions? Why does our society provide no forum at all for candidates to communicate with the public? I mean, we don't even provide one free election channel around election time. Why do we leave so much of the information role outside the democratic process in the corrupt paid media? Obviously this is a democracy optimized for corruption and parasitism.

Our democracy informs itself

Do not let the openly corrupt paid commercial media or other loud-mouths sway you with their extra-democratic ideas. Mistrust any important idea that was not brought up at your Nome's **ELECTION FORUM**. Use your Nome meeting as a 'court of public opinion'. Use your Nome's relatively impartial group mind to try the truth as a jury in a court of law does. If you hear something outside your Nome's forum, or its BBS, try not to let it weigh as evidence unless you bring it up at the forum for the rest of the Nome to discuss and analyze.

Besides, once we start communicating outside the recognized forum, it is more likely to lead to paid communication and campaign spending (and corrupting contributions) as well as, smear campaigns and extra-democratic political parties.

In our **LAWMAKING FORUM**, our Main-Senators should, wherever practical avoid considering information unless it was verified by the Senate. Here the attestation by even one Centi-Nome may do — although we probably want a higher bar for the truth. Here is why, one path to Senate elevation should be providing the Main-Senate with intelligent, efficiently worded commentary and information related to something the Senate is considering. This should be one of the ways for Sub-Senators to get elected to serve in the Main-Senate.

Under-informed voters should abstain

In order to cast a vote, you must be a voting age citizen, and you should have viewed the candidates speak, either in person, or online. However, voting is on the honor system. People are simply not supposed to vote unless they have seen all the candidates in their Nome communicate. People who don't want to invest the time should abstain from voting.

Voter participation is a great thing, but under-informed voting is not voter participation. In fact, under-informed voting is not even a second best sort of voter participation. Under-informed voting is a negative because under informed voters tend to vote for candidates that are not the smartest. Some vote for the most talked about people. Other vote for the most physically attractive people. Others vote for the people with the best educational qualification. Still others vote for the candidates with the "experience".

Never get out the vote

It is widely thought that higher voter turnout tends to give a slight advantage to the party of the people as opposed to the cobbled-together party of the parasite's special interests. This is certainly true. But there are other dimensions to the campaigns to get more people voting.

Firstly, those "get-out-the-vote" messages increase the corrupting power of campaign advertising. You see, these get-out-the-vote voters, by definition, would not have voted except for the campaign to get out and vote. They are often

people who have been convinced that under-informed voting is better than not voting at all. These votes tend to be based less on careful consideration and more on TV ads, sound-bites, door-hangers, yard signs, phone calls, and billboards. These votes also tend to be based on what religious leaders or labor union leaders say. Some people will feel that they are making an informed decision when they have read an article written by some ostensibly democratic group, or an article in one of those Rupert Murdoch fronted Mideast newspapers or news magazines. So all the get out and vote ads — they increase the sway of our parasite's many backdoors to power in our government.

Now we might as a society say something like; "If you are not reasonably sure who, or what you are voting for, please, for the sake democracy don't vote." or, "You owe your democracy/nation at least the same amount care in coming to a decision as you owe the poor man you are trying as a juror."

But maybe the whole idea of us voting to hire people we have never met in person is the faulty idea. What company would do that, especially with its management team? Let's instead pick people from our neighborhoods, people we live with and see regularly. And let's not pick people because they are well liked, or volunteered a lot: Lets pick them because they have shown that they are smart, hard working, and have good judgement.

Simplify elections as much as possible

I recall elections in California that were far too complex, elections with dozens of lengthy ballot measures (plebiscites) and often, just as many candidates all vying for our scarce attention. And because many people didn't take enough time to figure out all the 30 or 50 things they need to decide on, California's elections tend to be elections by under-informed voters.

But the big problem with complex ballots is (yet again) that of money affecting, or more precisely corrupting our election outcomes. Basically, the more complicated our ballots become, the more we have under-informed voters making decisions based on something they saw in some paid ad, or on the nightly news produced by "big media" — whoever that is. So ultimately, the problem with ballot complexity is that it increases the power of campaign spending, and the corrupting effects of campaign contributions.

Instead, to reduce the effectiveness of campaign contributions corruption, we should all go in the opposite direction and make our elections as focused as possible. This way, the people will focus their attention on the single most important political issue there is — that of finding the best problem-understanders and solution-administrator they can in their neighborhood.

Winston Churchill

"[The best argument against \[narrow\] democracy is a 5-minute conversation with the average voter.](#)"

Plebiscites are corrupt

Winston Churchill's famous remark is a weak argument against democracy in general, however, it is a withering comment about plebiscites. Here I want to point out that it is dumb to have everyone make all the decisions in our society because:

- 1) The redundancy is a huge waste of time.
- 2) It doesn't work well because many people don't take enough time to make an informed decision.
- 3) Plebiscites increase the power of paid communication and

media corruption.

4) Untrue arguments will work better on the masses than on the smartest people. and

5) The smartest people will in general make better decisions for society.

The only decision the public should be making is this: "Which people familiar to everyone in our neighborhood do we trust to make decisions for us?" Everything else should be decided by the broad base of smart people annually elected as the smartest. In other words, we should not ask the people to decide for society, we should ask their 1:250 delegates to do that.

Melancton Smith, 1788.06.25

"I know the impulses of the multitude are inconsistent with systematic government. The people are frequently incompetent to deliberate discussion, and subject to errors and imprudences. Is this the complexion of the [1:1,500] state legislatures? I presume it is not. I presume that they are never actuated by blind impulses -- that they rarely do things hastily and without consideration. The state legislatures were select bodies of men, chosen for their superior wisdom, and so organized as to be capable of calm and regular conduct."

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Referendum, n. A law for submission of proposed legislature to a popular vote to learn the nonsense of public opinion."

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Multitude, n. A crowd; the source of political wisdom and virtue. In a republic, the object of the statesman's adoration. 'In a multitude of counsellors there is wisdom', saith the proverb. If many men of equal individual wisdom are wiser than any one of them, it must be that they acquire the excess of wisdom by the mere act of getting together. Whence comes it? Obviously from nowhere—as well they say that a range of mountains is higher than the single mountains composing it. A multitude is as wise as its wisest member if it obeys him. If not, it is no wiser than its most foolish." [Here our parasite explains that if they keep the masses from listening to their wisest, then its host will be 'no wiser than its most foolish.']

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Rabble, n. In a republic, those who exercise a supreme authority tempered by fraudulent elections. The rabble is like the sacred Simurgh, of the Arabian fable—omnipotent on condition that it do nothing." [In Persian myth, a simurg was a large mythical bird of great age, believed to have the power of reasoning and speech.]

Anti-Federalist papers 1787.07.17

"The extent of the country renders it impossible that the people can have the requisite capacity to judge of the respective pretensions of the candidates. [Translation: The country is so big that the people will be unable to accurately judge the national, state, or even county candidates.] ...The people generally could only know and vote for some Candidate whose merits had rendered him an object of general attention and esteem. He was against a popular election [having elections by the people]. The people are uninformed, and would be misled by a few designing men. The popular mode of electing the chief Magistrate [President] would certainly be the worst of all."

Mandatory jury duty and optional voting?

It is strange how we require our citizens to participate in the tiny little insignificant jury decisions of our society, but when it comes to the all critical decision of who will run our government, participation is optional. Here the greatest absurdity is that even in arguments over money (civil lawsuits), our citizens must participate as jurors according to the 7th amendment; and they must participate in large and wasteful groups, no less!

Instead, we should use the precious and limited water of this spring more wisely. Instead of squandering it on trivial decisions, like who pays how much when someone accidentally slips and falls, let's use this spring for something really important like the universal decisions that everyone must follow.

Fastidious courts within a sloppy democracy

Maybe the reason for this state of affairs is that our parasite wants us using up all our energies on tiny individual decisions, growing fatigued, so we will be sloppier with the big society-wide questions. This way it is easier for our parasite to influence our society.

Everyone must participate in the election process

Under today's narrow democracies, with their universal polling of a single national electorate, it does not matter how many people turn out to vote, so entirely voluntary election participation works just fine. However, our new broad and decentralized democracy will be based on 250-voter Nomes, and here size by some measure must be maintained, or we will see the proliferation of increasingly undersized Nomes.

The most important thing for keeping our Nomes close at 250 is to require that all voting age people attend the national voting hour. They don't have to vote, but they do have to show up at a voting site so everyone can see that the Nome honestly contains around 250 people. They will also have to sign their Sub-Senator's vote documentation papers, so that a number acceptably close to 250 people attest that they witnessed the election of each Sub-Senator.

Those who don't vote will have to show a valid cause or pay a fine and serve say 100 hours of mandatory community service for not showing up. People who are elderly, disabled, unable, or unfit to vote, can be permanently removed from register of voters if they request. People who are ill can get a doctor's letter. People visiting another part of the country around election time can attend the vote wherever they are, but their vote will count as an abstention. Then they will go to the Nome's BBS and send in their abstention information.

When people leave the nation and intend to be out over an election, they may fill out a form that the immigration department will send to their Nome. When they return, another form will be filled out that will be sent by the immigration department to cancel the first form.

It will be the job of each new Sub-Senators to account for every voting age citizen registered in their Nome before they may be admitted to the Sub-Senate. Most people will appear on their Nome's role sheets collected on election day. Some will be excused (if they submit an acceptable and verifiable excuse within 72 hours), Some will be excused by the immigration department. but the remainder, the no-shows will be referred (by the winning Sub-Senators) to the local law enforcement like people who fail to show up for jury duty today. Then, the local law enforcement people will give the Sub-Senator a receipt naming the no-shows and promising prosecution for failure to appear. The newly elected Sub-

Senator will then submit documentation totaling 250 or more voting age citizens, for verification by his colleagues in the Sub-Senate.

It is unfortunate, but unavoidable that everyone in our new democracy must show up at their neighborhood voting place once a year for an hour. Compared to the average time we Americans now spend with jury duty, and filling out our income tax returns, an hour a year voting is not too much to demand. Besides, the time we spend voting will reduce the time we spend on taxes and jury duty.

Election terrorism

If everyone is required to attend the vote (or suffer a penalty) it will be much harder to use terrorism to keep people from voting.

Excusable Voting absence

If you are ill, or have a medical condition, and have a doctor's letter, you do not have to vote. If you have to take care of someone, then you may be excused. Emergency personal may also be exempted, however, we probably want to use our fire/police stations and hospitals as Nomes voting sites so we can better include the votes of these people. People over say 60 years old, and disabled people should probably be able to permanently opt-out of voting.

Maybe 3% of Nomes should get disqualified

We are never going to get 100% of our Nomes to quality in each election. Attempting to do this is a fool's errand. So what we will do is disqualify the Nomes with the highest absentee rate. This might be as low as 2%, but it should probably not go over 10%.

People over platforms

If we vote for candidates based on their platforms instead of their strength as candidates, we get the platforms we like and compromise on the people espousing those platforms. Thus a few key issues rule and everything else is in second place. The abilities of the leader are in second place, and all other non-key issues are in second place as well. Change your emphasis and get the smartest leaders possible in government. Then let them decide on the platforms.

Narrow democracy emphasizes platforms

Under narrow democracy, with elections being such a huge high budget thing, there is considerable polling and analysis of what the people want to hear. Then there is considerable pandering (pan•dar=all•give) with respect to platforms. Thus narrow democracy tends to inherently emphasize platforms, while making our candidates as plain vanilla as possible. However, under a broad (neighborhood-style) democracy, this sort of statistical politics becomes largely impossible. The result is that the man starts to matter more and his platform starts to matter less.

Platforms stretch and weaken a democracy

Taken to its logical extreme, the idea of everyone voting for leaders based on their platforms is a flawed idea. This because eventually, our various selfish interests (platforms) wind up pulling our common efforts in a variety of popular directions, one for each faction/lobby.

Know your candidate's patrimony

Given the nature of the harem-bred parasite the world is fighting, it would be a good idea to know the patrimony of our

candidates. So it should be normal for Senators to post on their campaign wall the nationality and pictures of their parents and grandparents. Be extra suspicious of people with ancestors that are dead, particularly those with foreign Semitic ancestors that are dead.

No bias in favor of rich lawmakers

Don't have any bias against rich people — just don't have any systemic bias at all that favors them.

If you can't come up with something original

Try to say something more tersely or more forcefully, or more comprehensively, or more memorably, even if it is superseded 2 hours later. It is the foolish gold miner that only looks for nuggets and shuns gold dust. A great deal of the improvement gold is found in the form of tiny particles.

Senate qualification test

The only qualification that our Senators should have should be informal and questions like:

- 1) Does the Senator understand supply and demand?
- 2) Does the Senator have a firm grasp of scientific notation and the true scale of the world around him and his decisions about it?
- 3) Does the Senator understand the dilution of shares?
- 4) Can the Senator accurately ascribe the four sorts of exponential relationships to the world around him?
- 5) Can the Senator understand all common metaphors?

Nothing else matters in comparison

Whether someone is well liked or well-known should make little difference in an election unless there are no other differences. If this is all your candidates have to offer, then fine, pick the most popular. But if one of them is even the slightest bit smarter than the other, pick that one. Try not to consider

- 1) Looks.
- 2) Popularity.
- 3) Sincerity.
- 4) Honesty.
- 5) Promiscuity.
- 6) Volubility.
- 7) Eccentric behavior.
- 8) If the candidate seems capable of doing bad things.

The public's only job is to find the smartest people that look like they will throw everything they have into trying to be worthwhile to the national cause. Just figure out who is the smartest, because nothing else really matters in choosing Senators.

How to tell smart leaders.

Look for leaders that can:

- 1) Find alternative solutions, even imperfect ones, that few others realize.
- 2) Foresee and describe problems before others.
- 3) Find ways to improve the existing way of doing things, even slightly.
- 4) Invent entirely transcendental new systems for doing things.
- 5) Point out unintended and especially unrecognized consequences.
- 6) Are minimally enthralled by pre-packaged ideology.
- 7) Realize that knowledge is not intelligence and most of the most knowledgeable people are not particularly good at recombining their knowledge in a useful way.

AD

"he was better at choosing between different options than devising them." [People like this should not be leaders.]

Ugly leaders

One of our parasite's more unbelievable propaganda songs, went something like this: "If you want to be happy for the rest of your life, if you want to be happy for the rest of your days... get an ugly girl to marry you." They were actually pushing the opposite, that we should not settle when it comes to physical beauty. They would have us compromise over intelligence or character, but not beauty.

Anyway, with respect to our leaders, this song is probably pretty sound advice. Don't vote for people because they are physically attractive or charismatic. Hold that against them a bit. And when a leader is scandalized by their political opponents, hold this in their favor a bit, to reduce the process of scandalization.

Neighborhood meetings will bring our communities together

Meeting to elect our best to the Sub-Senate will help bring neighborhoods together with a mind towards the good of society. Today, most communities are a long way from having too much of this.

A second term in the Sub-Senate

Don't favor people because they have already served in the Senate. Only favor the best ideas.

Moving to serve

There should be nothing wrong with moving to a neighborhood where one stands a greater chance of being elected Sub-Senator. In fact, this should be encouraged, strongly encouraged as this will serve to de-segregate our cities economically. It will also help expose the problems the poorer parts of society face.

Welcome new arrivals

How long should people live in a Nome before we elect them? If we have no minimum, then we will see more people moving into "bad" areas to run for the Senate. We will also see more "peace corps" volunteers moving to economically challenged parts of the world: Something that is a very beneficial and important thing for the world. I mean, if someone wants to move into a poor area with an eye to becoming their Sub-Senator, measure him fairly and do not hold his newness in your community against him. Simply decide who the best man is to be your Sub-Senator. You should even welcome foreigners to your Senate, so long as they are smart and don't seem Muslim or Middle Eastern. These you should treat with distrust unless they are clearly working for the forces of more and better.

Anyone can run for senate in any Nome

Cities always seem to have good parts and bad parts. So it is easy to imagine that some parts of our cities will be more competitive than others, and produce more qualified Senators than other parts. And some parts will tend to be less competitive, and produce less qualified Senators.

To bring up the quality of the least competitive parts, we will say that people don't have to live in a particular Nome to run for the Senate in that Nome. We will also say that everyone is obligated to elect the best man regardless of whether he is from that Nome. This way we will see the best

men spreading out and having a higher influence.

And except for Arabs, do not discriminate against people because they come from a nearby neighborhood, race or their legal sexual inclinations. Just elect whoever seems smartest. We want lots of people going from expensive west LA to poorer east LA and campaigning there because they stand a better chance of being elected. We want this because it will make our Senate better.

In better Nomes, the campaigning process should get underway earlier so would-be candidates can better make plans. As well, the BBS of each Nome should show where each candidate lives.

Nobody votes for themselves

If we let candidates vote for themselves, then we create a slight advantage for 'homegrown' candidates in Nome elections. Therefore, nobody in our new democracy shall vote for himself in any election.

Plebiscite priority #1

Everyone's duty is to elect the smartest people you can trust to the Senate. If good people live in another part of town but register in a Nome in a bad neighborhood, do not discriminate against them. Just pick the smartest and hardest-working people for government. That is your duty as a voter.

It is very important that we elect as many good people as we can to government. For this to happen, we must spread our better people out in our cities. And for that to happen, the people in the bad neighborhoods must elect more people from better neighborhoods.

A domestic Peace Corps

Give a bit more of a reward to good people who actually move into bad neighborhoods — especially those who also help their new community. Do not be biased against them because they are outsiders. Everyone should encourage this sort of thing by voting for the best people.

Over-majorities tend to spend less

Which government is more resistant to taking action and spending your money? The one that requires a 50% or the one that requires a 60% over-majority? Clearly if we want to reduce government action, including government spending, requiring an overmajority will help. But don't go too far with your over-majority, or you empower a minority with blocking power. Stay within the 1:1 to 2:1 range. Also, remember that under majorities suffer from being wobbly and quickly changing their minds.

Candidates should post pictures

People running for the Sub-Senate should post their own picture, as well as a picture of both their father and mother before they went gray. If they were adopted they must state this.

TERM OF OFFICE

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, Penguin version, comments prior to 43.1 "Most civilian offices were felt to require loyalty rather than skill, and allotment [the drawing straws for government positions] was used as an appropriate method for distributing appointments fairly among men considered equally eligible; military offices required ability and the confidence of the men serving under the officers, and so these were filled by election."

Royalty, castes and our parasite's influence

Think about castes and how men did what their fathers did. Think about how everyone had something to lose if they did not follow tradition. Now think about how the ability to follow in the footsteps of one's socially elevated father was often a matter of doing everything exactly the way their father did. It was also a matter of not making any waves.

Imagine how most people would go along and how only a small portion might become troublesome. Thus we see how our parasite is behind our caste and class systems, as well as all forms of inherited social status and title.

Eventually, if the people don't say anything, our parasite's caste control can be trope-d up without end until it resemble pre-British India. There our parasite's status divisions went all the way to the very bottom of society and prevented pretty much any development in that host society. Under this system, it was much easier for the Arabs to get rid of troublemakers. Thus it was always easy for the parasite to stay attached to its In•dei'n host society.

Uddhava Gita, 12

"Those who live outside a caste will tend towards a lack of faith. They will become dishonest in their dealings — stealing and quarreling needlessly. Impurity, anger and desire will be the characteristics of those outside the varnash•rama caste system. Non-violence, truthfulness and honesty, freedom from desire, anger and greed, always seeking the happiness and well-being of all — these are the hallmarks of those inside the varnash•rama caste system." [In India, the Arab parasite did not merely institute hereditary leaders, but hereditary everything. Here we can see how the Arabs used the ancient media (in the form of a principal Hindu religious text) to further their socio-political objectives.

Long terms of office, dictators and the caste system

Which is closer to dictator, president for life or president for 4 years? Which is closer to dictator, president for 4 years or president for 1 year? Which is easier for our parasite to manage, a legislature full carefully screened multi-term incumbents, or a legislature that is changing every year? Our parasite consolidates its power far more effectively when its host's leadership changes little. New leaders are always changing things, and these changes normally involve lower revenues for the parasite.

How often should we ask if our leaders ought to be our leaders?

Every 30 years? Every 10 years? Every 3 years? Every year? In answering this question, the easiest test is to ask back: "Which is least like an unimpeachable king?"

Anti-Federalist papers, Centinel #1, 1787.10.5

"The term for which they [U.S elected officials] are chosen, [is] too long to preserve a due dependence and accountability to their constituents." [Under America's first constitution, most state senators served for a year. Here someone was asking if it was wise to have 4-year presidents, and 6 year senators as the 2nd US constitution of 1787 was proposing.]

Anti-Federalist papers, John DeWitt, 1787.11.05

"After the first four years, each senator will hold his seat for the term of six years. This length of time will be amply sufficient of itself to remove any checks that he may have upon his independency, from the fear of future election. He will consider

that... places of honor and trust are not generally obtained unsolicited [i.e. without payments, the parasite's way of doing things]. The same means that placed him there may be again made use of. His influence and his abilities arising from his opportunities, will, during the whole term increase those means. He will have a complete negative [veto right] upon all laws that shall be general, or that shall favor individuals; and a voice in the appointment of all officers in the United States. Thus habituated to power, and living in the daily practice of granting favors and receiving solicitations, he may hold himself completely independent of [from] the people, and at the same time ensure his election. If there remains even a risk, the blessed assistance of a little well-distributed money will remove it."

[It is hard to tell if this text is a good man explaining how to make the government less corrupt or a bad man explaining how to make it more corrupt. This is something we often see in Arab heuristic gazettes.]

Longer terms of office increase corruption

Do we actually get better leaders or judges by awarding power for life? Isn't the opposite is true? Isn't it human nature to grow increasingly lazy and complacent?

Let's do what America's founding fathers did under US Constitution 1.0. Let's give our Senators a year of active service in each level of the Senate to do whatever it is they are going to do. If they do exceptionally well, their peers will vote to give them a promotion.

Tenured professors as made men

Pull a thorn from the paw of a lion, and he will remember you. A high percentage of tenured professors have probably done some service for the parasite, just like the made men in the mafia. And maybe they didn't do something for the parasite beforehand — maybe they are sure to do something for the parasite later because of some awful secret they have.

Find all the made men

Any place where people are hired by an large opaque institution for life should be suspect.

No more Strom Thurmons

Strong Thur•man served a 49-year tenure in the US Senate. This man did not help America to be free, he helped enslave it. We want to get as far away from this sort of frontman as possible. We don't want a government where strong individuals dominate, as these people are always carefully selected by our parasite and its great blood-sucking will that pervades all things. We want the opposite, a democracy where individual people have little if any power.

American dynasties

Nobody loves dynasties like the world's #1 dynasty, the haremi of the harems.

John Adams — John Quincy Adams

Teddy Roosevelt — Franklin Roosevelt

George Bush — George W Bush

Robert Morris — Robert (Groveneur) Morris

Julius Caesar, Augustus Caesar, Tiberius Caesar, Caligula Caesar, Claudius Caesar, Nero Caesar...

Incumbent

One definition of INCUMBENT is as an obligation. The other is a democratically elected officials already in office. Also, IN•CUM•BENT breaks down as in=within + cum=with + bent =

bended-knee , those forced to submit. The intersection of these definitions says a great deal about incumbency and parasitism. Here we see people who stay in office because they are obligated or they have submitted to the will of Mideast Inc.

INCUMBENT = in•cum•pehn't = not•with•say'nt

INCOMPETENT = in•com•peh•te•n't = not with, say you'nt

OLIGARCHY = ligarchy

LIG•ARCHY = rule by string pullers

Re-election of incumbents

Human connections, particularly lots of weak sting-pulling connections are a main tool of our parasite. For this reason, we don't want a government where experience and connections rule. We want a pure-hearted government where artless, sincere, "no•vice" Senators preside. We want a democracy by innocent, amateur, faceless lawmakers that get in, work like crazy to be elevated, and then cycle-out and get on with their lives again.

To this end we should have a simple rule. Once you have left the Senate, you must spend at least 7 Sub-Senate terms out before you can serve again. This way, incumbents will not take-over the character of our Senate. If our past Senators have more great ideas after they are out, they will just have to pitch these ideas as a SENATOR EMERITUS or a group of SENATORS EMERITUS.

Trustworthy novice or seasoned Baro•crat?

Some people may be wondering if we can rely on inexperienced "no•vice" elected officials to take over from the experienced baro•crat managers running our government. Well, the answer is firstly that in the top tier of America's government are frequently filled with relatively inexperienced people anyway. I mean, just look at how every time we get a change in the political party of the president, most of the upper echelon of our federal government are swept out and replaced with new appointees from the other party. So basically, we are already using novices anyway.

There seems little downside to using inexperienced elected people over the current system, because both are relatively inexperienced. On the up side however, we stop using people that have helped the cause of our parasite, and are owed favors. Instead we will use di-elected ordinary citizens, and frequently teams or committees of them.

We might also note a well-respected recruiting precept here: That it is better to hire good hard working smart people without specific experience over those with specific experience. This is because in a short time, the better people will outperform the more experienced ones.

SUBSENATE

Sub-Senate campaigns

To run for Sub-Senator, the candidate needs to be nominated and seconded at a Nome meeting. Three people are involved. People may nominate or second only one person per election. Anyone nominated will be able to speak uninterrupted, or take questions for up to 10 minutes at the Nome meeting. And while our candidates will have a limited amount of floor time, they may post any amount of material on their page on the Nome's BBS. If there are more than 20 candidates, then the Nome limit talk time to 6 minutes or require third-ing or fourth-

ing of candidate's nominations to get the number of candidates below 20 per election. There should probably not be any fifth-ing or talk times below 6 minutes.

We will consider free speech to be a sacred and inviolate aspect of our election process. For this reason, we will never allow a candidate to suffer any sort of prosecution at all, criminal or civil for what they say, write, or display while campaigning. It does not matter if the remarks are true or not, accusatory, or profane — all things said while campaigning shall be considered completely protected free speech. The only exceptions to this rule shall be matters that are directly related to the nation's military, defense, anti-terrorism effort, and intelligence gathering activities that have been declared secret by the Over-Senate.

The various Nomes will meet in pre-election sessions of up to 3 hours, starting at either 9am, 12pm, 3pm or 6pm. All this takes place on different days (each within the 4 time slots) so one auditorium can theoretically serve up to 120 Nome meetings per month. Government should not make any accommodation for the holy days of any religion, especially religions with Mideast prophets. If a candidate is unwilling to speak on a given day because it is a holy day in his religion, then so be it: He shall not speak, and he shall not be a candidate, and government shall function better with one less tool of an extra-democratic religion in it.

The entire Nome meeting will be videotaped and put online, unedited with overlapping segmentation so nothing can be edited out. This is for the people who can't or don't attend the neighborhood meeting, as well as for crediting ideas to their true originator.

Sub-Senate elections

The actual voting process should be quick, so the Nomes can meet anywhere to vote, even outside in the rain. The actual Sub-Senate vote will be by line. A flat open space with a straight line on the ground is needed. The line can be tape or rope on the floor, paint on pavement, or it can be a line scratched into the dirt. The vote can even take place outside, even if it is raining. In fact, no vote should be cancelled on account of rain or bad weather.

If any area normally experiences extreme monsoon-type rain on international election day, and it has insufficient roofed areas for voting, then it should erect voting tents for elections. Also, the people shall have the right to use any suitable facilities public or private as voting facilities and the owner shall receive no monetary compensation for this.

All the candidates will show up at their neighborhood voting spot prior to the voting time to "tow the line" facing in the same direction at different points along the line. They will do this about 4 meters apart from one another, each holding a placard with their name on it. To vote for a particular candidate, voters simply line up behind the candidate single file. If it is raining and there is insufficient room, they may form a multi-file line.

At 7:00 pm, the candidates shall all shout, "call to vote," At 7:07, they shall shout "three minute warning." At 7:08 they should all shout, "two minute warning." At 7:09 they should all shout, "one minute warning." And at 7:10, they should all shout, "voting closed." The moment the words "voting closed" are uttered by any candidate (and it actually is after 7:10) the votes are frozen and anyone attempting to change their vote or people appearing after this time shall be counted as abstained votes. However, prior to 7:10, voters are free to change which line they are in, and this is expected to act as a sort of automatic runoff mechanism for all but the

closest votes.

The vote count will take place by the following process after 7:10:

- 1) The candidates with the most voters should shout, "call to count the vote."
- 2) All the candidates should then call out "one" and one voter in each line will step over the line and walk forward by at least 10 meters, where they will remain. Then all the candidates will call out "two" and one more set of voters will step over the line. Then each candidate will call out "three," and so forth until there is only one candidate with uncounted voters left. This person shall then become the new Sub-Senator for that year. If two Sub-Senators are elected each year, then the two candidates with remaining uncounted voters will be elected.
- 3) In the event of a tie, the man from the last election with the greatest number of votes shall break the tie. For ties in the first election, there shall be a runoff election exactly one hour later at 8:00. If this still results in a tie, there shall be an additional runoff at 9:00, 10:00, etc. until someone wins. Attendance in these runoff elections shall be voluntary.
- 4) In order for a Nome's Sub-Senate vote to be valid, at least 5 non-candidates must record the election process on video.

Sub-Senator vote verification and Centi-Nome formation

Once a winner is determined, the people of the Nome will circulate up to 20 voter acknowledgment sheets. Everyone attending the vote will be required by law to acknowledge, or object to the validity of the vote they just participated in or witnessed. They will do this by signing the acknowledgment sheet. The simple declaration form is to be printed with the following words: "On DATE at LOCATION I participated in an election where NAME(S) were elected Sub-Senator for Nome number XXXXXX in POSTAL CODE(S) XXXXXXXX. I APPROVE/ OBJECT (circle one) of this vote. I DID/ DID NOT (circle one) make a video record of the vote." Voters must sign and write their name, address and electronic contact.

Anyone who objects to the vote must, within 24 hours, make a formal detailed declaration under penalty of perjury as to why they object. A certain number of objections per Nome will necessitate investigation. A higher number of objections per Nome will initiate a re-vote. These numbers will be as determined by the Over-Senate.

The election winner will take the original signed acknowledgment sheets, digitally scan them and post them on the Nome's website. He will retain the originals which he will bring when he meets with the 99 other new Sub-Senators in his Centi-Nome. Here the names of the various Sub-Senators in each Centi-Nome will be alphabetized in each tenth, and each Sub-Senator will verify the original acknowledgment sheets for the 2 Sub-Senator names that come after his alphabetically. The names will loop so the last Sub-Senators will be checking the first. Each Sub-Senators should look over the acknowledgment sheets and must contact at least three random voters to double check legitimacy.

Sub-Senator functions

On top of the group duties of Sub-Senate service, the many Sub-Senators will work to distinguish themselves individually by their individual and collaborative work. They may write studies, proposals, opinions and the like. They may report on business, or government. They may convey the ideas of the people in their Nome. They may report on any aspect of the nation, its regulation, its history, or its future. They may make comments on the work of others at any level of government. They may supply information requested by the Main-Senate. If

anything any Senator does is valuable, widely read, well regarded, or better yet adopted, it should be the surest way to be elected to higher office. In other words, the Sub-Senators that are the most useful to government should be the ones that get elected to the Main-Senate.

The stated purpose of the above is two-fold: On one hand we will create a meritocracy where people are rewarded for their contribution to the group effort. On the other hand we will have some 500,000 confirmed Sub-Senators each year. So soon there may be a bit of a shortage of ideas. Soon we will have a government that has solved all our problems and is absolutely famished and voracious for new ideas. This is in sharp contrast to the 1-in-1-million democracy running the world today.

Senators in start-up mode

We want to create a system where we have this large oversupply of Sub-Senators competing with each other — firstly to be confirmed, and secondly to be elevated. If we do this, we can have a government that operates more like a small startup company, and less like a bunch of AEFAB types. (AEFAB = any excuse for a break, pronounced 'a-fab')

In this sort of government, we can skip all work related requirements other than attending the mandatory voting sessions and that the votes always be kept secret.

Centi-Nomes can use any public property

All public property is open to their use until government builds enough **Centi-Nome** meeting places. If there is insufficient public property, then they may use any commercial property they wish, particularly parasite-owned property.

Balancing Centi-Nomes

- 1) All **Centi-Nomes** must take all Sub-Senators until they elect to close their roll.
- 2) All Centi-Nomes must let any Sub-Senator move when they want.
- 3) All Centi-Nomes must treat all Sub-Senators equally.
- 4) No Sub-Senator may be in more than one Centi-Nome at a time.
- 5) 97 Sub-Senators shall be required as a Centi-Nome voting quorum.

10 Senators join each Centi-Nome each teneth

There will be 10 speeches of up to 15 minutes each on the first day of each teneth for each Centi-Nome. Attendance real or virtual is mandatory. At the end of 15 minutes, the audience should begin applauding and the speaker must stop speaking and leave the stage. The applause should continue until the speaker leaves the stage. No deferral of time shall be allowed between candidates, for such exchange can lead us towards political parties.

Annual terms multiply the cost of corruption

Under the 1.0 version of the US constitution all elected officials served for one year. And to repeat for emphasis, every single elected official served for only one year.

Under today's constitution, we have a 4-year elected monarch and his lifetime appointees in the supreme court. We have 6-year senators and 2-year representatives.

Which is easier to corrupt: One 4-year guy or four 1-year guys? Obviously the corruption people will have to work a lot harder, maybe 2-4 times harder, to corrupt four guys instead of one.

Which government is harder working?

The one with a lone 4-year guy trying to make his mark, or one with four 1-year guys trying to make their mark.

All important appointments must be Senators

The parasite's 2.0 version of the US constitution has things diametrically backwards once again. Look at how our democratically elected officials are actually prohibited from administering the government in section 1.6.

Don't we have a democracy? Don't we think that appointees tend to be more corrupt than democratically elected people? Why do we prohibit our senators from administering our government?

Clearly this was written by our parasite and clearly we must go in exactly the opposite direction. Randomly draw some Senators for some functions, and elect other Senators for other important functions as they cycle out. Just make sure that there are no appointees making any important decisions in our democracy.

Sub-Senate hours

In the beginning, the Sub-Senate should probably work every night an weekends. Later in a few years, our Centi-Nomes might only meet one night a week, or every other week.

The Sub-Senate confirmation vote

Our Senators will have some nice perks. But it would be a mistake to give these for merely getting elected to the Sub-Senate. Instead, we will only confirm half of the Sub-Senators elected in each year. This way our Sub-Senators will have to work to get either elevated or confirmed.

The Sub-Senate Ranking vote

Each teneth, each Centi-Nome holds an anonymous ranking vote. This ranking will be used primarily for three things:

1. To generate a top-half committee

The top half committee will vote on all the things that can wait until the end of the teneth for a decision by the smart half of the Centi-Nome.

2. To confirm the top half of Sub-Senators

This occurs as our Sub-Senators cycle out of service Each Senator's average rank in all 10 of their ranking elections shall be calculated. The ones in the top half get confirmed. The ones in the bottom half are not confirmed. On top of this, those elevated to the Main-Senate shall all be deemed confirmed even if their average ranking was not above average for their Centi-Nome.

It should be noted that this vote is the last act of each Sub-Senator. Thus the golden apple of Senate Service does not come until after service is fully rendered. Also this vote occurs when each Sub-Senator has had a year to grow in maximum influence and respect in his Centi-Nome.

3. To elevate one man to the Main-Senate

This occurs each teneth when the top man in a Centi-Nome tenethly ranking vote is elevated to the Main-Senate. This Sub-Senator then finishes out his Sub-Senate term, and then when he rotates out of the Sub-Senate, he shall after the prescribed training period report to the Main-Senate.

Senate pay

Over-Senators: 1.4x the average pay.

Main-Senators: 1.1x the average pay.

Sub-Senators: 10% of the average wage in total. Confirmed senators in the top half thus get 20% of the average pay.

Can we afford so many elected officials?

10,000 Over-Senators	= 14,000x average workers pay
100,000 Main-Senators	= 110,000x average workers pay
500,000 Sub-Senators	= 100,000x average workers pay
Total	= 234,000x average workers pay

If the workforce is 234 million, then this is about 1/10th of 1% of GDP. We probably want to experiment with Sub-Senate pay and see if increases or decreases have any effect.

We need to hire managers anyway

Any way we run our nation's huge government, we are going to need to employ lots of people. The only real question is whether they are going to be appointed (s•elected) by a corrupt baro•cracy or elected by the people.

A related question is whether our society should use its best for government service, or something else. Do we want our best 1:2,500 people "wasting" their time on managing the group effort of the other 2,499 people?

Also, we probably want to pay wages to the top 20% of the Sub-Senate to further incentivize being in the top 20%.

It is actually an immense bargain

Some may balk at the cost of paying the wages of 250,000 people to our Senators. However, it is only around 1/10th of 1% of GDP. This is money well spent, because:

- 1) We need great redundancy to counteract corruption, and
- 2) Government will get exceptional people working for the average wages.

A uniform representation ratio

I thought about saying that less corrupt nations only need a 1:1,000 representation ratio. I thought about saying that corrupt places might benefit from a 1:250 representation ratio. We can't do this for two reasons:

- 1) We don't want it going the other way too easily. We want to hold firm at 1:500, so nobody can widen to 1:1,000, and then 1:5,000, and then say 1:1,000,000.
- 2) We have a single world government and every nation there must have the same representation. If we let one country send more members to the UM, then there will be an arms race where each sends an ever greater share of its population.

How do you fake that?

Your local (very local) Sub-Senator will live just down the road. He will come from your community and know a bunch of people from being their neighbor. How do you fake that?

Accessible government

Everyone will know a Senator. Everyone will be connected to government. Government will not be isolated and hard to reach. It will be the exact opposite. It will be as easy as approaching your neighborhood Sub-Senator as one of his 500 constituents.

And just finding good ideas will be a legitimate way for Senators to gain elevation in the Senate. So our Sub-Senators will all be all ears for new ideas unless they have enough ideas of their own and is a real leader — a real thought leader.

The person who comes up with a good Idea will be a shoe-in for the next Nome election, because the spirit of public tribute will be strong in our minds. We will learn a great lesson from the Arabs. We will reward the people who help our cause with everything a man could want from society. We will not leave this rocket fuel in the hands of the Arabs alone. Our men and our women will all consider it their duty to respect and

honor and help those who have helped the group cause. These will be our stars, not those moron rock-stars, movie stars, and athletic stars. In fact, I ask you all to openly scorn all of our parasite's "stars" from now on. Jeer them out of the media. Don't let them compete in any way with the status we democratically award to our elected Senators, the people we have chosen to run our world.

The Centi-Nome corruption graph

Less than 10 Sub-Senators is definitely corruptible in many parts of the world. Remember that at 10 men, the difference between a simple majority and a 2/3 overmajority is only 1.6 votes! Even with 50 men, the minor public purse of the Centi-Nome is possibly corrupted, for we are only talking about 8 votes to swing a 2/3 majority. With 200 Sub-Senators, it takes 32 votes and this is too complex an operation to work. Even with 100 Sub-Senators it takes 16 votes and this is too complex to work.

Why Centi-Nomes

Firstly, there are not 100 'Centenators' in a Centi-Nome, but 200, with 100 getting confirmed each year.

Centi-Nomes of 100 were chosen firstly because it is a round number that is easy to fraction. But secondly, it is enough people to subvert (turn vertically down) corruption, while having a large number of centi-nomes.

Maybe the least corrupt places would be a little better served with twice as many "Centi-Nome" of 50 Sub-Senators — so they have a plurum with twice as many government "brain cells". And Maybe the more corrupt parts of the world need Centi-Nomes of 200 to subvert corruption. Everyone should, however, start with Centi-Nomes of 100 and if you find too much corruption at the Sub-Senate level, shift to Centi-Nomes of 200.

Twice as many electors

There will be 200 men in each Centi-Nome and only 100 will be confirmed.

Centi-Nomes are part of the design

Don't ever be talked into letting each Sub-Senator allocate his share of any budget himself. If you do this, you are asking for corruption. You must have these large bodies to protect you from corruption.

10,000 specialized Centi-Nomes

On the WIKI/knowledge side, we will have some number of Centi-Nomes covering elementary math, dentistry, masonry, brake technician, and chemistry for example. And maybe 300 will deal with various aspects of medicine. And a few hundred Centi-Nomes will fund this sort of innovation, and a few hundred that sort of innovation. And all will have mad money to use where they think it is best to direct.

A government with 10,000 venture capital funds

1% of US GDP is around \$150 billion/year or \$15 million per Centi-Nome per year. What sort of dynamic business environment would the US have with 10,000 Centi-Nomes spending say \$15 million each on books and educational media. And another \$15 million on other sorts of innovation. And maybe we will spend another 1% on top notch video presentations so educational media will be more juicy and bright — rather than dry and dull.

And remember, the recipients here are not just getting reasonable payment for their inventions, discoveries and

creations, they are also getting respect and status from their entire society. They are being tried by various courts of the Sub-Senate, and awarded recognition for their contribution to society.

And on the side of society — once money is paid, the content will be free to use. In fact for most sorts of constructive media, government funding will take over as the way most constructive media is funded. Most people will just make and post content and hope for a good share of the public funding.

Let's restrict this spending further. Let's say no spending in the neighborhood and say that none of this money may be spent less than 100km from the Centi-Nome's location. It is only their local funding allocations that they will free to spend locally.

Corrupt brains need redundancy

And this is very wasteful

Thus corrupt brains are many times dumber as a result of the redundancy. So one of the most important things we can do to increase the intelligence of our democracy is to make sure that our group efforts are not corrupt.

Later designs for the SS

If we are going to expand the number of Centi-Nomes in the Sub-Senate, we can do the following: Nomes of 100 people elect 1:100 to the Sub-Senate. 250 million voters would thus have 25,000 Centi-Nomes. Every 5 teneths one man goes to Main Senate. This scheme thus elects 2 men to the OS each year from each Centi-Nome of 10,000.

Later, much later, we might have Nomes of 50 people elect 1:50 to the Sub-Senate. 250 million voters would thus have 50,000 Centi-Nomes. Every 10 teneths one man goes to Main Senate. This scheme thus elects 1 man to the OS each year from each Centi-Nome of 5,000.

Smaller Centi-Nomes

We want to try to increase the number of cells in the meta-creature's brain. But get the other procedures in this government design reliable and totally free from corruption.

Maybe you can have Centi-Nomes of 100 or even 50. Maybe we will ultimately figure out a way to get our Centi-Nomes down to only 20 randoms. But whatever you do, eliminate all corruption before you try for this.

>>>>

MULTI•PLIC•ATION= the number of shares you divide or fold something into.

>>>>>

Anti-corruption trumps multiplication

Only increase the number of cells so long as you halt all corruption. Get to the 99% point on corruption before you start worrying about increasing the number of cells. We need a totally honest society before we start multiplying cells.

And afterwards, don't let anyone talk you into giving up any key anti-corruption elements.

Centinels = centi•nel = 100 inside

We will call them Centi-Nomes, or Centi•nels. Each Centinel will be 100 Nomes.

How much will Sub-Senate oversight cost?

Let's say we pay 500,000 Sub-Senators \$50,000/year. That comes to \$25 billion/ year, or about 1/600th of GDP. Will we get our money back? Will we suffer fewer bailouts? Will we have stronger companies? Will be able to have less regulation? Will we have less corporate corruption, and less

corporate stupidity? The cost is practically nothing in the scheme of things, and the problems solved will be a huge thing.

Expect the Sub-Senate to grow

1% of GDP will surely not be enough for our new democratically administered knowledge economy. Also, a 1:500 Sub-Senate may not be enough people to run this new knowledge economy.

To keep government of a constant size

The last digit of the first Nome in each town shall be the last digit in the year the town was founded in.

MAIN-SENATE

Secondary houses are a bad idea

It is better to double check our lawmakers than their laws. When a majority of our double-checked Main-Senators decides on something, their decision should need no double-check to become the law of the land. And their decisions certainly won't be double-checked by a narrower legislature, or some monarch/ornament and his appointee administration.

How exactly are the houses differently constituted?

Q: How is the US House of Representatives so different from the US Senate?

A: It is our parasite's ruse for both narrowing our democracy and making a presidential override a bit harder to pull off.

Continuous government

We will divide the year into ten time periods called TENETHS averaging 36.5 days. Odd numbered teneths will have an odd number of days (37), even numbered teneths will have an even number of days (36). Senators from Nome's ending in a 1 begin at the start of the 1st teneth, those from Nome's ending in a 2 begin at the start of the 2nd teneth, and so forth so that 10% of our Senate will cycle out of service each 36.5 days. Thus we will have annual elections but a continuous form of government.

One tenth of our Senators will start service in each teneth. Also, in each teneth, each Centi-Nome will send its top ranked member to the Main-Senate to serve for one year. These will start their term as Main-Senator at least 4 teneths after their current term ends. During this time, they will complete the Main-Senate ethics education modules as well as the special education program for their sluice.

The tenthy rotation of Senators will give this new government almost total continuity, with no times where government is particularly vulnerable. As well, this will make it harder for elected officials to refuse to leave office as happens from time to time under narrow democracies.

Main-Senate vs. Sub-Senate spending

When the Over-Senate allocates money to the various Main-Senate Sluices, the entire Sluice must agree to spend this money in one way. When the Over-Senate allocates money to the Sub-Senate for ubiquity disbursements, each Centi-Nome spends this money as it decides, subject to limits on giving too large a percentage to one recipient. Thus the spending of the Sub-Senate is cumulative and imprecise.

Weekly voting sessions

In the beginning, the Regional voting houses may get used every day, but after a while, they will only get used once or

twice a week. So most Main-Senators and Over-Senators will not have to move house while they are serving in the Senate.

Transferring sluices

If a Main-Senate sluice invites a Main-Senator from another sluice and he accepts the invitation, he shall be considered adopted to that Sluice. However, not more than 2% of the sluice's membership should be adopted or traded in this way.

No more than 50 sluices

Let's have 50 sluices in our Main Senate, but not more than that. We don't want our Over-Senate growing too powerful in relative strength.

And the sluices don't have to all be the same size, but maybe the biggest should be no more than twice the size of the smallest. If a sluice is getting too small, juggle a few unrelated tasks to balance the workload.

Questions for legislatures to ask

Here are some questions to start with:

- A) What is the benefit and what is the cost?
- B) Is a better solution available by expanding the parameters of the problem?
- C) Are there near-term unintended consequences?
- D) Are there long-term unintended consequences?
- E) Are we handing money to some segment of society without taking it back?
- F) Are we unfairly taking money from some segment of society?
- G) Is there anything missing from the regulation?
- H) What regulation has outlived its useful purpose and can be eliminated?
- I) Can it possibly be done as efficiently by the private sector instead?
- J) Might the legislation benefit our parasite's agenda?
- K) What are the alternate approaches and should we use them?
- L) What are the most contentious parts of the legislation?
- M) Is the legislation hard to implement well?

We must randomly assign our Main-Senators to the various sluices or it might be possible to game the system.

Education and annually elected Senators

The only justification, a feeble justification, for long terms of office is that our elected officials become smarter through their service. Instead, our various sluices should produce educational material so our new Main-Senators will be completely "up to speed" on their first day. The Over-Senate will set a duration for mandatory Senate college for the various sluices. **NSE = new Senator education.**

Internships for the SS and PS decision makers

Our democracy will probably make smarter decisions if its decision makers serve a one teneth internship where they have no power to say anything, and can only watch.

Wind them up

One thing I have noticed is how voluble and smart people become when they are reading for most of their waking hours. We should do this with our Main-Senators before they enter service. The material should be 8 hours a day for most of the course and then 12 hours a day for the last week of Senate college.

I don't like any of the candidates

Under the new democracy, we will never have a shortage of good leaders because the supply is built into the system. Our government will thus always have an abundance of good pre-elected people competing for posts.

Long hours

The Main-Senate and the Over-Senate should be stuck in startup mode.

Those under 40 should work 70 hour weeks.

Those 40-50 should work 60 hour weeks.

Those 50-60 should work 50 hour weeks.

Those 60-70 should work 40 hour weeks.

Those over 70 should work 30 hour weeks.

MULTI-CHANNEL DEMOCRACY

Thabo Mbeki

"I don't imagine heads of government would ever be able to say, 'I'm not an economist therefore, I can't take decisions on matters of the economy. I'm not a soldier, I can't take decisions on matters of defense; I'm not an educationist so I can't take decisions about education.'"

Multi-channel communication

Imagine a single pair of copper telephone wires. These two wires can transmit a Morse code signal, or they can transmit a voice telephone signal, or they can be used for broadband internet access. In a similar way, we can squander our democratic infrastructure on a single-channel telephone-style democracy like we currently have: Or we can use our infrastructure efficiently for a multi-channel broadband decision making system. The difference between these types of communication is for the most part just a communication protocol, or democratic protocol.

Single-channel & multi-step legislatures

American style democracy occurs in single-channel legislatures. And while there are legislative committees, every single thing our national government decides, still has to go through one channel in two legislatures. First one legislative group mind of 350 in one channel must approve it. Then another legislative group mind of 100 with one channel must approve it. Then a lone president also must approve it.

This is a terrible design for a mind. It is a single thought channel that requires 3 approvals, 3 steps to do anything. It is a democracy designed to be slow, ineffective, and at odds with itself.

A 10-channel mono-cameral legislature

On the other hand, our new Main Senate will be divided into 10 legislative sluices of around 10,000 Main-Senators each. Each of these sluices, by itself, thanks to its broad representation will be substantially less corruptible than our current 400-man multi-step democracy. Thus we will go from a: 1-channel multi-stop democracy to an 10-channel, single-stop democracy.

A method of 10-way randomization

Randomization will be by rapid blind draw of 10 numbered ping pong balls in a clear sack suspended under a table. There will be a 10 cm hole and someone will reach in through this hole and immediately grab, blindly grab balls one at a time by a cloth gloved hand. The 1st number out will assign new Main-Senators from Centi-Nomes ending in that number to the 1st

Sluice or slice. The 2nd number out will assign new Main-Senators from Centi-Nomes ending in that number to the 2nd Sluice or slice, and so forth until all 10 balls are drawn. The 1st ball number drawn shall assign all Nomes ending in a 1. The 2nd ball drawn shall assign all Nomes ending in 2, and so forth.

The definition of Sluice

1) A sliding gate for controlling the flow of water, especially one that can be locked.

2) An overflow channel for excess water.

3) A water channel that separates and holds onto gold and diamonds while allowing the base material to be washed away.

Multi-channel democracy: A 10-house Main-Senate

Our new Main-Senate with 100,000 or so members can be broken down in a number of ways, but 10 sluices of 10,000-odd Senators each seems a good and relatively easy starting point. Each of the following sluices will be in charge of making and implementing all laws relating to its sphere of influence. Until we add more sluices to our government, all other government functions shall be fit into the following Sluices:

**** The following sluice information is repeated from the constitution**

Economic Sluice (ES): Tax collections, currency, money supply, central bank, interest rates, inflation management, banking, financial markets, real estate inflation, overall lending level, audits of government agencies, abuse of monopoly power prosecution. EIA (economic intelligence agency).

Industry and commerce Sluice (ICS): Business rules and regulations, product standards, industrial base development, business development lending, industry de-consolidation, anti-monopoly measures, domestic prevention of predatory pricing, business adjudication, working safety, working conditions, environmental regulation, union oversight, insurance.

Healthcare (HS): Optimizing the bang for the nation's public healthcare buck. Health procedure categorization, healthcare education and training, health related research, facilities construction, healthcare approvals, food safety, food additives, pesticides, healthcare taxation, health education. Mafia drugs administration and regulation and taxation of tobacco and alcohol.

Socialist Sluice (SS): Issuance of patents and the tracking of their use. Ubiquitization of inventions and patents. Elder pensions, child support, child services, unemployment dole, homeless shelters, and other social programs. One-child enforcement, education and daycare for children under age 18, workforce development, worker training, employment-related testing and certification.

Public Property Sluice (PPS): Acquisition, sale, and rental of the nation's properties, infrastructure, commodity extraction and nature reserves. New cities, urban standards, building standards, universal municipal rules, communication infrastructure, water supply, sewage, rain water runoff, transportation and commerce infrastructure, rail and road system, automobiles, vehicle networks, goods delivery.

Foreign Sluice (FS): International relations, foreign policy, trade policy, foreign aid, international actions, embassies, foreign language news outlets. UM integration, tariffs and

subsidies to prevent foreign predatory pricing, tariff and duty enforcement, inspections of imported shipments, FIA (foreign intelligence agency) to confirm DIA and EIA.

Military and Militia Sluice (MMS): Armed forces, defense industry, military bases, weapons development, civil defense. Strategic industrial subsidies, DIA (defense intelligence agency). The MMS pays and equips the military, however, the military shall only act under the command of the Over-Senate.

Internal Security Sluice (ISS): National law enforcement, national jails, prisons, visitor visas, immigration approvals, illegal immigration enforcement, refugees, exhods, internment camps, anti-terrorism, FBI, emergency services, disaster preparedness, citizen data, archives, civilian aviation, ports, border control, The ISS pays and equips the militia, however, the militia is under the command of each county's government.

Judicial Sluice (JS): National court system and national prosecution system. Writes the nation's criminal code, and sets all criminal penalties. Adjudicates between counties. Draws Senators for Senate juries and hires appointee judges for small claims matters. The JS may inspect any part of the justice system or any branch of government for no stated reason. The JS is the primary prosecutor with respect to corruption, tax evasion, and organized crime. A 50% majority of JS members exonerate anyone or cancels any civil judgement.

Knowledge Sluice (KS): Issuance of trademarks and copyrights, and the tracking of their use. Ubiquitization of knowledge and copyrights. Research funding, educational media, education of those over age 18, public textbooks and tutorials, education standards, testing standards, public libraries.

The KS also administers all public service websites such as the national search engine, the national industrial catalogue, the national face wall, the national twitting system, the national drop-ship warehouse, the national ratings boards, among other similar publicly-owned, free-to-use, 100% non-commercial public information utilities.

The KS shall not distract itself by actually assembling knowledge. The Over-Senate shall apportion a share of the national budget for award by the Sub-Senate. The KS shall divi-up this amount into a number of category maximums that all Centi-Nomes must abide by. The KS shall also track the money paid to each party by the Sub-Senate.

Jurisdictional Overlaps

It is a good thing if organized and corruption have to fight an 8-headed prosecutor. Therefore, all sluices will be able to initiate investigations, audits and prosecution with respect to corruption, mafia activity, and monopoly pricing power. Redundancy here is a good thing, because we want to miss as little as we can. And this power must never be used to compel or modify behavior.

Our sluices should also compile overlapping statistics. This is firstly so we don't miss anything and also so we can see when any sluice's picture is inaccurate.

There are probably other things that we want to leave in the Main-Senate's overlap.

META-DEMOCRACY = a democracy of democracies. Meta-democracies do not work and are always doomed to failure. The first US constitution of 1777 was a meta-democracy. A

majority from 7 of the 13 state legislatures would pass a bill, and it took a majority from 9 of the 13 states to do important things. The problem was that this could be as little as 26.9% and 34.6% of the electorate respectively.

DIVI-DEMOCRACY = a democracy where voting is done in separate places but tallied together in one vote. This approach works fine.

Conflicts between sluices and Centi-Nomes

All duplications of effort and conflicts between sluices shall be decided by the Over-Senate.

LEGE = legislation, policy, spending, intellectual property, ubiq assets

The 2 roles of our Senators

Role-1: Assemble lege for judgement

Role-2: Judge that lege

Role-2 is mandatory and randomly assigned in Sluices. Here as little as perhaps 1-4 days a teneth will be spent in voting session.

Role-1 is totally optional, and our Sub-Senators will be free to meet with any of their peers in any other division of their Senate. In other words, our Senators are randomly assigned to their duty as judges, but they are at liberty to go wherever they like with respect to the lege they propose.

Specialized decision making,

Unspecialized contribution of ideas

To be clear, our new democracy will only be specialized and randomized multi-channel with respect to Role-2. With regard to Role-1 activities, our Senators will be free to contribute anywhere they want in their respective Senate.

Sluice membership is only about voting

The sluice assignment is a voting assignment. All Main-Senators will be able to make comments in all Sluices. Also, any sluices may elevate any Main-Senator from any Sluice if they elect. However, once a Main-Senator has been elevated to the Over-Senate, he must change sluices or refuse the elevation.

Voting duty

Once the Senator has satisfied his voting duty, he will be free to participate anywhere else in government. Here we imagine our Senators going where they are most useful and making comments and adding material — this in addition to their role in their own Sluice or Centi-Nome.

Senators can be elevated by any sluice, it is just that all things being equal, it will be easier in their own Sluice. Also, one's own sluice, will be where one gets confirmed to a higher Senate, so there will be benefits for participation.

Centi-Nome allocations

With respect to judgement duty, the Over-Senate will allocate a number of Centi-Nomes to each topic, so that for example biotechnology and research might get 100 Centi-Nomes allocated to it.

Rotate important Centi-Nome assignments

If we don't rotate our important Centi-Nome assignments, it is conceivable that some particular localities will rise in power as perpetual masters of some critically important fiefdom of government. For this reason, we must not only have random Centi-Nome assignments, but they should also be rotated

regularly.

It is probably not necessary to do this with some 80% of assignments because they are not strategic. And it is probably not necessary to do annually. And there will obviously be something of a learning curve for our Centi-Nomes, so perhaps we will rotate 1% of certain Centi-Nomes assignments every teneth, so it takes 100 Teneths, or 8 years for a complete rotation of these rotation Centi-Nomes.

Now it is unlikely that a bunch of ringers will be able to move to a particular area with the intent of entering a particular Centi-Nome and taking over. However, it is still possible. So what we will say for rotation topic Centi-Nomes is that new residents to an area can't enter the Senate until after their Nome's Centi-Nome has had a random rotation. This will be on average 4 years.

This design scales

China will have 8 Main-Senate sluices of around 55,000 people. These will meet in perhaps 40 RVCS. France, with 64 million people will have 2 RVCs. Poland with 38 million people, will have one voting center. All other smaller nations will have one voting center.

China will have 4.4 million democratically elected Sub-Senators acting in 44,000 Centi-Nomes.

ROMAP = Rules of mustering and propagating

Voting all at once is safer

Under which system are the resources of election terrorists stretched the most? Under which system is there more safety in numbers for the public?

A) We vote all day long, where we frequently stand vulnerable for hours in long lines. Or.

B) We all vote at once and this takes as little 10 minutes nationwide.

Voting all at once returns power to the people

If people can vote all day long, then people could theoretically go around casting ballots all day long. So if we have all-day voting, we must also have a voter-registration infrastructure to keep people from voting more than once. The problem is that once we do this, the party in power gain some control over voter registration, and who gets to vote. It also frequently gains control over the election process, the ballot counting process, and when elections are held. Thus all-day voting hands much power to the parties already ruling a democracy.

There is no need to pre-register voters

Under this new democracy, we will have Nomes or divisions of 250 voters. It will be very hard to sneak through and pretend to be a citizen, and it will be very easy to get caught. Besides, we will still check everyone's IDs for citizenship, especially those with foreign sounding accents. And we will be videotaping our Sub-Senate elections, and we will have our voter documentation sheets, and will have severe penalties when non-citizens vote fraudulently. A few foreigners may sneak in and cast a ballot here or there, but there will be much less possibility of plebiscite election corruption in comparison to our current system.

Voting all at once & self-instituting democracy

If we are voting all at once, the people can muster-up whenever they want, regardless of what the standing government wants. They can also count their votes by themselves and they can and declare themselves the new

government based on how they mustered sufficient people to claim the rule of their land.

The true source of political power

If everyone accepts the idea that the people are the source of all government power, why do the people need the consent of government to call an election? Here is how the people can take back control of the election process and muster (all by themselves) into a new democracy.

You don't need permission

You don't need permission from the parasite's ornament democracy to muster up. It is your right to do this.

Abraham Lincoln

"Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up, and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable - a most sacred right - a right, which we hope and believe, is to liberate the world."

George Washington

"The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government."

Abraham Lincoln

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or exercise their revolutionary right to overthrow it." [Amendments are real hard under the US prototype democracy by design. A democratic revolution is much more realistic.]

John Adams, Thoughts on Government

"The people alone have an incontestable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to institute government; and to reform, alter, or totally change the same, when their protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness require it."

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.29

"A government of our own is our natural right: And when a man seriously reflects on the precariousness of human affairs, he will become convinced, that it is infinitely wiser and safer, to form a constitution of our own in a cool deliberate manner, while we have it in our power, than to trust such an interesting event to time and chance.

If we omit it now, some Massanello [Ghassan•nello, Ghassan•inside] may hereafter arise, who laying hold of popular disquietudes [anxieties], may collect together the desperate and the discontented, and by assuming to themselves the powers of government, may sweep away the liberties of the continent like a deluge."

US Declaration of Independence

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most

likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains [compels] them to alter their former systems of government."

Less bias against change in government

The underlined portions of America's Declaration of Independence (above) have unfortunately been far too true throughout history. Below are some new conventions that will make it easy for the world to peacefully muster up into broad democracies.

The gift of peaceful self-organized democratic revolutions

What a tremendous thing humanity would gain if it learned a way for any nation to peacefully muster-up and institute a democracy at any time, without any central authority organizing the process.

Structured protests

Today when we protest, we do it as a giant unstructured mass of people. We then leave it up to the openly corrupt paid commercial media to talk about what the people have done. And we let the media talk up, or talk down how big the people's protests were. Basically if our parasite likes our protests, it uses the media to talk the protest up in size. If it doesn't like the protests it ignores them — or if it can't ignore them, it talks them down and minimizes them.

A better approach would be for all protests to be structured in Nome-sized groups of 250. This way, the number of people protesting a cause can be accurately measured. As well, the size of the movement and its growth-rate can be accurately charted over time. Failing to do this, a protest would be deemed to trying to hide its small size and powerlessness.

If it can't even muster Nomes, it ain't news

All serious news outlets should report all Nome-scale protests everywhere in the nation on a daily basis. Also, they must be reported numerically with accuracy.

They have no right

Anyone who follows the news has heard of tyrants and oligarchies and narrow democracy putting elections off for years — frequently waiting until the people actually take to streets. As well, we are constantly hearing cries of voter fraud directed at governments that are overseeing the elections destined to oust them from power.

When a tyranny, ligarchy, or narrow democracy gets in the way of your mustering democracy, cast a wide net and be absolutely merciless with the devil's henchmen. And be least forgiving of the highest up and those who participate in any way with the abusive use of police or military force in suppressing the people. Burn them, hurt them, firebrand them to death through the streets. Make everyone afraid to commit democide.

The current democracy is beyond repair

Will the current US constitution permit us to increase our representation ratio by 1,000 fold, so our Congress is more than 1,000 times harder to corrupt? Will our constitution let us vote in divisions of 250 so there is no need for candidates to spend money on campaigning? Can these massive changes occur under our current constitution? Do we even want to wait for the corrupt US political system to slowly change itself into a corrupt version of a broad democracy? Or do we in America, the beacon of democracy, want to show the world how easy it is to muster-up into a broad democracy without any central authority whatsoever?

People, America has a duty here. We must show the world how easy it is to become a true democracy — how easy it is to sweep away the parasite's democracy, the de·ex·pull's democracy all at once.

If you think these words are the truth, it is your obligation to say and repeat this mantra: "Its all true". Drop whatever else you are doing in your life and make it so. Get out in the streets and start showing your support for a broad democracy every day at noon.

Threatening an emergent democracy

It shall be the crime of democide to threaten, menace, harass, fine, arrest, attack, or kill anyone peacefully mustering up to form a broad democracy. Anyone doing so, whether in the government, or any subsidiary police or military force, or outside government, may be charged with the capital crime of democide.

Everyone in the police and military: If you are ever ordered to interfere with citizens more-or-less peacefully mustering up into a broad democracy, so long as they are not causing significant and permanent harm to people or property, you must defy the order as you would defy an order to shoot unarmed people. For both will be considered malignant and capital crimes against humanity.

And you people mustering up, please everyone, try to be utterly peaceful whatever violence you face. And if there is either baiting violence, or terrify the protestors violence, or any other sort of violence against protesters, the perpetrators should pay with their lives after the election of the new government. The world will become different now. Now the entire body human will turn against those who commit the traitorous crime of betraying their own people by interfering with their emergent democracy.

Learn from the Tiananmen Square massacre

- 1) Your government's Arab masters will not hesitate to kill its livestock by the tens of thousands if it will help them to maintain their hold on power.
- 2) The Arab government will lure people to protest so it can find all the pandas, the gentle but determined creatures with a clear demarcation between black and white, wrong and right.
- 3) Leave your cell phones home, and on.
- 4) Meet in thousands of places where everyone can see you meeting.
- 5) There is strength in numbers. If even 5% of the population protests, the Arab front government can't take action against them.
- 6) The sooner you begin mustering the more powerful the democracy movement will be.
- 7) You in Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, India, Thailand, and Free Korea, help lead the way for the people of China who risk arrest for protesting.

You have the right to protect yourselves

Cover your face and hands when you demonstrate and muster in unfree nations. You don't want them to come for you for being a panda = peh•an•da = say•renew•give, a gen•tel creature with a sharp distinction between black and white.

Bring arms when you muster, even if you only have knives and clubs and Molotov cocktails. No machine guns or grenades unless government forces are armed that way. Anyone attempting to use violence to interrupt or terrorize the mustering process should be killed. If possible burn them alive slowly and post the videos to send a message. Remember all cameras and posting devices have digital watermarks, so take precautions.

All El's fury on those who oppose democracy right? Anyone who opposes democracy remains un-cleaved from the evil ex•pull of the Arabs Inc. right?

Police state

Now there is a euphemism! Funny how it is the shortest term we have for a government that kills its own people when they get in the way for our Arab masters.

In hostile environments

Mustering starts the day after revelation day in the middle of lunch hour. If it doesn't take hold, then it starts the next day at lunch hour, and so forth.

If you are afraid to come out, try to squint a little, or blink rapidly, or breath in deeply when you look at others. This means, that you want to muster up.

There are many parts of the world where the people are disarmed and ruled by threat of force. These will be much more formidable if they all commit to wielding El's fiery fury on their tyrants and their helpers when they finally take democratic power. Therefore, anyone in uniform, and anyone taking up arms against the new incipient democracy gets burned. If it doesn't happen immediately, it happens after a million 3-d printed single-use plastic pistols and rifles get air dropped on that nation.

All uniform officers and military have to stay away from the mustering worldwide or they will be burned. Do not go, or you will be sorry.

Only broad democracies

Anyone trying to organize or advocate a tyranny or narrow democracy should be considered an Arab agent.

MUSTERING = structured protests where groups of 250 voting age citizens elect temporary Nome leaders.

MUSTERING NOMES = Nome-sized blocks of mustered people.

Yet another huge flaw of US-style democracy

Obviously, all free nations want to spread freedom and democracy. With this in mind, why isn't there a standard procedure, or a set of guidelines, for "The People" of all nations to assemble, hold elections and peacefully take power by themselves, without the consent or input of their Arab-frontman oppressors? If we only had such international standards in place, the forces of freedom and democracy would become much harder for tyranny to resist. As follows are some simple rules that will make it easier to MUSTER-UP and self-form into a broad democracy.

Speed is key

If we all move quick enough, we can sweep the Arabs from

power without them struggling or fighting at all.

Track Mustering-Nomes by city

To make it easier to count Mustering-Nomes, have sub-tallies for each city and district.

Forgive your former enemy or there will be a great war

I ask you all a favor. Don't be angry with each other. We don't need a world war, a pan-epidemic, a nuclear war, right now, just before the recursion. And we will need many, many millions to battle humanity's real enemy, the environment. Besides you on the inside: What are you going to do now that your great secret is out?

How to cure a protest turned violent

Our parasite has at times sent in agent-provocateurs to commit violent acts and make a protest violent. After this, the violence then becomes a reason for the establishment to disband the protest. Do not allow this to happen. Everyone should be on guard against agent provocateurs in their protests.

Here is a method for protestors to ostracize violent protestors from their protest. All that has to happen is the peaceful protestors start chanting "no... no... no" in unison while they raise their wrists up and point at the violent ones. When the protest security forces see this, it will mean they will have the support of the protestors in arresting the part of the protest that has turned violent. Also, all security forces shall be duty bound to arrest any people ousted from a protest and hold them for the maximum amount of time allowed so that protestors can come forward and stand as witness against the people ousted for committing violence during their protest.

Never have a broad democracy party

I was at first going to recommend that until our new broad democracy has achieved the national quorum point, we should consider it a political party within the current narrow democracy. I thought we should do this even though we strongly disdain political parties as anti-democratic.

On second thought however, I am more worried that the parasite might attempt to include broad democracy as a sort of permanent political party within our current narrow democracy. Here I imagine the harem brothers leading a series of carefully crafted compromises that ultimately discredit broad democracy without ever really giving it a chance to work as intended. So please, do not allow our new broad democracy to become a party under a narrow democracy. Please work to entirely replace our current corrupt narrow democracy with a broad corruption-free democratic design.

Demonstrations = Demon•strata•ians

This word seems to come from the Haremi word for their organized protests of the demon•stratas of the host societies. The matrix name tells us exactly what demonstrations are, and how easily then can be manipulated to violence by the parasite. We should stop allowing anarchic demonstrations. Instead we must:

- 1) Make sure that all protests are structured into Mustering-Nomes with elected Nome leaders.
- 2) Make sure everyone knows how to oust violent people from the protest.
- 3) Make sure that anyone causing violence to hinder mustering be charged with democide and punished as traitors of their people.

A counter-violent attitude

We will all be better off if we presume all demonstration violence to be the Arabs working on the demon•strata of our society.

El's fury on Arabs, Haremi and Brothers that resist

If the Brothers in power resist any incipient democracy in any way, then they shall suffer El's fiery fury.

Crier-poling

If you want to pole say 10,000 people without any ballots, or more importantly without any administrators, here is how to do it.

- 1) Gather in front of any recently used poling place, or government building, or the big tree at the end of the road. Whatever.
- 2) Establish a line of people, one every 10 paces down one sidewalk of the road. These stand in place, one every 10 paces, on the street-side of the sidewalk on one side of the road. They count out 99 people who line up behind them. Then they close their row by crossing their arms.
- 3) At the time the vote was called for, each line centurion raises both arms straight up and shouts "silence" three times. Then they hold their arms out horizontally like an eagle. Then they cry out "Time to vote. All those in favor by my right hand, all those opposed by my left hand. Then after one minute the centurion cries out time to count off. Then the two opposing lines call off 1-1, 2-2, 3-3, and so forth until one side has not enough people. Then the vote shall be said something like 47-46, 48-46, 49-46, 50-46, 51-46, 52-46, 53-46, 54-46.
- 4) At 6 minutes after the voting hour, the first centurion at one end of the street/line shall shout "Century 1 how vote you in favor" and all in his line shall roar 54. Then the next century down the line shall do the same thing. "Century 2 how vote you" and all shall roar whatever their score was.
- 5) In this way, the vote is both easy to tally and impossible to falsify.
- 6) Carry weapons to protect yourselves if there is a risk.

SENATE BBS — SENATE FLOOR

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #109

["The University of Paris is the eldest daughter of the kings of France..."](#) [note how an enterprise is disguised as a daughter here.] [and some time ago, there was a great controversy with some scholars concerning the letter Q, which the university wanted to pronounce like a K. The dispute became so violent that some of the participants had to have their property confiscated.](#) [One way the parasite silences the opposition.] The Parliament had to step in so as to put an end to the quarrel. And in a solemn decree it granted every subject of the King of France permission to pronounce the letter as he saw fit. A fine sight that was to see, two of the most important institutions in Europe occupied [squandering their time] deciding the fate of a letter of the alphabet.

[new subject] [It appears... that the greatest men find their minds becoming stunted when they are assembled together, and that the more wise men \[gathered in one place\], the lower their wisdom.](#) [new subject] [Great institutions are always so attached to minute detail and empty formalities that the main business gets left to the end](#) [Here is the parasite telling us one of its strategies. Always push the formalities, always struggle to waste their time. Do this so there is less time for them to deal with its important matters.]

Look, there really are people trying to get legislatures to squander their time on trivial things. Guard your legislature's attention and don't let it be squandered. Don't let your legislature be drawn into establishing time wasting formalities and protocols that don't help legislative productivity. There should be no formalities of respect or titles in the Senate, and all protocols should deal exclusively with truth discovery and election of the truth and election of policy.

The word Parliament says a lot

If parlaying is talking and growing, then a parlay'em•n't is where people do the opposite, where they don't talk and where they don't grow.

To me, democracy is not about parlay'em•n't and a few hundred people who all turns speaking to everyone present. I always hated this about government. This is a terrible and artificial way to communicate, and it is such a completely awful approach that it must be our parasite's idea. It is not only un-enjoyable, it is dumb. We should not have any imposed structure at all to speaking beyond the 10-minute introductory speech that all new Senators give.

It would be much more efficient if democracy mostly took place on a great BBS where people watch whatever until they are tired with it. Then periodically, the various Senates meet to vote.

The legislative floor = the eff•al•oo•our

Faster democracy

Have you ever watched a legislature in session? Talk about slow and boring! I mean, the way we have to all sit around and listen to everyone take turns speaking on the "floor", the way everyone listens to everyone, even though they mostly make obvious commentary, or repeat each other.

I am too impatient. I could never enjoy doing this job. What a waste of time and energy this is for our lawmakers. Just imagine what they could get done if this internal information function was made more efficient. And imagine how much more stimulating and enjoyable it would be to serve as a lawmaker.

Live oral legislatures waste time and sap energy

It is just such a waste of everyone's time and energy the way we get our leaders together in a room and take turns speaking. We really should stop doing our government business this way. Instead, our Senators (at all levels) should post their thoughts and proposals on the appropriate BBS in writing mostly. Once posted, that body's Senators will cast BBS up and BBS down votes to raise/lower the various items.

Chain Reaction Film, 1996

[a fictional congressman is talking] ["I am aware of the law Mr. Shannon. Thank you, I wrote it. I don't remember when I was drafting it, that I anticipated a large portion of the south-side of Chicago blown up."](#) [Here we are told four times that our lawmakers are the wise men drafting own laws. Not only is this not true, but here we have a Morgan Freeman, Johnny Depp film insisting four times that it is true]

This film is cleverly disguised political propaganda that says to America, "Your brilliant congressmen are writing your laws". Clearly someone wants Americans to think that our lawmakers are the ones drafting our laws. After all, they mention or hint at this idea 4 times. Clearly someone is putting propaganda placements in our media that say our lawmakers are the smart people actually drafting our laws. Clearly the

opposite is true and someone else is putting propaganda placements in our media to hide that idea. Funny how some propaganda speaks the truth with perfect clarity once you realize it is propaganda.]

Of Roman consuls and pro-consuls

In Rome, CONSULS had the all-important role of introducing or proposing legislation to the Senate. And Latin PRO = in-place-of. Thus a PROCONSUL was a stand-in, an appointed administrator standing in place of the consul. Thus the non-elected proconsul administrator had the all important job of introducing and proposing new laws. It is remarkable how little things have developed under "democracy" in the past 2,200 years.

Senate speaking — another thing we do backwards

Today, in our elections process, we let our 250-million voters with their tiny little votes listen to whatever they want. On the other hand, when our elected leaders use their super-valuable time to perform the duties of government, while the government is in session, we force them (at least sometimes) to all sit in a room and take turns speaking to everyone. This is yet another thing that the parasite has our democracies doing backwards.

A better approach would be to only use Senate speaking only for introductions as people tend to do anyway at informal meetings. So in our Nome elections, all candidates will all get to address all voters for 6-minutes. And all voters should listen to all of these 6-minute speeches from all candidates in order to vote in their Nome Election. At the 6-minute mark, everyone should start applauding. Those who waste time talking about other candidates should be presumed to have nothing constructive to add. Except for this, and the 10 minute introductory speeches of our newly elevated Senators, there will be no mandatory public speaking/listening in our Senates.

Star Wars propaganda about democracy

Recall the immense tubular legislature from the recent Star Wars films. Recall how absurdly huge everyone's private box was. Recall how the countless lawmakers would zip into the center to take the "floor". Recall how the image of this legislature was featured over and over in the film in typical propaganda fashion. Someone it seems wanted us thinking of giant legislatures as a crazy idea, so they cooked up a foolish example of a giant legislature.

Single brain-cell democracy

Today, all legislatures have a single floor where lawmakers take turns speaking. When these are in session, our lawmakers usually spend over 90% of their super-valuable time listening to things they mostly do not need to listen to. The speakers also speak much slower than most lawmakers read.

This single channel of discussion is so suboptimal that it must be our parasite's idea. It clearly makes our democracies slower, much slower, and by extension stupider. In fact, it is a brain-dead stupid way for lawmakers to communicate with one another, and it should be entirely prohibited, except when our new Senators introduce themselves.

And while legislative floors are a completely absurd idea in huge legislatures with hundreds of cells, they are still a dumb idea in a small group that might have even two men. No. We must abandon all single channel, single-minded

parlay'em•nots, no matter how small. And we must stop using Robert's (our•ob•arts) rules of order. These are both inventions to slow the thoughts of our democracy and the group spirit of the host.

There must be a path before a path can be blocked

Unless everything has to go through one narrow place, it can't be stopped and throttled. This works for legislatures as well as trade sphincters. Thus without a floor there is no possibility of the parasite's minority delaying the host's majority.

Without a floor, there is also little need for extra-democratic political parties with the power to lean the ship of state this way or that way. And there is also no need for legislative speakers and prime ministers calling people to the floor to address the legislature. All that is left are the good parts of democracy — a broad base of elected leaders voting on how to run the group effort.

Your president is a sphincter

Everything narrows to pass over the "desk" of this one man. How absurd! I mean that the affairs of the United states have to pass over the "desk" of one man. Do you actually believe this garbage? Do you really believe that the affairs of 305 million people can in any way be managed by one man and a bunch of his public slaves or public servants? Your president is an unnatural sphincter in a democracy. And as with all sphincters, the Arab Sphinx mafia has greatest control at the sphincter points.

ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER

Robert's = Our•ob•arts = Our•obstructing•arts

Our•ob•arts rules of order

Without mandatory listening in our Senate, there is no need for rules of order with respect to speech. All that is needed is an objective way to elevate content for regard and for vote — something that is quite simple. It is only a system where every Senator gets to vote once on the value of any BBS item.

Henry M. Robert, Robert's Rules of Order, Ch.2

"Thus, if a motion to have a banquet on a certain evening had been laid on the table, it would be out of order to move that a concert be given on that evening, because if the latter motion were adopted, it would interfere with and probably prevent the adoption of the prior motion, when it is taken from the table.

When the first motion is taken from the table, the second can be moved as a substitute for it. [Not only is this section hard to understand, it is hard to watch for on an ongoing basis, and it is a subjective matter to judge. Reader: How many times do you have to read this section to fully understand it?]

Debate: In order to debate a pending question, a member must obtain the floor as already described and address his remarks to the chairman [the chairman, or prime legislator/ legislative king is thus very powerful for he decides who gets to speak and which motions become pending and immediately pending]. A motion is pending after it has been stated by the chair until it has been disposed of either permanently or temporarily. There may be a number of motions pending at the same time. The pending motion that was last stated by the chair is called the immediately pending motion. Debate must be confined to the immediately pending question, and must deal with other questions only so far as they are necessarily involved with the immediately pending one.

The speaker must avoid all personalities, must not

attribute improper motives to a member, [foreigner English alert] and must not even mention a member's name if he can be properly described in some other way, as 'the member who last spoke.' Officers should be referred to by their official titles and not by their names. No one can speak in debate, except by permission of the assembly, more than twice on the same question on the same day, nor longer than 10 minutes at one time. On an appeal from the decision of the chair, no one but the chairman can speak more than once. No member can speak a second time on a question if any member who has not spoken upon that question desires to speak. [This helps make political parties necessary — This clause helps political parties to be valuable because they have an advantage with being able to explain complicated matters.] The member making a debate motion has the [exclusive] right to the floor for debate, if he claims it with reasonable promptness, in preference to other matters, even if they rose and addressed the chair first. [Debate is thus encouraged over decisiveness] A member who has exhausted his right to debate the main question has a right to debate any debatable subsidiary question that afterwards may be immediately pending. [Again, debate is encouraged over decisiveness]"

Robert's Rules of Order, Ch.2

"Indefinite Postponement. Instead of voting down the motion, it may be killed just as effectually by adopting the motion to postpone indefinitely. An affirmative vote on it is identical in effect with a negative vote on the main question. This motion cannot be made if any other than the main motion is pending. Postpone indefinitely is debatable, and while it is pending, the merits of the main question may be debated the same as if this motion had not been made." [The underlined in this section seem not to have been written by a native English speaker.]

Robert's Rules of Order, Ch.2

"Improper Amendment. An amendment is improper and out of order if it is not germane [G·our·mn] to the motion to be amended; or if its adoption would make the motion an improper one, as described, page 11; or if its adoption would make the affirmative of the amended motion the equivalent of the negative of the original motion; or if it changes one form of amendment to another form, See page 24a-c; or if it substitutes one form of motion for another form; or if it strikes out words that have been inserted, unless some additional words are struck out to make the new question entirely different from the old one; or if it inserts words that have been struck out, unless the motion to insert includes enough additional words to make the question entirely different from the question of striking out which was previously decided."

[If government worked in writing on a BBS, none of this hard to understand and even harder to implement Sphinxing procedure would be needed]

Speeches: as little as possible

We should de-emphasize the role of public speaking in lawmaking to the maximum extent practical:

- 1) With writing, the actual logical merits of an argument don't have to compete so much with the art and emotion of delivery.
- 2) Speech comes at a single speed, and must be delivered to the lowest common denominator, too slow for the smartest. With written communication, the speed can be adjusted, an sections more easily skipped.
- 3) Most Senate-level people will be able to understand what they read faster and better than what they hear.

4) When it comes to large groups of people drafting precise language, it is easier to compare versions and make modifications to written material than spoken material.

Floor time

Under this system, there is no Senate floor, and nobody ever has the floor, except the new Senators for 10 minutes each, and the people running the Senate votes.

Only introduction speeches

There will only be one place where all Senators must attend and listen to their colleagues speak in turn. It is when the new Senators introduce themselves for 10 minutes each. Except for this, no individual or minority shall ever have the power to command that the entire Senate read something, or listen to a speech. Mandatory reading/viewing shall only come about when a majority of Senators elects something as mandatory reading on a Senate BBS.

Have a high bar for BBS comments

Those without something worthwhile to add, should not comment. Those who make too many dumb comments on a Senate board should be marked down by their Senate peers. After this few people will pay attention to what they say on the Senate BBS.

It is vitally important that we keep the reading volume down, so our Senators will be able to cover more territory and our Senate will be smarter.

Headed and indexed as tweets

The Senate BBS system should be indexed as a twitter with a limit to the size of the header tweet. This should start at 300 characters and be fined tuned for optimality. There should also be an expand button for additional text. There should also the possibility of attaching images and creating polls. There should also be the possibility to sequence and connect related tweets.

The Senate is supposed to experiment with header lengths, likes, inanes, and retweet amounts, comment valuing and indexing schemes, divisions of labor in viewing and valuing posts, Senator contribution ranking systems, and other reward systems for making valuable comments to the group mind.

Rules of Senate BBS comments

- 1) Everyone comments in their own verified name, and it shall be the felony of election fraud to comment in someone else's name.
- 2) Frivolous and inane comments cancel out good ones.
- 3) There are likes, super-likes, and inane buttons.
- 4) All Senators get a fixed number of likes, inanes and retweets allocations. The part time Sub-Senate does not get as many of these as the full time Senates. This number
- 5) The most liked posts rise to the top of the comments for each subject. Posting well liked comments should be the most important considerations in a Senator's status and elevation to a higher Senate. However, likes, inanes, and retweets are to be judged subjectively by each Senator and there should never be a formal system where these automatically elevate a Senator.
- 6) Senators that are the first to second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth a new universal idea also imparts a portion of the idea's status on a Senator.
- 7) It is against Senate rules to discuss giving likes, inanes and retweets with others, or their swapping. Senators may be disciplined or expelled for doing this. There is nothing wrong

with discuss the getting of likes.

8) The following each have their own BBS: The people, The national Sub-Senate, Each national Main Senate Sluice, the national Main-Senate overall, The national Over-Senate, the UM Main-Senate, and the UM Over-Senate. Additionally, each county Sluice, and each county Over-Senate shall have a BBS.

9) The people's BBS shall be administered and judged by the Sub-Senate, where valuable comments are posted to the appropriate sluice of the Main-Senate's BBS.

10) Except for the people's BBS, Senators can only post on their own BBS.

11) All BBSs are cloned in each nation, and function more or less identically.

12) The public is not able to post on a Senate BBS, except by convincing a Sub-Senator to comment on their behalf. The public may however post on the public section of that BBS. The two sections shall be separate.

13) When members of the public make valuable comments on the public section, it shall be in their own verified name. When members of the public make valuable comments, it shall be considered a justifying election to the Sub-Senate.

14) The rules of vote buying/selling shall apply to all aspects of the Senate BBS. It is a felony to make comments for others.

15) All BBSs shall generally be open for public viewing except those concerning national security and military tactics.

16) Once a person has been confirmed to the Senate, their Senate rank shall be displayed on their BBS profile name for the rest of their life.

17) Nobody can change their name or identity on the Senate BBS, even those who marry and change their name.

18) Every person's comments to the Senate BBS shall be permanently kept and shall be viewable in their account.

19) When members of the public make a comment to the Senate BBS, there shall be an anti-nuisance commenting fee of two day's wages charged.

Ideas as the coin of our electoral realm

All contributions that make it on a Senate's BBS should be listed by contributor (unless the contributor wants to remain anonymous). At election time, these contributions should be weighed with other considerations. Under this system, valuable ideas will replace money as the coin of our political realm. Here we will still sell our elections in a market, but the market will democratically compare the value of the various contributions.

Under this system, anybody can make comments on a Senate's public BBS, and start at the bottom with respect to ratings. Either that, or they can make a comment (anonymously) through their Sub-Senator. If they do this, it will be up to the Sub-Senator to decide if the comment is worthy of passing up to his Main-Senators.

The rules of Senate address

The following rules should apply to the Senate, so we don't squander the attention of our group minds, our most valuable resource:

- 1) Most important first, least important last.
- 2) Eliminate unnecessary words.
- 3) Avoid saying the obvious, or repeating what was said before.
- 4) Say nothing knowingly untrue.
- 5) The thanks and credit goes in a credit appendix, afterwards, as a footnote.
- 6) No dead time, the talk begins half a second after the start.
- 7) No music, introductions, or starting credits.
- 8) No appeals to emotion or drama. Logic rules.

9) Self-serving arguments must be declared.

10) All spoken material shall be meter transcribed.

The BBS does many things

The Senate BBS systems (one for each sluice, each Centi-Nome, the Sub-Senate, and the Over-Senate) will have no power by itself:

- 1) It monitors and tracks authorship of bills, amendments and comments to safeguard this primary and cornerstone aspect of law making.
- 2) It keeps track of comment ratings so the best can grow in importance and the worst wither.
- 3) It measures recognition to Senators for making good commentary and helps root out saboteurs and moles.
- 4) It determines what is required reading for each sluice and committee.
- 5) It verifies that Senators have read or viewed the required material.
- 6) It uses ratings to assemble bills (unapproved laws), parts of bills, and reports.
- 7) It authorized bills for actual vote by the Senate.

Tracking

Every part of every law must have Senator authorship

It is amazing the way we are so fastidious about authorship when it comes to high school school papers and the latest dumb song. Even more amazing is the way we are completely apathetic about the authorship of our laws. This is yet another thing our parasite has us doing completely backwards. Every section of every law must have authorship. On top of this at least half of the people in the committee/ BBS assembling the law must approve of every single paragraph if not clause.

Laws formed openly, laws elected secretly

We will assemble our laws in broad recorded daylight (dei•light) to frighten away those who may do evil/harm to us. We will shine the sun's full brightness here. Many of us will watch the proceedings. And of course, we will archive everything and every thing. Much attention goes here. Make it a national pass-time to talk about the sub-decisions of the Senate instead of the ball tournament.

Form your laws in the noon-day sunlight in an everything-tracked BBS for all to see. But when it comes to the Senate vote, that must be done under total secrecy to make any vote selling impossible to verify. Remember this difference. Read this a few times. Put words like the above on your transit instead of those worthless adds.

Yet again, we do things backwards today. Today, we assemble our laws in total darkness and secrecy. Just look at how so many laws of the US congress appear out of the darkness as fully formed creatures. Today, the people have no knowledge whatsoever about the dark origins of their laws.

Now on the side of the legislative vote, where our lawmakers vote a law into force — we do that live on CSPAN. This way there is no secrecy at all about which legislator is voting how. This way the bribe payers can be assured that their money is being well spent.

Something is better than nothing

We must do something to track bill authorship. Today, we do nothing at all in our democracies to monitor the origins of our laws. Today, these normally appear out of the darkness as fully formed creatures. Where do these come from? We have no idea today.

The attached BBS will probably need lots of modifying and tweaking, but it will work right away, and it will offer some improvement over doing nothing.

Senate BBS voting

BBS voting must not be secret, so we can all go back and see how our laws were assembled — so we can see who added what clauses. Every clause should be attributed to someone or some group of people. Each of those names should be searchable to see what they contributed.

The BBS has no real power

It is just a tool, a convenience for the Senators so they don't waste time on voting too much. The BBS votes will only be valid for assembling laws and calling a real Senate vote. BBS votes shall have no power at all because the votes are not secret. In fact they are the opposite of secret votes.

Anonymous commentary

All citizens shall be assigned a life-long COMMENT NUMBER, which shall be a private number. All BBS comments shall by default display this number. It shall be felony election fraud to use someone else's number without permission, however everyone shall have the right to post things for other people. They shall also have the right to say absolutely anything they want either anonymously or using their ID number. It shall be the crime of election fraud to comment under more than one name, or to take money or favors for making comments. It shall be election fraud to distribute or be in possession of indexes of these numbers. People shall be free to make their comment number public, and many running for office will do this.

Everyone shall always have the right to say whatever they want either anonymously or on the record. However, we shall all regard anonymous comments with the same dis•creed•hence as something spray-painted on a wall. All anonymous comments begin with a rating of 0 out of 100. And we shall never forget to ask why the person saying these things wanted to stay anonymous.

The Senate BBS is only for Senators

Any Main-Senator from any house may contribute on any on any Main-Senate BBS system. As well, any Sub-Senator may contribute on any Sub-Senate board. In both cases, these people will be responsible for making valid comments, and the rating they receive on any BBS will count on his rating average.

The Senate's public board

The Senate will operate two sorts of BBS. In addition to the one previously discussed that is only for Senators, there will be one that is mostly for the public. Many comments on the PUBLIC BOARD will little-doubt be elevated to the SENATE BOARD. This elevation of comments shall be a duty of each Sub-Senator, and all shall share in the glory (kal•ori = green mouth) of those ideas they promote.

The various Senate boards

Each Centi-Nome, the entire Sub-Senate, each Main-Senate Sluice, each Main Senate Committee, and the Over-Senate will have a BBS.

Rating

Recognition where recognition is due

In all Senates, every proposal, every amendment, and every deposition shall be entered into the Senate BBS in writing. The Senate and People shall give honor and recognition where they are due as defined by first mention in the Senate BBS. This will drive everyone to use the BBS for public commentary and communication. Also, ordinary people will be able to make posts to the BBS. These will be recorded and monitored by the Nome and Centi-Nome they were made to. Here is how a great number of ordinary people will find themselves elected to the Senate. It will happen simply by the quality of their posts, for there will be no better way to prove your value to the Senate than to be of actual value to the Senate.

The best of the best ideas

At all levels, our Senators will generally be keen to listen for ideas from their constituency. These ideas should benefit the person making them. They should also benefit the people who first see their value and champion (ak•amphi'n) their value in each Senate. The originator(s) of the idea may get elected to the Sub-Senate or more based on them. And the Sub-Senator may get elevated based on his early recognition of them.

Thus a large share of good ideas in this nation will be heard by one of our 500,000 Sub-Senators that get confirmed each year in the US. Then the best thoughts and their supporters will get elected to the Senate.

The rating of raters

Everyone's comment number will be indexed for the following:
COMENTING RATIO= comments per transaction
HUE= how positive or negative they are on average
COMENTING VOLUME= the number of comments they have made in the past 10 teneths.

WORTH RATIO = the percent of people saying their comments are worth reading.

The foregoing shall be determined by stranger/blind viewers. None may know the person they are reviewing. All comment numbers will display these numbers in the following format 05:47:18:72, meaning:

- 1) He only comments on 5% of the things he reads.
- 2) When he rates, he gives an average rating of 47, slightly below average.
- 3) He only made 18 comments in the last year.
- 4) His comments are well regarded with a 72% rating.

How to do Senator ratings

Everyone's rating starts out at 50. Some rise high on high volume, some fall on low volume.

BBS features

No entry can ever be erased from the Senate BBS system. All entries will have titles and up to 13 keywords to facilitate search.

All Senate viewers will be able to give any two-digit percentage as a rating. All content will display the average rating percentage, along with the number of Senator viewers. In order to give over a 50% rating, Senators must watch or read the entire post. To give less than a 50% rating, Senators do not have to view the entire work.

Viewers will also assign markers like: F, V, R, W and N, where F=fresh, V=valuable, R=redundant, W=worthless N=negative. In this way, our Senators will read and focus on the most valuable and non-redundant comments. The Senators will be able to search and organize the Senate BBS postings by any of the above rating criteria as well as by date/time, keyword, number of votes, heading, etc. They will be able to

do this in their own Senate and in other Senates.

BBS voting browsers

Voting on posting value would be much simpler if everyone could just rate posts on a scale of 0-99 as they move on to the next page or comment. Perhaps no rating means 50%. Have this for all three Senates. Here we imagine a democracy that routinely rates and indexes all that is important and even tangential to it, especially Senator contributions.

Don't heed BBS rank in your elevation elections

Think of the elevation elections, when our Senators elevate the colleagues they work with. In these, our Senators should reconsider the various contributions by themselves and they should not give too much heed/head to the BBS values. Doing otherwise, creates a back door to your democracy.

To **DEMOTIZE** = democratically prioritize, verify and recombine all the comments on a BBS.

A democratic agenda mechanism

How do you decide whose Senate business is introduced first? How do you decide which comments are most valuable? How do you decide which comments should get heard by everyone? Who approves of summaries and headings? You must not leave these things outside your democracy. If you do, the agenda setters have a veto over who and what gets on your democracy's agenda.

Everything in writing

A fully transcribed BBS

In all Senates, every proposal, amendment, comment, and information source shall be entered into the Senate BBS in writing. If matters are being discussed formally among Senators all these discussions should be recorded and entered. Thus if a change or comment later proves problematic, (for example treating all that bad subprime debt as if it were treasuries) we will know who the source of the idea was. If someone is responsible for making such changes, it will be a red flag about parasite involvement. Also, if all proposals and all changes are indexed by Senator, the best will stand out as well as the worst.

All speaking must be meter-transcribed

We won't say, "no speaking". If Senators want to post video, they may. What we will do is say that all speaking must be recorded and meter transcribed because most smart people can read faster and better than they can listen. Also, the written transcript version shall be the official version, and the spoken version will have no official value. We must drive government into something that is written and read, rather than spoken and heard. By doing that we will not only increase our government's capacity, but also its intelligence and its fairness. For all these things live more in print than in the spoken word.

Its a deal, trust me

The spoken word is the stuff of crooks and the written contract is the stuff of contracts. How should our Senators communicate?

Politician vs. used car salesmen

Today, which one is more likely to be telling the truth? We all know to get it in writing from the used car salesman. How come we don't do the same with our elected people? If it is

official, it is recorded in writing, in an easy to search way.

No more rostrum/podium speeches

Try to minimize your speaking as candidates and Senators, and please stop all forms of rostrum/podium speaking. And let everyone watch as and when they like.

Everything in writing

In our Senate, all communication must be recorded in writing. It can also be recorded in video or other formats, but it must all be in writing. Both must be recorded by the Senate BBS.

Senate required reading

Keep required reading to a minimum. Only with a 50% vote can BBS material be made required reading for everyone involved with that committee.

SRVS = Senate reading verification system

This will track eye movements and it will make sure that our Senators have read all the required material.

Must read Senate voting material

Prior to voting on any matter, the Senators must read view all the majority approved media. Reading non majority comments is voluntary.

A constant reading level

We should establish a maximum daily word count that must be read under SRVS.

Committees

All committees are open

All Main-Senate committees are open to all Main Senators of any sluice, and None may limit its membership like in the US Congress does today. And we will say that when a Senator is on a committee, he has to read all the material to vote. And if he hasn't/doesn't read the material and vote, he can't be on that committee and the committee can't count him as a member.

All committees are under a MS sluice

One of the 10 sluices will judge every single thing is elevated from the committees to the Main-Senate and turned into law.

The only two rights of a committee

All a Committee gets is the right to list a single 120-word heading in its name on the main BBS. This will show membership size, committee overmajority percentage, and Main BBS percentage. Whenever the matter of the posting gets a 45% vote on the main BBS of a Sluice, it shall be called for a secret Senate vote by that Sluice.

Committees are listed by size

All committees are listed on the main BBS of their Senate in order of membership size. The committees with the largest membership go first. In general, our Sluices, in their capacity as judges should give their attention first to the biggest committees and last to the smallest ones.

Small committees are optional

The Over-Senate will apportion times for voting duty in all Sluices. This will start out being 1 day in 6. The Sluice will start at the top a the most widely constituted sluices and then it will work down as far as it can go towards the more narrowly

constituted sluices

Committee membership

Senators must read/view all the permanent and current BBS material before he can join a Committee. If he fails to keep up on his required BBS reading, he will be removed from the Committee by the system, until he reads the material.

Committees can't delete

Senate BBS have a garbage file that is never deleted. This is searchable and it tracks all the other files the "garbage" item was in. We don't want any parasite/pirate committees forming and then deleting their garbage.

Committees will constantly form & reform

This is a good thing, it is evolution at work.

assembling bills

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.27

"Could the straggling thoughts of individuals be collected, they would frequently form material for wise and able men to improve into useful matter." [Is this about improving government, or keeping it from improving?]

A democracy with multiple competing bills

This is a democracy broad enough to always have multiple competing sections and bills. Some of these will come from the Sub-Senate, and some will come from the committees that assemble the material.

The 4 functions of lawmakers

- 1) Gather and organize information about reality.
- 2) Develop and consider a variety of plans based on that information.
- 3) Decide which plan(s) to try.
- 4) Implement and manage those plans.

How laws will be drafted

Once a draft law reaches 45% on a BBS, it can be posted for comments for say 10 days on the main board. If substantial changes are made as a result of these comments, the draft laws shall be posted again (and again) for the comments of the Senate and People of the nation.

There is no time limit on these steps, so they might be less than a day in duration if the matter is of an urgent nature and all minds are focused upon it. For example, if the nation suffered a surprise attack.

Our Senates must physically meet to vote

Anonymous voting is the single most important democratic feature for preventing Senators from selling their votes. It is one of those things we can never take any chances with.

It is going to be quite inconvenient and time consuming for our Senators to come together and spend some days each teneth on voting. But we must not use technology here, or we risk vote tracking and a violation of Senate voting secrecy. This in turn leaves the door open for vote buying, intimidation, blackmail and a host of other bad things for our democracy and our Senators. No. You must come together to vote, and anything less will leave you open to corruption.

Senate voting schedule

Unless it elects otherwise, all Senate's shall meet to vote 6 times a teneth. All Senates shall establish a fixed interval for

voting that may vary but should not fluctuate too much. Any Senators unable or unwilling to vote in this way shall be expelled from the Senate, even if their religion has a holy-day holiday where work is prohibited.

endnotes

Settle divisive issues first

Every group is weaker when it is divided and fighting among itself. This eternal truth is most obvious militarily — for countries fighting a civil war are much easier for outside enemies to conquer.

In democracies, the same principle also holds true. If the people are fighting a metaphorical war over say abortion, or tax rates, the two sides are not only distracted, but less motivated to fight over say oil drilling rights. Thus our parasite constantly struggles to foster divisions and political strife in the land of the host — as this increases the power of the parasite.

Instead, we must first decide on divisive issues and move on based on those decisions. Then we will increase our own native power and minimize the power of our parasite.

How can we call ourselves a democracy?

We have never held a national vote on how we stand with respect to the most divisive issues of our age. What an incredibly easy thing to do this is. Who's idea was it that we never do this, that we remain divided?

A 14-day RC period

Let's have a 5-day REVIEW AND COMMENT or RC PERIOD when non-emergency measures are closed for changes prior to the sluice vote. During this time, anyone who cares to will read the bill and make comments.

The Main-Senators proposing each bill will run the yea side of the BBS. These will judge the value of comments that might help their agenda, and push the best comments to the top of the Yea-side of the BBS. The Main-Senators against the bill will run the Nay-side of the BBS in opposition. These will generally try to dissuade votes as much as possible by the power of the arguments on the BBS. These will push the best arguments against the bill to the top of the nay side of the BBS.

Some bills will be changed over several public input cycles. Each time, they are sent back to start the review period over again. Each time, the law is improved.

Emergency legislation with a title that begins with the word "emergency" will be exempt from the RC Period. However, emergency legislation shall last no longer than half a teneth.

An 8am to 10pm government

Under this scheme, each Main-Senator works 7 hours a day, every day, or more if they want to. Some take the early shift, from 8am to 3pm, others take the late shift from 3pm to 10pm. When they need to vote, the overlap gets extended a bit on both sides.

Thus if our Senators all work 7 hours a day, every day, they will work the equivalent of 49 hour weeks today. This is not too much to expect from our elected leaders, to work this amount.

Some government infrastructure will now function upwards of 2.4 times as fast and with 2.4 times the capacity as it would under a single shift and 40-hour work weeks.

OMNI-RATIO = the proportion of time that the economy take

place. 40-hour weeks have an omni-ratio of 23.8%. an 8am to 10pm daily schedule has an omni-ratio of 58.3%. In the interest of more efficient infrastructure use, society should lightly encourage activities that increase the omni-ratio. We want the omni-ratio to eventually approach 100%, although it is not that important if it never really does.

PUNCH-RATIO = the proportion of the average person's time that is spent "punched in" on the clock at work. This will fall and fall over the decades.

The Judge's secretary will be deciding

We would never allow any judge or juror to delegate his duties to an appointee when he was making a decision about the fate of a man, one man, accused of a crime. Funny how when we make decisions concerning the entire nation, that it is just fine and dandy to delegate the decision making process.

Once again we see the telltale inverted logic of the parasite at work. The tiny individual decisions should always be made by the appointed assistant and the huge society-wide decisions should never be made by an assistant.

Lawmakers must NEVER delegate their decision making, and this is vastly more important than with jurors. Also, they must never change their decisions to please other people, no matter how many and how important the decision seems to these pleaders. Anyone who does this is a bad judge and a betrayer the trust placed in you by his people. When serving in the Senate, it is everyone's duty to decide for themselves whatever they think is right — and nobody should ever question them for the way they voted.

Regulations too long and complex

Democracies need some form of built-in bias towards shorter laws and regulations. To achieve this, the most common sense thing we can do is to simply require that each Senator personally read all laws and regulations they are voting on. And here we might make them read the final version say 3 to 7 times. Let's start with 4 times and go from there.

All Senators must do their reading using the Senate's video-recorded eye movement verification system. And given that the public will normally be reading the legislation many thousands of times more frequently than our lawmakers, this is really not very much to ask. Thus shorter and easier to read bills will be more likely to pass — While longer bills will tend to remain unread and unsuccessful.

Now under America's current narrow form of democracy, we simply don't have enough law makers for them to read, let-alone write all our federal legislation. Today, our 400-odd overloaded lawmakers delegate much of our nation's critical national decision making process to non-elected congressional staffers. These have no bias in favor of shorter regulation. In fact, being Arab lackeys (al•ak•ees) they want longer regulation. They are with the Sphinx Mafia, and they want our government as hard to deal with as possible.

DOPS — Describe the problem first

The accurate understanding of a problem is the first step towards proposing solutions. Here are some simple rules for problem definition that should improve the quality of our Senate decisions. For example, government actions should generally come in response to a DOP, or a democratically elected Description of a Problem. This is something compiled democratically on a Senate BBS. Wherever possible, our lawmakers should resist getting started with legislation without clearly defining the problem, their

objectives, and the methods that are intended to solve the problems and bring about the objectives. This is the commentary that justifies the existence of the legislation they propose. It is also what their successors will read when the legislation comes up for PERIODIC REVIEW. It will also explain the intent of the law more clearly to those enforcing and judging the various points of their legislation in the court system. Hopefully most subjects will have multiple competing DOPS, and legislation bulletin boards. Also, the Main-Senate should be able to skip the formal DOP process in case of emergency.

Tony Blair

"It is not an arrogant government that chooses priorities, it is an irresponsible government that fails to choose."

[We must also have a formal process by which the Over-Senate chooses priorities within each sluice and between sluices.]

Randomly drawn Senate vote monitors

Every day the Senate meets to vote, it shall randomly drawn Senate voting administrators. At the start of each voting day, one of the last acting vote monitors reaches blindly and rapidly into a fishbowl and draws a numbered ping pong ball from among others that are identical in touch and weight. These balls shall be numbered 1-10. The Senators from Nomes ending in those digits shall then serve one day of voting administration duty for that Senate voting house. One man pulls out one ball and shows it to everyone, then puts it back and another man does the same. Senators with Nomes ending in these two numbers (for example 6 and 3) will serve the day as vote monitors.

There must however be three vote monitors, and if not enough Senators are from Nomes ending in these numbers, then Senators from the next numbered Nomes (for example 64, 65, etc.) shall also be called up for vote monitoring duty until the number reaches the quorum for vote monitors. Once all the other people have cast their vote, the vote monitors will cast their votes. For the first draw, the oldest person shall make the draw.

The BBS voting monitors will call for the vote as well as the cast their voting cards. He will end the vote and run the tabulation mechanism. He will also assure voting secrecy, and address issues of miscount.

Carefully document Senate intent

Once a bill is passed, the BBS shall be saved as potentially valuable commentary on the LEGE = legislation. This should exist in two forms. The CURRENT VERSION of the LEGE COMMENTARY is always current, and the AS PASSED VERSION is frozen at the time the LEGE was passed. This way, everyone will know the original intent, and what has come of it. Then when the legislation comes up for mandatory LEGE REVIEW, there will already be an ongoing dialogue about the good and bad parts of the lege. In addition to the LEGE BBS, existing in these two versions, there will also be the various sub-BBSs, and the comments that do not get approved by the Senate.

In democracies, good leaders don't decide, they explain

The concept of the single best genius decision maker head and shoulders above the rest of his people is the stuff of monarchs as frontmen for the parasite. The stuff of democracy is the insightful explanation that helps the many make an informed decision. In a democracy, the leaders don't decide,

they speak a truth that influences all the other decision makers.

Filibusters

Here we have a minority blocking the way for a majority. Is this democracy, or is this a way to make our non-democratic political parties more powerful? What a ridiculous thing our current 1789 constitution allows. Why on earth does our current constitution allowed people to hold and block the one discussion channel of our nation?

SOCRATIC dialogues are actually ISO-CRATIC dialogues

Gr. ISOS = equal and Gr. ISO-CRACY = equal•rule/role.

Isocratic dialogues are when the Senate engages in a fairly weighted discussion of a matter.

It was important for our parasite to get rid of this word/idea. And streams are much easier to divert than to stop over the long run. Here why we have the term SOCRATIC DIALOGUE. In fact, all the Pull•a•ton•ak dialogues are just the parasite trying to obliterate all constructive memories of Athenian isocracy, they ob•literated in 404BC. A Socratic dialogue is actually an ISO-CRATIC DIALOGUE, a fairly weighted discussion or dialogue about a matter.

Greek bouleuein & gold bullion

Gr. BOULEUEIN = to deliberate. It is a remarkable intersection that our parasite's word for our deliberation is also our word for gold bricks held in national treasuries.

BULI = bulletin board service or BBS

BULO = a single comment on a BBS

There are many variations of bulo, for example, Facebook, Twitter, blogs and article comments.

Open your government to comment

In the beginning, there will be lots of low-hanging fruit, and the Senate will probably not need public input as much as later on.

Senate feeds

There are both written and video things on a Senate BBS. Info is supposed to be written wherever possible, due to the efficiency of reading over talking and listening. But video and audio are still possible on the system. Each Senate will rank everything that is said and the best stuff gets put up on this feed. Each county Senate will have one of these, sort of in competition with the local TV news. The National Senate will have a few of these, with all the contributors being Senators (and their constituency) and the judges being likewise. This will compete with Al Jazeera, CNN, and their corrupt ilk.

CORRUPTION

The more money corrupt people spend, the more they can steal

Here is why both governments and condo managers are so greedy for taxes and fees of all sorts. This hunger is a common symptom of corruption.

Swamping out corruption

Corruption isn't normally stamped out. It is normally swamped out by having too many real people making democratic decisions for your government.

War tyranny and corruption

The war causes the tyranny, the Odious Rex. The Odious Rex permits the Arab corruption. Often the war is not necessary.

How to weed out everyone but the crooks

If you only want to let crooks have something, here is how to do it: Get something valuable and keep it in a safe inside a fortress of a building surrounded by a great yard full of vicious dogs and a barbed wire fence. Never answer the door. Once you do these things, the only people coming in will be crooks.

Look at the way "our media" drags politicians through the muck. What good person would want to go through this? The billion dollar campaign finance system locks the doors, and CNN is the pack of vicious dogs in the yard. Pretty much the only people we have entering government are the crooks that the Sphinx Mafia allows in — the men who have answered the riddle of the Sphinx. These are all the next incarnation of "Odious Rex" — in other words, they are all pretty much all high-functioning" crooks.

The giant caravans of Arabia

In greater Arabia, it was customary for everyone to go after and kill all the outsiders and cheaters. Thus getting across the Mideast has normally been quite unsafe. Everyone was highly opposed to movement because movement tended to take a bite out of the apple, the forbidden fruit. So all movement, except for those participating in the giant caravans tends to get attacked. Thus the only way to move trade safely was to include it on one of the great caravans and pay one's share of the huge duty payable to the ak•us•toms offices, the portmen of the cities they passed.

At times we read of a single annual camel caravan arriving in Damascus or Cairo, Jerusalem, or Baghdad each year. This was a caravan with thousands of camels and men, a caravan so large that nobody dared attack it.

The giant omnibus spending bills of America

Now think for a moment about the massive omnibus annual appropriation bills that the US congress approves each year. Here, most of an entire year's spending is appropriated in one bill. Isn't this the same process at work? And isn't the gridlock of our congress analogous to the lack of safety and inability to move in the Mideast? Here we see how the source of the unsafe conditions in the Mideast, is the same as the source of our own gridlock.

Here we see how the Omnibus appropriation bills are quite analogous to the the giant caravans — and both are symptoms of a parasite infection. In both cases, only the business that the parasite approves of gets to join the only caravan for that season. Everything else gets killed by whatever means the parasite uses to kill off outsider traffic.

Thus omnibus spending bills are a sign of the parasite's power in your democracy. In fact, the degree to which your government uses this sort of spending is the degree to which it is enslaved by the parasite. For there is not other way to spend money that takes as much power from your legislatures and hands it to the non-elected appointees of your monarch president.

INITIATING CORRUPTION = the power to corruptly start new government activity. For example the adoption of the US Patriot Act, where the US government started finding all the patriots as well as the bad guys.

DIRECTION CORRUPTION = the power to corruptly veer government activity off course. For example, the way the US geological survey was made a geographical survey.

BRAKING CORRUPTION = the power to halt government activities. For example, the way so many judges have halted

many state US responses to illegal immigration.

VETO CORRUPTION = the power to prevent the halting of a government activity. For example, the power to prevent the halting of the corrupt Obamacare program.

The US functions rather like a constitutional monarchy

The administration of the lone 4-year monarch has near total control over law-execution, just as under a hereditary monarchy. 2) Unless everyone else is 2:1 in favor of a new law, the president's non-elected bar-ocracy can veto them. This keeps the power of the parasites administration in check, so it doesn't start waking people from the matrix.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.40

"If you want a monarchy but fear the accursed title, you can avoid the title by ruling as a Caesar... In this way you can enjoy the reality of a monarchy without the stigma that is attached to the name."

[Where the people will not allow kings, the Arabs give them temporary kings called by another name. Then they eternally struggle, or jihad to expand the powers of those kings.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.17

"Through this process, the power of both the people and the Senate was entirely transferred into the hands of Augustus. And it was at this time that a monarchy, to use the correct term, was established. It would certainly be most truthful to describe it as a monarchy even if two or three men held supreme power at the same time. It is true that the Romans hated the actual word monarch so vehemently that they did not refer to their emperors either as dictators or kings or anything similar. But since the final decision in the government process is referred to them, it is impossible that they should be anything other than kings.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.17

"They adopt the title of Imperator [Emperor] for life... and they use this title instead of king or dictator. The emperors have never used these last since they first fell out of style in the running of government, but they secure for themselves the prerogatives of those positions through the title of Imperator [emperor]. This designation empowers them to raise troops, collect funds, declare war, conclude peace, rule foreigners and citizens alike, at all times and in all places, and even to put to death both knights and senators...

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.21

[In reading the following it should be repeated that the Roman Senate continued to meet until the total collapse of European civilization in around 600AD.]

"The Senate as a whole continued to sit in judgement on its own, as it had done before, and on certain occasions conducted negotiations with delegations and heralds from both democracies and monarchies. Besides this, the people and the plebs continued to meet for the elections, but nothing was done that did not meet with Augustus's approval. It was he, at any rate, who selected and put forward for nomination some of the candidates for office though for some others [the Arab innies that looked to win anyway] he observed the traditional custom and left the election to the vote of the popular and tribal assembly. But he also made sure that no candidates should be appointed who were unfit [as outies] or who owed their

election to partisan intrigue or to bribery." [Thus all the outies that came close to any real power were scandalized and gotten rid of.]

A chain is as weak as its weakest link

A democracy is as narrow as its narrowest house

If there is a king, or lone president, anywhere in the linkage, it is a monarchy.

Kings and presidents are just bar-ocracy ornaments

Any time there is one completely overloaded man acting as leader, there normally is a non-elected Arab-friendly bureaucracy lurking somewhere in the background. It doesn't matter if he is a king or a president, he is just an ornament, a decoration, a figurehead to hide the Arab bar-ocracy.

1-in-1-million brilliant minds?

Are our lawmakers and presidential candidates 1-in-1-million minds? Are they even 1:1,000 minds? Are they even smart at all, or are they just a certain type of man drawn to positions of sale-able power like bees to honey?

When running for office is very expensive, the high cost is a symptom of corruption.

The 1% funding rule

No Centi-Nome or Sluice may spend more than 1% of its annual budget in a single vote. The intent is to eliminate the omnibus caravans from our legislatures.

How to cut government spending

1. The Over-Senate will set budgets and the Main-Senate Sluices will full-fill those budgets. The Main-Senate will have no power to increase spending beyond the budget allocated by the Over-Senate.
2. Spending will be by secret ballot and our Senators will vote as they think is best. Thus nobody will ever know if their bribe or blackmail is working or not.
3. Spending will be managed more efficiently by 8-sluices than one single channel.
4. Spending will be by the teneth, causing government reaction time to be much faster.
5. There will be no omnibus spending bills and no CARAVAN CORRUPTION.
6. There will be hundreds of thousands of Senators to improve policy.

Random draws match in base ten

When you have up to 10 digits to be recombined with up to 10 digits, do it with one draw of 10.

When you have up to 100 digits to be recombined with up to 100 digits, do it with two draws of 10.

When you have up to 1000 digits to be recombined with up to 1000 digits, do it with three draws of 10.

When you have up to 10,000 digits to be recombined with up to 10,000 digits, do it with four draws of 10.

The card method of randomization

We will print 50 card decks of pure white plastic cards with 5x the digits 1234567890. There are no suits. All the 2's for example are identical. The procedure is to lay the cards numbers-up in 5 rows for all to see.

- a) Then one Senator turns them over, mixes them and puts them in a stack.
- b) Then a 2nd Senator cuts the deck.

- c) Then a 3rd Senator bridge shuffles the deck twice.
- d) Then a 4th Senators cuts the deck.
- e) Then a 5th Senator bridge shuffles the deck once and draws between 1 and 50 digits.
- f) All senators must rotate their assignments for card cutting and shuffling

Random draws are sacred

Everyone should pay special attention to any corruption involving random draws. These will not take much time and it is just so important that it remain actually random. There is not much too it, just watch carefully. Also, anyone even offering to corrupt this vote should be considered a democide, a democracy killer.

Lawmaker orientation class

It is remarkable how we make our realtors take a whole series of ethics classes, but our leaders are just expected to know the rules. This is a mistake. Let's require that all our new Sub-Senators take for an ethics class that covers every single type of corruption anyone can think of — a class with lots of case studies as examples. Once they have completed this course, there will be no excuse for any situation discussed in the Senate ethics class. We will then be able to enforce a strict set of rules for our elected officials.

Let's also require that they pass the common-sense ethics test with a score of 100%, just like people have to do with shop safety tests. After this, we can hold them to very high standards regarding all forms of corruption including violations of secret voting protocols.

Impeachments: Strict but fair

We will make common sense rules for impeachments. And then we will make all our Senators take a shop safety class on corruption. Then they will have to pass the "corruption test" with a 100% score before we let them work in the shop. After this, we will repeatedly run stings and punish severely any violation of the corruption rules.

Nothing that came out of a sham democracy should ever be sacred

You are free to change any Washington, Ottawa, Brasilia, Brussels policy you want. They were all corrupt. It doesn't matter how long the law was in force. If it doesn't make sense, change it.

Life of Vespasian, 16

[Here we see how the Arabs have been pushing for strict laws and selling indulgences for over 2,000 years. Next we see how the Vespasian administration] "[openly sold government positions to people. He also sold acquittals to men facing prosecution, regardless of their guilt. Some believed he even deliberately promoted the most insatiable officials to higher positions. This way they were even richer when he later imprisoned them](#) [thus confiscating the proceeds of their corruption]. [Such men were commonly called his 'sponges', as he let them soak up money, which he later squeezed out of them.](#)" [This is how the real Arab wise guys work. Here succinctly stated is their role in corruption and organized crime.]

T.E. Lawrence, Seven Pillars of Wisdom, Ch. 8

["They had inherited the Turkish system in the towns... The Turkish Government was often not unkind to strong men, who obtained considerable license on terms. Consequently, some](#)

[of the licensees in Hejaz regretted the coming of a native ruler. \[Licensees are people who buy licenses to steal from the citizenry in prescribed ways\]... especially as voiced by Beduin; for the Beduin lived on what he could exact from the stranger on his roads, or in his valleys; and he and the townsman bore each other a perpetual grudge.](#)

[The Beduins were the only fighting men the Sherif had got; \[foreigner English\] and on their help, the revolt depended. He was arming them freely, paying many of them for their service in his forces. Feeding their families while they were from home, and hiring from them their transport camels to maintain his armies in the field. Accordingly, the country\[side\] was prosperous, while the towns went short."](#) [Note how the Arab way is to have towns and opposed Beduin pirates in between. The towns hate the Beduins and vice versa. The only ones that benefit are the Harem race. The more the Arabs spread their ways, the more this will be the way in the outside world.]

Corruption hungry government = a form of government where the greediest sponges are promoted and helped to soak up money.

Ammianus Marcellinus, 30.4

["Men who have paid large sums for their government posts are like oppressive creditors. They try to recover their investment by prying into everyone's assets so they can extract the plunder they are due."](#)

[Original Penguin version: Men who have paid good money for their government posts are like troublesome creditors. They try to recover their outlay by prying into everyone's resources and wresting from others the spoils they have won.]

Life of Vespasian 19

["It was customary at funerals for an actor to wear a mask of the deceased and to act in a similar way. For Vespasian, an actor called Favor was chosen. In keeping with the emperor's character, he asked to organizers in a loud voice how much his funeral procession cost. When told '10 million sesterces', he howled and said, 'Give me 100 thousand and throw me in the Tiber'."](#) [evidently the Vespasian figurehead was interfering with the stealing and that is why he was whacked after 10 years.]

Aeschines, Against Timarchus 119

["every year the Council sells off the prostitution tax, and that those who buy the right to exact the tax do not guess, but have precise knowledge of the people who engage in this trade."](#) [The Arabs know all about organized crime because they have been the ones running it for thousands of years.]

Procopius, The Secret History, c.560-570 AD, 21.6

["Everywhere in the Roman Empire Justinian followed this method. He picked out the most degraded specimens of humanity he could lay his hands on and sold them the offices they were to corrupt, charging a very high price; for no one with any decency or any vestige of good sense would ever think of pouring out his own money for the pleasure of robbing inoffensive citizens."](#)

After collecting the cash from those with whom he was negotiating, he gave them permission to do anything they like to those under them. This enabled them to ruin all the districts allotted to them, inhabitants and all, and make enough money to keep them in luxury for the rest of their lives. To find money to pay for their cities, they obtained a loan from the

bank [fronting for the parasite] at a very high rate of interest, handing over the money to the seller [of this license to steal. Who might that be?] [This Brotherly management technique is known as BARRA-TRY and it is still used widely around the world today; especially in countries regarded as "klepto-cratie". Basically, the corrupt officials have to rob from the public to pay for the interest on the loan they took out from the Brothers to buy their office from the Brothers. Here they generally find themselves subject to a loan that necessitates their becoming not only corrupt, but aggressively corrupt.

Whenever we see absurd and bottomless greed in government people, it is usually a figurehead fronting for "big mouth," or "deep throat," or "the bottomless pit," or "the money pit" or just the endless hunger of the world's parasite empire.

It might also be worth noting the way the blame is once again placed upon the superficial reality. Note how our parasite always has a superficial scapegoat for every bad thing it does. There is always a superficial scapegoat, usually our powerful, but dimwitted, leaders. Continuing... then when they arrived in the cities, from then on they brought every variety of misery upon their subjects, having no other object in life than to make sure that they could satisfy their creditors [Their creditors were the Haremi Brothers. We can easily see the same process at work in the corruption endemic in many parts of the world today. The Brotherly governors sell government jobs which amount to a license to steal whatever they can grab. Do we all want this sort of world? Do we want a world ruled by a government that seeks to maximize the money it can steal from its people from ?]... and themselves be included from then on amongst the richest in the land. The business did not lay them open to any risk or criticism. It brought them on the contrary a good deal of admiration [We made corruption normal and even admirable], which became greater and greater as they succeeded in the senseless killing and despoiling of more and more of their chance victims. For to call them murderers and despoilers was to give them credit for vigor and effectiveness. But the moment Justinian noticed that any office-holder had amassed a fortune, he found some excuse for netting him and dropping him and all he possessed into his fisherman's basket." [It appears the Brothers get the fish to eat each other and then they net out the big ones.]

Thomas Paine, The Crisis, #3, 1777.04.19

[Said of the British as the new Mideast front empire] "They had ravaged one part of the globe, till it could glut them no longer; their prodigality [reckless, wasteful spending on Mideast concession goods] required new plunder, and through the East India [Company's] article [product] tea they hoped to transfer their rapine [violent seizure] from that quarter of the world to this. Every designed quarrel had its pretense: and the same barbarian avarice accompanied the plant to America, which ruined the country that produced it."

[Here is how it works: The parasite gets the corrupt government or religion to overpay for all sorts of things like:

- 1) Arab incense-hashish for 'public sacrifices'
- 2) Single-use javelins
- 3) Monopolized marble columns for public buildings
- 4) Stained glass (often the most costly part of a church)
- 5) 'Holy' artifacts
- 6) \$900/sq. ft. showplace airports
- 7) A military presence to enforce the Arab trading monopolies like the East India Company.

These and other extremely wasteful practices exist so the parasite can obtain its cut of our public projects. They also exist so that the corrupt government will tax the growth out

of the economy. This is like how some low-bidder landscapers will cut your shrubs down to the ground so they don't have to work at trimming them any more. And it is just like what the kelp trimming companies do when they cut the kelp down a couple meters to where less than 1% of life-giving red sunlight penetrates. In other words, if our government is inefficient enough, our entire economy will not grow so fast (like these plants) and our parasite will have an easier time hanging on.

The interpreter film, 2005

"It's hard to remember that Edmond Zuwanie [zoo•ani = animal•again] was once a good man. It's not unusual for these guys. They all begin as liberators and 20 minutes later they are as corrupt as the tyrants they overthrow. He liberated the country from one of the most corrupt governments on earth, gave the people hope and he was a hero. They need another name for what he is now." [This may be about Robert Gabriel Mugabe. The man's middle name says a great deal about who his true masters are.]

Chapter 15: The Scowl and Smile

[Here we see a Arab guide on how to find good a puppet leader in an American style democracy. Here Judge Pynchon is the prototype of an Arab thumbs-man, a man who will do whatever he is told by his secret masters. Here we learn how to recognize a man such as Judge Pyncheon, the archetypical figurehead, and how to gain control of him. Apparently the Brothers always try to have a skeleton in the closet of all the democratic leaders they support or simply do not oppose. Also, Hawthorne was supposedly a native speaker. Note all the underlined foreigner English.]

"The Judge, [the archetypical figurehead thumbs-man] beyond all question, was a man of eminent respectability. The church acknowledged it; the state acknowledged it. It was denied by nobody. In all the very extensive sphere of those who knew him, whether in his public or private capacities, there was not an individual -- except... some lawless mystic... and possibly a few political opponents -- who would have dreamed of seriously disputing his claim to a high and honorable place in the world's regard.

[But] Hidden from mankind -- forgotten by himself, or buried so deeply under a sculptured and ornamented pile of ostentatious deeds that his daily life could take no note of it -- there may have lurked some evil and unsightly thing. [or even better]... a daily guilt might have been acted [out] by him, continually renewed, and reddening forth afresh, like the miraculous bloodstain of a murder, without his necessarily and at every moment being aware of it. [This is useful for a) swaying the political figure's vote, and b) eliminating the political figure if he ever gets free from his leash. Notably, the same smearing force is alive and well in America's political system today, some 160 years later.]

Men of strong minds, great force of character, and a hard texture of the sensibilities are very capable of falling into mistakes of this kind. [The sort of man to look for as a thumbs-man] They are ordinarily men to whom [Plato's] forms are of paramount importance [Plato's forms are basically about taking broad and many-headed terms such as 'justice', 'wisdom', and 'leadership' and trying to define them in a single, universal, pure, and definable 'form.' In other words, these 'forms' take blunt generalities and attempt to give them precise meanings -- an exercise in futility really. Anyway, leaders who revere 'forms' have a blunt mental and moral tool kit, and can be talked into positions by their trusted advisors.] Their field of action lies among the external [materialistic] phenomena of life.

They possess vast ability in grasping, and arranging, and appropriating to themselves the big, heavy, solid unrealities, such as gold, landed estate, offices of trust and emolument [pay], and public honors. With these materials, and with deeds of goodly aspect, done in the public eye, an individual of this class builds up, as it were, a tall and stately edifice, which, in the view of other people, and ultimately in his own view, is no[ne] other than the man's character, or the man himself. Behold, therefore, a palace! Its splendid halls, and suites of spacious apartments [rooms], are floored with mosaic-work of costly marbles; its windows, the whole height of each room, admit the sunshine thorough the most transparent of plate glass; its high cornices are gilded, and its ceilings gorgeously painted; and a lofty dome -- through which, from the central pavement, you may gaze up to the sky, as with no obstructing medium between -- surmounts the whole. With what fairer and nobler emblem could any man desire to shadow forth his character?

Ah, but in some low and obscure nook -- some narrow closet on the ground floor, shut, locked and bolted and the key flung away; or beneath the marble pavement, in a stagnant water puddle, with the richest pattern of mosaic work above -- may lie a corpse, half decayed, and still decaying, and diffusing its death scent all through the palace! The inhabitant will not be conscious of it, for it has long been his daily breath! Neither will the visitors, for they smell only the rich odors which the master sedulously [diligently] scatters through the palace, and the incense which they bring, and delight to burn before him! Now and then, perchance, comes in a seer [a wise guy, a brother bent on extorting a vote from judge Pyncheon],, before whose sadly gifted [single] eye the whole structure melts into thin air, leaving only the hidden nook, the bolted closet, with the cobwebs festooned over its forgotten door, or the deadly hold under the pavement, and the decaying corpse within. Here then, we are to seek the true emblem of the man's character, and of the deed that gives whatever reality it possesses to his life. And beneath the show of a marble palace, that pool of stagnant water, foul with many impurities, and, perhaps, tinged with blood - that secret abomination, above which, possibly, he may say his prayers, without remembering it -- is this man's miserable soul!

To apply this train of remark somewhat more closely to Judge Pyncheon: We might say (without in the least imputing crime to a personage of his eminent respectability) that there was enough of splendid rubbish in his life to cover up and paralyze a more active and subtle conscience than the Judge was ever troubled with. [Apparently, smarter men become paralyzed by their rotting corpses. So we imagine that the Brothers look for a special sort of man who can forget and move on and not become paralyzed by these shameful things that he thinks he did. Apparently this type makes a better political puppets. Apparently the rotting corpse is actually the reason why these dimwits got the job, or became the anointed one in the sham democratic process.

Also, certainly, the Haremi Brothers must be experts at setting people up, or luring them into situations where they think they were responsible for their own rotting corpse. Just look at how Edward Kennedy's Chappaquiddick incident happened the year after his brother Robert Kennedy was assassinated by the Arab Sirhan Sirhan and five years after his brother president John F. Kennedy was assassinated by a real American claiming to be a patsy -- a man gunned down on national television by J•ak Our•oo•bin•stein. Our secret masters could not assassinate all three Kennedy men -- people would get suspicious -- so the third Kennedy was

disqualified in a set-up. Strange how Chappaquiddick is in the Apple dictionary. Strange how John F. Kennedy Jr. died in an airplane crash just after his potential as a leader was first discussed by the national media. Apparently the parasite needs most of our leaders to be either thumbs-men or Bros like Bar•ak Hussein Ob•ana.]

The purity of his judicial character, while on the bench; the faithfulness of his public service in subsequent capacities; his devotedness to his party, and the rigid consistency with which he had adhered to its principals, or ... organized movements; his remarkable zeal as president of the Bible society; his unimpeachable integrity as treasurer of a widow's and orphan's fund; his benefits to horticulture... and to agriculture, through the agency of the famous Pyncheon bull [A bull is a powerful but stupid and predictable creature that will again and again charge the red cape]; the cleanliness of his moral deportment, for a great many years past; the severity with which he had frowned upon, and finally cast off, and expensive and dissipated son, delaying forgiveness until within the final quarter of an hour of the young man's life [when he finally succumbed to the Arab poison]; his prayers at morning and eventide, ... his efforts in furtherance of the temperance cause [The Arabs always struggle for total prohibition of all popular intoxicants so their 'mafia' can have a highly profitable monopoly]; his confining himself, since the last attack of the gout, to five diurnal glasses of old sherry wine [a product placement ad for imported sherry]; the snowy whiteness of his linen, the polish of his boots, the handsomeness of his gold-headed cane, the square and roomy fashion of his coat, and the fineness of its material, and, in general, the studied propriety of his dress and equipment; the scrupulousness with which he paid public notice, in the street, by a bow, a lifting of the hat, a nod, or a motion of the hand, to all and sundry of his acquaintances, rich or poor; the smile of broad benevolence wherewith he made it a point to gladden the whole world -- what room could possibly be found for darker traits in a portrait made up of lineaments like these? This proper face was what he beheld in the looking glass. This admirably arranged life was what he was conscious of in the progress of every day. Then, might not he claim to be its result and sum, and say to himself and the community, "Behold Judge Pyncheon there?"

And allowing that many, many years ago, in his early and reckless youth, he had committed some wrong act -- or that, even now, the inevitable force of circumstances should occasionally make him do one questionable deed among a thousand praiseworthy, or, at least, blameless ones -- would you characterize the Judge by that one necessary deed [That one horrible deed is a necessary prerequisite for gaining ostensible power in an simulated democracy run by Mideast Inc.] and that half-forgotten act, and let it overshadow the fair aspect of a lifetime? What is there so ponderous in evil that a thumb's bigness of it should outweigh the mass of things not evil which were heaped into the other [side of the] scale! This scale-and-balance system is a favorite one with people of Judge Pyncheon's brotherhood [Here the Haremi brotherhood is stating its strategy -- that it supports the idea that a single gray act should taint an entire career. For everyone is human and every leader has some gray act in their past. Thus only the people who the Haremi parasite race like will cut the mustard = ak•oo•te the mus•te•ard]

A hard, cold man, thus unfortunately situated, seldom or never looking inward, and resolutely taking his idea of himself from what purports to be his image as reflected in the mirror of public opinion, can scarcely arrive at true self-knowledge, except through loss of property and reputation.

Sickness will not always help him do it; not always the death hour! [Things to look for in a puppet leader. Also remember George Bush's face when he was told about September 11?]

Thus far the Judge's countenance [facial expression] had expressed mild forbearance [toleration] — grave and almost gentle depreciation of his cousin's unbecoming violence, free and Christian-like forgiveness of the wrong inflicted by her words. But when those words were irrevocably spoken, his look assumed sternness, the sense of power, and immitigable [impossible to reduce] resolve; and this with so natural and imperceptible a change that it seemed as if the iron man had stood there from the first, and the meek man not at all. The effect was as when the light, vapory clouds, with their soft coloring, suddenly vanish from the stony brow of a precipitous mountain, and leave there the frown which you at once feel to be eternal.

At the death... it was found that his visible estate, of every kind, fell far short of any estimate ever made of it. [The Sphinx Mafia had drained his wealth as soon as it came in, that is the bargain that these political figures make with the devil.] He was supposed to be immensely rich. Nobody doubted that he stood among the weightiest [wealthiest?] men of his day. It was one of his eccentricities, however -- and not altogether a folly, neither [either]-- to conceal the amount of his property by making distant and foreign investments [This is what Swiss bank accounts and other similar tax haven bank accounts are], perhaps under other names than his own, and by various means familiar enough to capitalists, but unnecessary here to be specified. [In a 'classic of American Literature'] ... his entire property was bequeathed to me, with the single exception of a life interest to yourself in this old family mansion..."

Rotting corpses — the #1 job qualification thumbs-men

There is a reason why there are so many pedophiles in the Catholic Church. It is because the prime qualification for being a priest is that the man have some dirty little secret, some metaphorical corpse (like Judge Pyncheon from ch.15 of the House of Seven Gables) buried in the basement of his house. This way the priest will do whatever he is ordered to do, no matter what. If he doesn't, the metaphorical rotting corpse will be exposed, and the priest will go down hard. Thus all come without fail when a Brother jerks their chain, their dog chain. And then they do exactly what they are told by the person holding their chain.

Now for the Arabs pedophiles have 3 big advantages over other sorts of criminals as thumbs-men:

- 1) The Arabs make it incredibly shameful to come forward so people tend to stay quiet.
- 2) it is an accusation that is normally without any physical evidence, and a young boy is making it against a respected 'man of god', so it is easy to sweep under the rug and
- 3) The priests are not only thumbs-men, but they literally 'fuck up' dozens of boys/men so badly that they don't reproduce.

See, the Catholic church in Rome is not a thing run by your own people for the benefit of your people. It is not even a thing run by the good spirit of mankind, the good side of the force. At its highest levels the Catholic Church is actually run by Arab harem people for the benefit of their parasite's de-ex·pull, the devil, the dark side of the force. These seek out under-my-thumb type men to be their yes-man priests. All have some character glitch that enslaves them and puts them under the thumb of their masters. These are men who are super honest with the main thing the Arabs care about — remittances, and they preach orthodoxy just as they are told. And as a fringe benefit, they molest and "screw-up" lots of

Rumi people as kids.

Now this enslaving secret can be anything really, but the ones that have homo-sex with underage boys tend to also spread their mind virus upon the soft minds of other people's lines. In this way they sort of reproduce their memo-type. And in this way, many of the most attractive Rumi boys go homo and leave more girls for the Haremi. The other reprehensible under-my-thumb qualify-you-to-be-a-priest activities don't spread as well. This why there are just so many pedophiles in the Catholic church.

Thus we come to see the Roman Catholic Church as an organization that has a bias towards selecting wicked people to be priests. To me this is not the church of the great good spirit of mankind, it is the church of a parasite and its evil=ex·pull.

William Shirer, Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. Ch. 5

"He, [Hitler] who was so monumentally intolerant by his very nature, was strangely tolerant of one human condition - a man's morals. No other party in Germany came near to attracting so many shady characters. As we have seen, a conglomerate of pimps, murderers, homosexuals, alcoholics and [their] blackmailers flocked to the party as if to a natural haven. Hitler did not care as long as they were useful to him." [The figurehead nature of the Third Reich is not really obvious when we look at Hitler alone. It is much more obvious when we consider the men in Hitler's cabinet which were of the sort described above. Here it is easy to imagine a bunch of completely a-moral poser-figureheads that left everything to their Arab-run administrations.]

The Good old days, they were terrible Ch.6

"Tammany Hall, was later described... as 'not a party' but a 'business enterprise like Standard Oil and Western Union'. It has been estimated that during its reign, the Tweed Ring robbed the city of \$160 million, which compares favorably with the losses of the Chicago fire—put at \$30 million. No services reached the public without first being submitted to a thorough pilfering. Every important city job was twisted into a sinecure for some political trickster, whether it was the post of police magistrate or that of municipal commissioner. Crespy tells of the case of a man brought back from a distant state to answer for a felony who ended up in New York as the auditor of public accounts. Favors were for sale in any department. 'Manipulators thought no more of buying an alderman [than] ... buying a watermelon' [water·mal·on].

Other cities during these decades were being subjected to similar boss rule. Chicago had its Nash machine; Boston its Lomasney ring; and Kansas City had Pendergast. From 1867 to 1922, the Cameron-Quay-Penrose dynasty owned Philadelphia...

The bosses maintained control by diligently currying favor with the 'little people', to whom they appeared as heroes from their own social class who protected them from the tyranny of the rich and powerful. There was always a glad hand, the free liquor, the little gifts of cash and coal, the job for a new immigrant and hasty [expedited] naturalization. 'Every good man takes care of his friends', pronounced George Washington Plunket... Such subtle pressures made 'reform' a dirty word, and there were times when reasonable men doubted whether a majority of its residents really wanted their city to be cleansed of evil."

Aristotle d.322BC, 398.19

"the most distinguished and important men had their appointed place. Some were the king's bodyguard and attendants, others the guardians of each of the enclosing walls [fiefdoms, trade paradises, walled areas, like the Great trade Wall of China created], the so-called 'listeners' and janitors [secret police and assassins j•ani•terr=j•new•earth] These helped their king, who they called their master and deity, to see and hear all things [in his kingdom].

Besides these, others were appointed as stewards of his revenues and leaders in war and hunting, and receivers of gifts, and others charged with all the other necessary functions. All the Empire of Asia, bounded on the west by the Hellespont [Hellenes•pontus = Greek Bridge at Istanbul] and on the east by the Indus, was apportioned by race to generals and satraps and Kings. Slaves of the Great King, there were [many jobs for] couriers and watchmen and messengers and superintendents of signal-fires." [And it was a great age for the land of no resources.]

The parasite's agenda

- 1) Lax or ambiguous corruption standards.
- 2) Low corruption penalties.
- 3) Lower standards for elected officials.
- 4) Hard to charge or impeach officials.
- 5) Pardons of corrupt officials.
- 6) Monarchs or lig•archs tied to the Haremi.

All of these things help foster a corrupt government. All invite theft from the public purse. None of these are natural or normal and whenever we encounter them, it is surely our parasite's idea, for it needs its figureheads to feel fearless about doing its unpleasant dirty work.

Changing your own employment contract

All elected bodies in government and fictional citizens, shall be prohibited from changing their own: pay, job scope, rules of conduct, incentives, hours, leave time, reimbursements, retirement benefits, and housing benefits. In the Senate, all must be approved by a simple majority as follows, and it shall take 10 teneths before any changes come into effect:

- A) The Over-Senate will judge these for the Main-Senate.
- B) The Main-Senate will judge these for the Sub-Senate.
- C) The Sub-Senate will judge these for the Over-Senate.

All fictional citizens must be bicameral

And the secondary house shall be made up of a Senate magistracy with veto rights. This applies to all forms of fictional citizen, including those for profit and those not for profit. In all cases, based on the greater of the number of employees, the turnover and the income, a Senate committee of a certain size shall be assigned to supervise the activities of the fictional citizen. After this, all matters brought up to the randomly assigned, annual Senate magistracy for that particular fictional citizen shall be considered reasonable, unimpeachable and injurable. Anything truthfully and accurately presented to a Senate supervisor committee and ignored by those Senators shall not be the subject of liability.

The Senate oath of fidelity

At the convening of all political meetings, instead of pledging allegiance to something as inconsequential as our flag, "and to the republic for which it stands," we should instead pledge allegiance to something that will make a difference: The good of our society overall. Therefore, all government officials, in all

voting sessions shall swear the following 12-point oath:

- 1) I swear to only vote when I have personally read and fully understand what I am voting for.
- 2) I swear that all votes I cast are my own decision from my own mind and I have not relied on others to make my decisions.
- 3) I swear that any words I speak here will be my own.
- 4) I swear not to sell my vote, or swap votes in one issue for another.
- 5) I swear to stand up to protests and terrorism from outside the democratic process.
- 6) I swear not to take any gifts of any kind while in office except ordinary meals, beverages and ordinary ground transport.
- 7) I swear to abstain from voting on matters that would significantly and disproportionately affect the finances of myself, my family or my close associates.
- 8) I swear not to profit-from or share any legislative insider information.
- 9) I swear never to offer or sell influence in my democracy.
- 10) I swear to take the longest term view practical, for the greatest portion of my nation, without causing overwhelming short term pain to some people.
- 11) I swear that I hold no political allegiance at all to any foreign government or group.
- 12) I swear to hold the interests of the nation above all else, including my own constituency.

Constituency loyalty is a backdoor

Do we want our elected officials obeying their constituency or their own conscience? And if they are supposed to obey their constituency, what does that mean? How is that determined without sub-elections? Is it simply determined by which side shouts and complains the loudest? And isn't our parasite — with its single minded objectives — generally the one that shouts the loudest and most persistently, frequently passing itself off as a number of genuine constituencies. After all our parasite is the granddaddy of the loud and even violent protest... as well as the violently aggrieved faction.

Now the prevailing wisdom among business people is that we should find good managers, tell them our objectives (or let them figure it all out for themselves) and turn them loose. Don't we want to use this same wise approach for our elected government managers? Don't we want a huge body of smart elected people, di-elected and tri-elected people figuring out the problems of our society and solving them without their "bosses" (or people pretending to be their bosses) intervening and micromanaging?

So let's be clear as a democracy. Let's say that when we elect people, we don't want them caving-in to small groups of highly motivated people, no matter how much noise they make, or how violent they become. Let's say that caving in to small loudmouthed groups is not only anti-democratic, its really is a form of caving in to terrorists. It is just that these terrorists use protests and letters to change out political will, instead of bombs. After all, the process and the result, are exactly the same.

Let's be clear as a democracy. Let's empower our democratic leaders to do what they think is right. We need to say, "You are our representatives, our elected jurors, we elected you to consider the matter carefully and you all decide for us." If we don't do this, we open a back door for loudmouths and terrorists in our democracy.

When leaders don't decide for themselves, it is corruption

Obviously our leaders need to be smart, logical, honest, fair, understanding, etc. This goes without saying. Less obvious is that our leaders must see with their own eyes, and form their own opinions by themselves. And they must have enough confidence in their own opinions to decide (by themselves) that they know the best approach, and their chosen approach should be applied to all of their society. This ability to see for yourself (with your own eyes) and decide for yourself (with your own mind) is not only a critical, must-have part of leadership, it is generally not included in our common sense about leadership. Do not omit SELF DECISION from your understanding of leadership.

If you are an elected official, and you heed the advice of a trusted right-hand-man — perhaps a man that has been with you from your start in politics, you must ask if you are perhaps his tool. When the recently elected mayor of London took office, he restricted the girification of women in transit advertising. In the CNN.com shot he is posing with the real mayor of London. The man you elected is just the public nice guy.

If you heed the party agenda set by some extra-democratic party leadership — most never elected by the people— you are definitely an Arab tool. If you listen to astrologers, or consult your horoscope, you are probably an Arab tool. If you heed the word of god as explained by some church, or some supposed prophet of god, you are probably a tool of the people selling your church its overpriced sacramental incense — in other words, the Arabs.

PLEASE, DECIDE FOR YOURSELF OR YOU HAVE NO BUSINESS LEADING YOUR PEOPLE. DECIDE FOR YOURSELF OR YOU MAY HAVE ANSWERED THE RIDDLE OF THE SPHINX AND BECOME A MIDEAST PUPPET, AN ODIOS REX. IS THAT THE WAY YOU WANT TO LEAD YOUR PEOPLE?

The thing we absolutely don't want in our leaders is people who look to others for advice, or guidance. That is what our parasite looks for in our political leaders. It does this so it has a back door to political power in our societies. It wants our leaders to follow its political parties, its campaign managers, its churches, its respected minds, its prophets, its climate scientists, its Scripps Institute of Oceanography, its Umma, its astrologers, and its tarot readers, so it can gently pull strings and steer our group decisions to its advantage.

You only need to blindly follow one of the Mideast's pantheon of religions or false interpretative ideologies. Any one of their many matrix ideologies, any matrix program will do. Do this, and you are OK with the Sphinx Mafia, and they will help you in your rise to power.

Please, if you are an elected official, you must never blindly take your government down any path recommended by any political party, religion, labor union, or ideology. In fact, you really should not to allow your decisions to be shaped in any way by any extra-democratic institutions. If you do this, you will be giving your democracy back doors for corruption.

In fact, please, do not even follow my ideas blindly. I am only a man, a completely fallible man, and I certainly make many mistakes in the things I say herein. There will certainly be many things that I tell you to do that are wrong or contradictory. If you find something like that, and it looks like it is definitely not the right path, then by all means don't take that path. And if you are definitely on the wrong path, then stop and change your direction.

Follow my ideas only with your eyes and mind open to pitfalls in the path I reveal. And the same with all ideologies,

especially religions.

And please never let anyone claim to be an expert in interpreting my words: No professors, no authors, and certainly no priests or churches or umma-like pseudo-democracies. My words are between me and you and nobody gets in between that. I don't even want them spoken. You should all read them, except that you can as broad national democracies make animated versions of my work.

Napoleon Bonaparte

["What a precious thing it is to be able to decide."](#)

[This was supposedly said by an Arab figurehead responsible for the deaths of millions. The words were probably put in his mouth by his man-behind-the-man Talleyrand.]

Ammianus Marcellinus on Roman Emperor Valens d. 378 AD

["he was better at choosing between different options than coming up with them \[himself\]."](#)

Even thermostats leave many people dissatisfied

The torpid, the old and the ill are frequently too cold. The young and active are frequently too hot. Some people will in the same way always be dissatisfied with your democratic decisions. It is just the way the world works. Do not listen to people screaming outside of the democratic forum, or you will invite CRYBABY CORRUPTION from a "kid" who knows he will never get smacked for diesel crying.

Trust your Senate

Don't give in to the people who scream loudest. If you do this, it will rapidly become a form of corruption.

The Pope and the Umma

I want to direct attention to two of our parasite's most powerful apparatuses for influencing our societies: the Pope and the Umma. Both have been used for many centuries to shape group decisions in countless host societies.

The Pope, for Catholics, is the Vicar of Christ, the vicarious presence of Christ on earth, and by extension the vicarious presence of God on earth. For Catholics, whatever the Pope says is the word of God. Needless to say, the Pope holds tremendous sway over the world's Catholics, and many of these people will try to do whatever their Pope says to do.

But aren't Popes elected through an opaque democracy where only the people promoted to Bishop get to vote on who will be Pope. And isn't Christianity a Mideast religion? And weren't the Popes the lone emperors of the parasite's Holy Roman Empire starting in the 800s? And isn't the Papacy just another figurehead monarchy for our parasite's non-elected administration?

Regarding Islam's umma: It is merely a consensus of "scholars" chosen by "Saudi" money. Here is a quote that shows how Islam's umma is corrupted. It is from [The Great Theft - Wrestling Islam from the extremists](#) by Khaled Abou El Fadl, (P.88): ["A Muslim scholar spending a six month sabbatical in a Saudi Arabian university would make more money in the course of this sabbatical than he would make in ten years of teaching at the Azhar university in Egypt. Similarly, writers or imams espousing pro Wahhabi positions would qualify for very lucrative contracts, grants and awards... In fact, the most alarming development of the 1980s was that even Muslim scholars who were known for their liberalism and rationalism wrote defending Wahhabism -- portraying it as a movement most capable of confronting the challenges of](#)

modernity."

The core quorum

What is going on is that there is a CORE QUORUM, a CORRUPT SELF-CORROBORATING CHORUS in the CORRIDORS of both China's and America's governments. This eternal and highly influential quorum wants to feed on the outside world.

The core quorum also wants its host poor and torpid, so it changes slower and is easier to hold onto. It also wants its host poor so their temporarily cornered commodities are maximized in value relative to the host's labor.

Broad democracies have no room for right-hand men

This design for a broad democracy, will have no place for advisors let alone speech writers. Please do not ever create, or even allow a place for them. And please this democracy must do what it can to diminish and resist the power of advisors, gurus, quasi-democratic labor unions, non-democratic churches, and anyone else outside the democratic process who seeks to influence our elected leaders.

No more speech writers

Look at how much effort we all spend in school learning how to express ourselves, by ourselves. Look at how plagiarism is so viscerally punished by our schools.

With this in mind, isn't it just so strange how we allow our leaders to read the words of others to us? By allowing this, we give our parasite's dim-witted figureheads or dictators a big leg up in the popular mind, while our own smart, honest, dedicated people must suffer the competition. From now on, all political speaking should begin, "In my own words..." and this will be considered an oath: That the words were written by the person declaring the oath, and that nobody else wrote any part of the speech, except where quoted.

Regulation: Start anew from the ground up

Our parasite's byzantine regulation is so pervasive in most government systems that we would generally be better off scrapping all rules and starting over from the ground up. Basically we will create a new simplified, streamlined, and efficient regulatory system and then toss out the old system as soon as possible. I cannot stress strongly enough that we must discard 100% of our existing regulation system and start over anew without the involvement of our parasite's men.

With 100,000 Main-Senators in 10 sluices, and 10,000 Centi-Nomes, we can start everywhere all at once here. Here we see again the immense benefit of having a more realistic representation ratio.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.3

"From the foundation of the Government up to 1837, there were nine distinct commercial crises [60 years, 9 crises = a crisis every 6.7 years. Wow the Arabs were struggling against early America.] which brought about terrible hardships to the wage workers. Did the Government step in and assist them? At no time. But during all those years the Government was busy in letting the shippers dig into the public funds and in being extremely generous to them when they failed to pay up. From 1789 to 1823 the Government lost more than \$250 million in duties, all of which sum represented what the shippers owed and did not, or could not pay. And no criminal proceedings were brought against any of these defaulters.

This however, was not all that the Government did for

the favored, pampered class that it represented. Laws were severe against labor union strikes, which were frequently judicially adjudged conspiracies. Theoretically, [the] law inhibited monopoly, but monopolies existed, because law ceases to be effective law when it is not enforced; and the propertied interests [fronting for the Arabs] took care that it was not enforced. Their own class was powerful in every branch of Government. Furthermore, they had the money to buy political subservency [from a government sensitive to money] and legal dexterity" [from professional court corrupters commonly called lawyers].

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

Most of the legislatures were composed of men who while perhaps, not innately corrupt, were easily seduced by the corrupt temptations held out by the traders [fronting for the Arabs]... the legislatures were approachable. Some members who were put there by the rich families needed only the word as to how they should vote, while others, representing both urban and rural communities, were swayed by bribes. By one means or another the traders and landholders [fronting for the Arabs] forced the various legislatures into doing what they wanted. ...

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"This class [fronting for the Arabs] distorted the powers of government by calling either for the drastic enforcement of laws operating for its interests, or for the partial or entire immunity from other laws militating against its interests and profit."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.6

"Corrupt government was welcomed by the landholding trading and banking class [fronting for the Arabs], for by it they could secure with greater facility the perpetual rights, franchises, privileges and the exemptions which were adapted to their expanding aims and riches. By means of it they were not only enabled to pile up greater and greater wealth, but to set themselves up in law as a conspicuously privileged body, distinct from the mass of the people.

Publicly they might pretend a proper and ostentatious horror of corruption. Secretly, however, they quickly dispensed with what were to them idle dronings of political can't [song and dance]. As capitalists they ascribed their success to a rigid application and practicality; and being practical they went about purchasing laws by the most short-cut and economical method. They had the money; the office-holders had the votes and governmental power; consequently, the one bought the other. It was a systematic corruption springing entirely from the propertied class [fronting for the Arabs]; they demanded it, were responsible for it, and kept it up. It worked like an endless chain; the land, charters, franchises, and privileges corruptly obtained in one set of years yielded vast wealth, part of which was used in succeeding years in getting more law-created sources of wealth. [this cycle must be broken and kept broken.] If professional politicians had long since got into the habit of expecting to be bought, it was because the landholders, traders and bankers had accustomed them to the lucrative business of getting bribes in return for extraordinary laws."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

[note all the foreigner English underlined.]

"The trading, banking and landed class [fronting for the Arabs] learned well the old, all-important policy of having a Government fully susceptible to their interests, whether the governing officials were put in office by them, and were saturated with their interests, views and ideals, or whether corruption had to be resorted to in order to attain their objects. At all events, the propertied classes, in the main [mostly], secured what they wanted. And, as fast as their interests changed, so did the acts and dicta [dictator dictates] of Government change.

While the political economists [working for the Arabs] were busy promulgating the doctrine that it was not the province of Government to embark in any enterprise other than that of purely governing—a doctrine precisely suiting the traders and borrowed from their demands—the commercial classes, early in the 19th century, suddenly discovered that there was an exception. They wanted canals built; and as they had not sufficient funds for the purpose, and did not see any immediate profit for themselves, they clamored for the building of them by the States. In fine [in the end], they found that it was in their interest to have the States put through canal projects on the ground that these would 'stimulate trade'. The canals were built, but the commercial classes in some instances made the blunder of allowing the ownership to rest in the people.

[dear bro, don't you make this mistake in the future.]

Never again was this mistake repeated. If it proved so easy to get legislatures and Congress to appropriate millions of the public funds for undertakings profitable to commerce, why would it not be equally simple to secure the appropriation plus the perpetual title? Why be satisfied with one portion, when the whole was within reach?

True, the popular vote was to be reckoned with; it was a time when the people scanned the tax levy with far greater scrutiny than now. [1]; and they were not disposed to put up the public funds only that private individuals might reap the exclusive benefit. But there was a way of tricking and circumventing the electorate. The trading and land-owning classes [fronting for the Arabs] knew its effectiveness. It was they who had utilized it; who from the year 1795 on had bribed legislatures and Congress to give them bank and other charters. Bribery had proved a signal success. The performance [of the Arab actors] was extended on a much wider scale, with far greater results, and with an adroitness [skillfulness] revealing that the capitalist class had learned much by experience, not only in reaching out for powers that the previous generation would not have dared to grant [2], but in being able to make plastic to its own purposes the electorate that believed itself to be the mainspring [source] of political power [3]."

[1] Pay close attention to the spending of government. This is the how the Arabs feed on your government. If you can stop the corrupt spending, you can stop the Arab parasitic feeding.

2) Note the multi-generational time horizon of the Arab struggle, and the talk of eroding = ex•roding = out•nibbling the powers of the host in favor of the parasite.

3) Here the Arabs talk about the matrix and how the electorate of the US 'believed itself to be the source of political power' when it was not.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Two years later, at one of the sessions of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, Delegate Walker, of North Brookfield, made a similar statement as to conditions in that State. 'I ask any man to say... if he believes that any measure of legislation could be carried in this State, which was generally offensive to the corporations of the Commonwealth [fronting for the Arabs]? It is very rarely the case that we do not have a majority in the legislature who are either presidents, directors, or stockholders in incorporated companies. This is a fact of very grave importance.' Two-thirds of the property in Massachusetts, Delegate Walker pointed out, was owned by corporations.

In 1857, an acrimonious [angry and bitter] debate ensued in the Iowa Constitutional convention over an attempt to give further extraordinary power to the railroads. Already the State of Iowa had incurred \$12-million in debts aiding railroad corporations. 'I fear' said Delegate Traer, 'that it is very often the case that these votes (on appropriations for railroads) are carried through by improper influences, which the people, if left alone, would, upon mature reflection, never had adopted.

These are but a very few of the many instances of the debauching [turning away from duty] of every legislature in the United States. No matter how furiously the people protested at this giving away of their resources and rights, the capitalists were able to thwart their will on every occasion" [This was due to the inherently corrupt design of their democracy.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"By 1876, however, the public agitation had died away. The time was propitious [favorable]. Congress rushed through a bill carefully worded for the purpose. The lands were ordered sold in unlimited areas for cash. No pretense was made of restricting the sale to a certain acreage so that all any individual could buy was enough for his own use. Anyone, if he chose, could buy a million or ten million acres, provided he had the cash to pay \$1.25 an acre. The way was easy for capitalists to get millions of acres of the coveted iron, coal and timber lands for practically nothing. At that very time, the Government was selling coal lands in Colorado at \$10 to \$20 an acre, and it was recognized that even that price was absurdly low."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Fraud was so continuous and widespread that we can here give only a few succinct and scattering instances. 'The present system of laws', reported a special Congressional Committee appointed in 1883 to investigate what had become of the once vast public domain, 'seem to invite fraud. You cannot turn to a single state paper or public document ...[without finding the term] 'fraud' in connection with the disposition of public lands...

A little later, Commissioner Sparks of the General Land Office pointed out that 'the near approach of the period when the United States will have no land to dispose of has stimulated the exertions of capitalists and corporations to acquire outlying regions of public land in mass, by whatever means, legal or illegal.' "

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"And here was the anomaly of the so-called American

democratic Government. It was [is] held legitimate and necessary that [Arab fronting] capital[ism] should be encouraged, but illegitimate to look out for the interests of the non-propertied. The capitalists were very few; the non-propertied, holding nominally the overwhelming voting power, were many. Government was nothing more or less than a device for the nascent capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs] to work out its inevitable purposes [feeding on the host society], yet the majority of the people, on whom the powers of class government severely fell, were constantly deluded in believing that Government represented them. Whether Federalist or anti-Federalist, Whig, Republican or Democratic party was in power, the capitalist class went forward victoriously and invincibly."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"there was never a time when the majority of the men who sat in Congress, the [state] legislatures or the judges did not represent, or respond to, either the interests or the ideals of one or more of these divisions of the propertied classes [fronting for the Arabs].

Finally, out of the landowners, slaveowners, bankers, shippers, factory masters and tradesmen a new class of great power developed. This was the railroad-owning class. From about the year 1845 to 1890, it was the most puissant [powerful, influential] government class in the United States, and only ceased being distinctly so when the industrial trusts became even mightier, and a time came when one trust alone, the Standard Oil Company, was able to possess itself of vast railroad systems. [In 1911 the US government broke Standard Oil into 34 parts and today it has grown back as Exxon]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"It was they, sometimes openly, but more usually covertly, who influenced and manipulated the entire sphere of government. It was they who raised the issues which divided the people into contesting camps and which often beclouded and bemuddled the popular mind. It was their maternal ideals and interests that were engrafted upon the fabric of society [the interpretive matrix] and made the prevailing standards of the day."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"Business men did not consider it at all dishonorable to oppress their workers; to manufacture and sell goods under false pretenses; to adulterate prepared foods and drugs; to demand the very highest prices for products upon which the very life of the people depended, and at a time when consumers needed them most; to bribe public officials and to hold up the Government in plundering schemes. These and many other practices were looked upon as commonplaces of ordinary trade."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"He is the kingfish that is robbing these small plunderers"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Let a man steal in colossal ways and then surrender a small part of it in charitable, religious and educational donations; he at once ceases being a thief and straightaway becomes a noble benefactor."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"The year 1868 proved a particularly busy one for Vanderbilt. He was engaged in a desperately devious struggle with Gould. In vain did his agents and lobbyists pour out stacks of money to buy legislative votes enough to defeat the bill legalizing Gould's fraudulent issue of stock. Members of the Legislature impassively took money from both parties. Gould personally appeared at Albany [capital of New York state] with a satchel containing \$500,000 in greenbacks which were rapidly distributed. On Senator, as was disclosed by an investigating committee, accepted \$75,000 from Vanderbilt and then \$100,000 from Gould, kept both sums,—and voted with the dominant Gould forces."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Every year they prepared a false account of their revenues and expenditures which they submitted to the State officials. They pretended that they annually spent millions of dollars in construction work on the [rail]road—work, in reality, never done. Their money was pocketed by them under this device—a device that has since become a favorite of many railroad and public utility corporations."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Vanderbilt... would concentrate at Albany a mass of silent arguments in the form of money and get the necessary legislative votes, which was all he cared about."

Then ensued one of the many comedies familiar to observers of legislative proceedings. It was amusing to the sophisticated to see delegations indignantly betake themselves to Albany, submit voluminous briefs which legislators never read, and with immense gravity argue away for hours to committees which had already been bought...

Laws were sold at Albany to the highest bidder. 'It was impossible', Tweed testified after his downfall, 'to do anything there without paying for it. Money had to be raised for the passage of bills'. Decades before this, legislators had been so thoroughly taught by the landowners and bankers how to exchange their votes for cash that now, not only at Albany and Washington, but everywhere in the United States, both legislative and administrative officials haggled in real astute business style for the highest price that they could get.

One act after another was slipped through the Legislature by Vanderbilt in 1868 and 1869. On May 20, 1869, Vanderbilt secured, by one bill alone, the right to consolidate railroads, a free giant of franchises, and other rights worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and the right to water [down equity in] stocks and bonds to an enormous extent.

The printing presses were worked overtime in issuing more than \$44-million in watered stock. The capital stock of the two railroads was thus doubled."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Protest as it did against Vanderbilt's merging of railroads, the middle class found itself quite hopeless. In rapid succession he put through one combination after another, and caused theft after theft to be legalized, utterly disdainful [contemptuous, sneering] of criticism or opposition. In State after State, he bought the repeal of old laws, or the passage of new laws, until he was vested with authority to connect various railroads that

he had secured between Buffalo and Chicago, into one line with nearly 1,300 miles of [rail]road. The commercial classes were scared at the sight of such a great stretch of railroad—then considered an immense line—in the hands of one man, audacious, all-conquering, with power to enforce tribute at will."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"The Legislature of 1872, was elected...following the revelations of the Tweed 'ring' frauds. It was regarded as a 'model reform body'. As has already been remarked in this work, the pseudo 'reform' officials or bodies elected by the American people in the vain hope of overthrowing corruption, will often go to greater lengths in the disposition [transfer] of the people's rights and interests than the most hardened politicians, because they are not suspected of being corrupt, and their measures have the appearance of being enacted for the public good.

The Tweed clique had been broken up, but the capitalists who had assiduously [with great care and perseverance] bribed its members and profited so hugely from its political acts, were untouched and in greater power than ever before. The source of all this corruption had not been struck at [affected] in the slightest. Tweed the politician, was sacrificed and went to prison and died there. The capitalists who had corrupted representative bodies everywhere in the United States, before and during this time, were safe and respected, and in a position to continue their work of corruption.

Tweed made the classic, unforgivable blunder... The very capitalists who had profited so greatly by his corruption were the first to express horror at his acts."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"His [Vanderbilt's] chief instrument during all those years was a general utility lawyer, Chauncey M. Depew, whose specialty was to impress the public by grandiloquent [pretentious] exhibitions of mellifluous [poured honey] spread-eagle [1] oratory, while bringing the 'proper arguments' to bear upon legislators and other public officials [2]. Every one who could in any way be used, or whose influence required subsidizing, was, in the phrase of the day, 'taken care of'. Great sums of money were distributed outright in bribes in the legislatures by lobbyists in Vanderbilt's pay. Supplementing this, an even more insidious system of bribery was carried on. Free passes for railroad travel were lavishly distributed. No politician was ever refused. Newspaper and magazine editors, writers and reporters were always supplied with free transportation for the asking, thus insuring to a great measure their good will, and putting them under obligations not to criticize or expose plundering schemes or individuals. All railroad companies used this form, as well as other forms of bribery.

It was mainly by means of the free pass system (which was not abolished by Congressional legislation until 1906) that Depew, acting for the Vanderbilts, secured not only a general immunity from newspaper criticism, but continued to have himself and them portrayed in luridly favorable lights. Depending upon the newspapers for its sources of information, the public was constantly deceived and blinded, either by the suppression of certain news, or by its being tampered with and grossly colored."

[1] The term spread-eagle once referred to democratic openness where all parts of the democracy, elected official, or democratic dialogue were open for everyone to see. This term

and the openness it implied was problematic for the spreading darkness of Islam and Arab power. So it was blurred away. Today in the Apple dictionary we find no less than 6 entries that have nothing to do with this original meaning of this very useful word for free people and the democracy they establish for themselves.

2) At this point, footnote 17 says of Chauncey M. Depew that he is sent: 'to Albany every winter to say 'haw' and 'gee' to his cattle up there'. Thus we see the original form of the 'yee-haw' term so often repeated in film propaganda about the American frontier. The term was actually GEE-AWE, meaning respect or awe for Mr. G, or the wise guy harem cause.

3) We do not have a free press, we have a false anarchy, and openly corrupt paid commercial media that looks with the most favorable light believable upon its Arab masters.

4) Have we changed the way our democracy works? Have we instituted a new constitution, or have our Arab masters simply backed off on their corruption of our system to preserve the illusion of good government?]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"These repressive tactics took on a variety of forms, some of which are not ordinarily included in the definitions of repression.

The usual method was that of subsidizing press and pulpit in certain subtle ways. By these means, facts were concealed or distorted, a prejudicial stat of public opinion created, and plausible grounds given for hostile interference by the State."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.7

"Despite every legitimate argument coupled with venomous ridicule and coercive and corrupt influence that wealth, press and church could bring to bear, the labor unions stood solidly together. [The oligarch-rich, the press and the church are all mechanisms for the Arabs to exert power over their host societies, along with monarch administrations, judiciaries, transportation services, and education.] [On top of this,] On election day groups of Tammany [Hall] repeaters [repeat voters], composed of dissolutes [dissolved people], profligates [wasters], thugs and criminals, systematically, under directions from above, filled the ballot boxes with fraudulent votes...

But the vote of the labor forces was so overwhelming, that even piles of fraudulent votes [ballots] could not suffice to overcome it.

One final resource was left. This was to count out [with a election recount] Henry George [the Labor candidate] by grossly tampering with the election returns and misrepresenting them. And this is precisely what was done, if the testimony of numerous eye-witnesses is to be believed. The Labor party, it is quite clear, was deliberately cheated out of an election won in the teeth of the severest and most corrupt opposition. This result it had to accept. The entire elaborate machinery of elections was in the full control of the Labor party's opponents. And had it instituted a contest in the courts [with their inherently corrupt judicial appointees, and corrupt fore-hire lawyers], the Labor party would have found its efforts completely fruitless in the face of an adverse judiciary.

By the end of the year 1887, the political phase of the labor movement [so dangerous to the Arab fronting magnate oligarchs of the day] had shrunk to insignificant proportions, and soon thereafter collapsed. The capitalist interests [fronting for the Arabs] had followed up their onslaught in hanging and

imprisoning some of the foremost leaders, and in corruption and fraud in the polls, by the repetition of other tactics that they had long so successfully used [over the millennia].

Acting through the old political parties [The two-item menu favored by the Arabs] they further insured the disintegration of the Labor party by bribing a sufficient number of its influential men. This bribery took the form of giving them sinecure [Tenured, lifelong appointment] offices under either Democratic or Republican local, State, or National administrations. Many of the most conspicuous organizers of the labor movement were thus won over, by the proffer [offer] of well-paying political posts to betray the cause in the furtherance of which they had shown such energy. Deprived of some of its leaders, deserted by others, the labor political movement sank into a state of disorganization, and finally reverted to its old servile position of dividing its vote between the two capitalist parties [fronting for the Arab-fronting capitalists].

From now on, for many years, the labor movement existed purely as an industrial one, disclaiming [staying away from] all connection with politics. Voting into power either of the old political parties, it then humbly begged a few crumbs of legislation from them, only to have a few sops [worthless bread crumbs soaked in soup] thrown to it, or to receive contemptuous kicks and humiliations, and, if it grew too importunate [persistent, annoying, intrusive] or aggressive, insults backed with the strong might of judicial, police and military power." [Translation: At this point, the labor movement became a purely industrial thing, avoiding politics entirely. It began supporting one of the two old political parties fronting for the Arabs, begging them for a few crumbs. These crumbs were thrown to it, often with some contemptuous kicks and humiliations in the media. And if the labor party grew too annoying or aggressive, media insults backed with the strong might of judicial, police and military power were used.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

"The committee found that Samuel Colt, the founder of a fortune based upon the manufacture of firearms, paid out at least \$15,000 to Dickerson, his attorney and one of his lobbyists, to buy off the opposition in Congress to a bill extending Colt's patent rights, the time limit of which had expired. The testimony indicated that about \$60,000 in all was spent in getting the bill passed. Another lobbyist, Jere Clemens, who also did the disbursing of Colt's bribe money, was, at the same time, as he admitted under oath, lobbying for various railroad corporations seeking land grants, and for a bill similar to Colt's which extended the patent rights of Cyrus H. McCormick, a manufacturer of reaping machines, and the founder of the Multi-millionaire fortune.

And how other factory owners were bribing Congress to pass tariff acts was disclosed by the investigation of a select committee of the House, the majority of which committee reported that one firm in particular, Lawrence, Stone, and Company [Arabs] ... had expended \$87,000 in bribes to have..."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

"Congress reeked with fraud and bribery, of which only slight oozings came to the surface... Bribery, indeed, was so undeniably rife that as a sop to public feelings, one investigating committee after another was appointed to inquire into charges."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

" 'The evidence taken', the [Wisconsin Senate] committee concluded, 'establishes the fact that the La Crosse and Milwaukee Railroad Company have been guilty of numerous and unparalleled acts of mismanagement, gross violations of duty, fraud and plunder. In fact, corruption and wholesale plundering are common features.'

They were not merely common features of the railroad corporations in Wisconsin, but everywhere else in the United States. Year after year they went on unhindered by legislative or Congressional investigations. Far from being forfeited, the granted rights and property became strongly riveted vested private rights. Neither the bribers nor the bribed were troubled with criminal prosecution except very rarely, and then it was only the subordinate tools who were sent to prison. Every bribery scandal would be shortly followed by some new scandal. The old [scandals] would die away or become forgotten, and the new would absorb public attention for a time, only to go through the same process."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

"Men placed to manage corporations for the interest of the stockholders manage them only for their own. They become contractors, half ruin the corporation, pay themselves with its assets at enormous discounts, then resuscitate things and are rich in the result."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

"The query can here naturally be expected: Why was Gould not prosecuted for his malefactions [wrongdoings]? How was it possible for him to have carried through his immense lootings without some visitation of criminal proceedings? So long as he robbed the people, the great plodding [slow-moving], powerless multitude, without any real representation in political office, it could be understood that his license would in nowise be interfered with, seeing that all law was at the command of the rich freebooters [pirates]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.17

[Quoting William Larrabee, governor of Iowa] "It is the policy of the political corruption... [people] to ascertain the weakness and wants of every man whose services they are likely to need, and to attack him, if his surrender should be essential to their victory, at his weakest point. Men with political ambition are encouraged to aspire to preferment, [high-paying employment] and are assured of corporate support to bring it about. Briefless [having no clients] lawyers are promised corporate business or salaried attorneyship. Those in financial straits are accommodated with loans. Vain men are flattered and given newspaper notoriety. Others are given passes for their families and their friends. Shippers are given advantage in rates over their competitors. The idea is that every legislator shall receive for his vote and influence some compensation which combines the maximum of desirability to him with the minimum of violence to his self-respect. . . The lobby which represents the railroad companies at legislative sessions is usually the largest, the most sagacious and the most unscrupulous of all. In extreme cases influential constituents of doubtful members are sent for at the last moment to labor with their representatives, and to assure them that the sentiment of

their districts is in favor of the measure advocated by the railroads. Telegrams pour in upon the unsuspecting members. Petitions in favor of the proposed measure are also hastily circulated among the more unsophisticated constituents of members sensitive to public opinion, and are then presented to them as an unmistakable indication of the popular will. . . . Another powerful reinforcement of the railroad lobby is not infrequently a subsidized press and its correspondents."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.17

"With money supplied, the political bosses of Maryland engaged in packing of primaries, indiscriminate bribery of voters and stuffing of ballot boxes, thus insuring the election of subservient officials...

Having a complete monopoly, they now exacted extortionate charges for transportation, and they likewise increased their profit by cutting the pay of their employees. In desperation, the railroad workers declared a strike in 1877. False reports of the violence of the strikers were immediately dispatched broadcast. Using these charges as a pretext, the military was called out. At Martinsburg, W. Va., the State militia refused to fire upon the strikers, but a company of militia, recruited from a class hostile to the striker, opened fire, killing many of the strikers and wounding others."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"Our land system seems to be mainly formed to facilitate the acquisition of large bodies of land by capitalists or corporation, either as donations, or at nominal prices. . . . Numbers who purchased from the State lands sold as swamp or overflowed, find their farms claimed under the railroad grants, and themselves involved in expensive contests before Registers of Land Offices." [Quoting governor H.H.Haight in his 1869 message to the California Legislature]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"Not one of these messages had any vital [surviving] result. In some instances, they were sincere, but, as a rule, there were intended to be nothing more than wordy sops to appease middle-class public opinion. Some of the very Governors who wrote them with such a display of earnestness were put in power and controlled by the corporations of which they complained. The legislatures were wholly under the domination of the great private corporations, and the Judiciary almost wholly so. Year after year, the different Governors denounced corporate practice, and demanded corrective legislation, which never came. Two and three decades after Governor Newton Booth's denunciation, Governors were still writing similar futile messages.

Acclaimed at first as public benefactors, Huntington and his associates were subjected to the fiercest denunciation when the people realized the enormous frauds that they had committed. For the frauds, of which [only] an epitome [summary] has been here given, were only a portion of the total. It is hardly necessary to plunge into the tortuous mass and maze of detail; how they resorted to nimble [Arab-style] subterfuges to escape their obligations, and defrauded the Government; how they corrupted and ruled States and Territories, and seized hold of one possession after another; and how, through their control of political machinery, they sent Representatives and Senators to Washington as though they were so many errand boys."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"If recurring charges are any indication of corruption, the officials of the United States courts were constantly corruptly influenced or bribed to bring no criminal action against men of wealth, or to cause cases finally to be dismissed, if actions were brought. Even slave traders... seem to have bought immunity, and this, too, after the Civil War had begun." [Who would want to bring in slaves after the Civil War had begun? Here we imagine a generation of Arab bros posing as slaves who ran-away to join the Union Army.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"In the 15-years before 1860, they were the most notorious manipulators of the New Jersey Legislature. Time after time they lobbied bills through, swayed the elections and the courts, ignored or evaded the laws, and bled the public by an illegal system of transportation charges."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"As gold was the international trade standard of value, the United States Government followed the policy of holding a certain amount as a treasury reserve. When... this reserve was depleted, the Government was compelled to issue bonds to replenish it.

The ...leading... bankers... forced the United States Government to put out these bond issues. This they did by draining the treasury of its gold, and by then going through the empty [but quite profitable] form of selling back that gold in return for bonds.

The treasury notes, comprising much of the currency of the United States Government, were redeemable in coin. This provision was construed as calling for payment in gold. The bankers would take over to the sub-treasury in New York City great stacks of treasury notes and exchange them for gold. This gold they would then hoard in their vaults. [until such time as they would sell it back to government at a premium.]...

In 1894, the Government had been drawn into handing over two bond issues of \$50-million each to these bakers. Their profits, it is estimated reached tens of millions. With the advent of the year 1895, the United States Treasury was again emptied of gold. Where had the gold, which the Government had purchased only a short time previously at usurious rates, gone?... President Cleveland was reported as saying privately that 'the banks had got the country by the throat'

At the appropriate moment a syndicate of bankers appeared in the open and magnanimously offered to supply gold to the Government in exchange for bonds. This syndicate was composed of J.P. Morgan & Company, August Belmont & Company, representing the Rothschilds; James Speyer, the National City Bank and four other extremely powerful national banks...

The syndicate had squeezed the United States Treasury of its gold. It had then compelled a bond issue, and declared that it alone could supply the required gold... Cleveland... turned over the \$62-million of 4% bonds to the Morgan syndicate at a price of 104. The syndicate immediately resold the bonds to investors in America and Europe at 118, 119 and 120 clearing, it was estimated, in direct profits, about \$18-million. This sum represented the sum that would have gone to the Government had the sale of bonds been

accomplished without this intermediary operation...

To realize, however, the full import of the action of the Government in this particular bond sale, by which a present of fully \$18-million was made to a few bankers already surfeited with wealth, it is necessary to recall the conditions among the mass of people, especially after the panic of 1893. In normal times, according to the estimate of Carroll D. Wright, for some years United States Labor Commissioner, the number of unemployed at any one time was about 1-million men, women and children. After the panic of 1893, the number reached perhaps 3-million. Not a finger was lifted by the Government in the aid of any of these, nor was the remotest consideration given to means for alleviating this misery or to the causes producing it. Repressive measures were used to suppress street meetings of protest, and leaders of labor unions were flung into prison on the alleged charge of contempt of the Federal courts. Only the year before, in 1894, the regular army had been ordered out by Cleveland against the railroad workmen on strike. Nowhere and in no respect did Government do other than carry out the demands made by the great capitalist who dominated all of its functions.

3— FALSE ANARCHY

Plato, Laws, 842, c 400BC "Our state's legislator, you see, need not bother his head very much about the merchant-shiping business, trade, hotels, customs duties, mining, money-lending and compound interest. Waving aside most of these and a thousand other such details, he'll legislate for farmers, shepherds, bee keepers, for the protectors of their stock and the supervisors of their equipment." [The first group is the highly profitable work the Arabs want to do in our society. The second group is the low wage work the Arabs want us to do in our society. We should probably add religious sacraments, luxury goods, and media to the first group.]

Hesiod, c. 700BC, Works and Day, 248-251

"They need have no traffic with ships,
For their own grain-giving land
Yields them its harvest"

[Apparently the Mideast has been producing propaganda-filled media for thousands of years, calling it precious knowledge cherished by our forefathers and all the while pretending not to be there.]

Ed-mund Bur-ke, d.1797

"Nothing turns out to be so oppressive and unjust as a feeble government." [This is the parasite's carefully crafted matrix illusion at least.]

Marc Block, Feudal Society

"There were the imponderable but nevertheless precious advantages which accrued, rightly or wrongly, from the patronage of a powerful man in a highly anarchic society. All these advantages were prized; nevertheless, in the long run, the vassal's obligations outweighed the benefits he received." [Who was it that reaped these benefits?]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.14

"the supposed freedom of the mob proves in reality to be the bitterest servitude, under which the better elements suffer at the hands of the worse, until in the end both are destroyed.

[Those who have lived through the false anarchy of a plebocracy know very well how easy it is for this system to be

corrupted. They know how a large mob can be rabble roused and steered against those who make trouble for the Arabs who are seeking to install their chosen odious mobster as our leader.]

H. L. Mencken

"The most dangerous man to any government is the man who is able to think things out... without regard to the prevailing superstitions and taboos. Almost inevitably, he comes to the conclusion that the government he lives under is dishonest, insane, intolerable."

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 15.4

"Nobody had the presence of mind or the readiness of tongue to suggest what should be done, until at last people [in the Arab chorus] began to speak under their breath the name of Ursicinus, a man of [ostensibly] outstanding military distinction." [One of the greatest Arab techniques for political domination is to silence/kill anyone in government or the public who stands up and offers logical leadership. After this, our society is leaderless and mute, and then the Arab chorus of infiltrator and blackmailed thumbs-men can guide the host nation in any plausible way that benefits the Arabs.]

T.E. Lawrence (of Arabia), Seven Pillars of Wisdom, Ch.7

"Some of us judged that there was latent [dormant, untapped] power enough and to spare in the Arabic peoples... a prolific Semitic agglomeration, great in religious thought, reasonably industrious, mercantile, politic, yet solvent rather than dominant in character."

The true meaning of Anarchy

The word breaks down as ANA-ARCHY. Now in the extremely vague particle language of the Brothers, the Haremi, ANA = new, anew, reproduction, renewal, recursion, recycling or the end (among other things). So ana-archy really means anew-archy, or renew-archy. It is the "solvent" rule of the Brotherhood in its purest form — It is when the host is in utter disorganized chaos, and the Brothers are maximally strong thanks to the power vacuum on the host's side.

Anarchy = monarchy without the escape goat

With a kings and presidents our parasite has a scape goat. And while the escape goat is definitely handy in many ways, it is not critically important. Besides, without a king to keep order, many types of chaos can reign for a while without arousing the suspicions of the people.

All anarchy is false anarchy

It is strange that there is any debate at all about the merits of anarchy, because anarchy is really just plain impossible.

Firstly, there is hardly a group-effort anywhere that will not benefit from the imposition of some rules or standards of behavior. Who is going to choose no rules over some basic rules, some law and order?

But secondly and more importantly, factions are always trying to steer society's group decision for their own benefit. Taking away government rule changes that reality not one bit. In fact it encourages gangsters and warlords. So basically ALL ANARCHY IS FALSE ANARCHY, because even if we eliminate all our own chosen rulers, we will still have people that will try to rule over us anyway. And this is not only true in government, but also in the economy, and in the media.

Now the folly of anarchy is widely recognized in government, and very few people support anarchy for

government. But anarchy in the economy is another story: There are many people who foolishly favor a number of forms of economic anarchy, where we 'let the market decide'. Here in truth, we are frequently leaving things up to people who would quietly/secretly assume the role of government in order to manipulate a market and grab more for their own parasitic enterprise.

With respect to the media, a clear majority of people today actually support anarchy. In fact, most people are opposed to any form of government involvement in deciding what the truth is, and what we see. But here the question is purely one of trust: Who do we trust to decide what the truth is, and what is worth seeing? Do we trust our democracy, or do we trust some Rupert Murdoch fronted news corporation?

Here the truth is as obvious as the thousands of sidewalk vending machines for Newscorp's Wall Street Journal. Look how they all told us for years that all the easy oil is gone, that our oil companies must now drill for oil in the deep ocean, off the continental shelf. People: we can't leave the truth to anarchy. Democracy must offer its own means of informing the public. Democracies must produce at least one version of the truth under democratic supervision. An accurate picture of the past and present is vitally important to the future. Please do not leave this to the false anarchy of the paid commercial media, and a few "respected" history professors.

A primary job of the Sub-Senate can thus be seen as figuring out what is true and valuable and eliminating the false-anarchy from government, industry and media. Let Murdoch's multi-billion-dollar for-prophet news-outlets continue to spew whatever propaganda they will, but our new democracy must have its own voice too.

Epictetus, d.135AD, Lectures Collected by Arrian, 4.13.5

"In Rome, reckless men are trapped by soldiers [party officials] in the following manner. A soldier [party official] in civilian clothing sits down beside you and begins to criticize the emperor. Then if... you add what's on your mind, you will a moment later be bound and lead away." [The Roman thought there was freedom of speech until they became entertainment in the colosseum or co-lysi-um. Thus we see that false anarchy ruled in Rome as well. Epictetus was expelled by the administration of emperor Domitian in 89AD]

Thucydides, History, 4.80

"To maintain control of the helots [the Spartan slave caste], the Spartans used to send specially selected young warriors, the crypt-eia [secret police], out into the countryside to kill any of them that they found going around at night. Sometimes the crypteia went into the fields during the day and killed any helot who was particularly strong or fit" [That is smart or quick, or otherwise a threat to the established order fronting for the parasite. The illusion of freedom is a form of false anarchy.]

Does your anarchy love cartels?

We must be mindful of all situations where our society abdicates responsibility — especially anarchic situations that result in a monopoly, or a cartel of a few large players that extinguish all real competition. When this happens, it is a false anarchy.

All anarchy is an illusion

Except where there is nothing of value.

Consensus or only its appearance?

Recall Al Gore (Al G-our) saying that it was time to close the

debate on climate change. Was this the consensus speaking, or only the appearance of consensus speaking? Clearly it was the latter, and clearly the false anarchy of the scientific method can be gamed.

Mark Henderson

"Science is provisional, always open to revision in light of new evidence. It is anti-authoritarian: Anybody can contribute, and anybody can be wrong. It seeks actively to test its propositions. And it is comfortable with uncertainty. These qualities give the scientific method unparalleled strength as a way of finding things out."

I'd like to teach the world to sing in perfect harmony

In science, our parasite uses the same old tricks for manipulating our group decisions. Mainly it uses a chorus or core of Brothers to sing their metaphorical songs in perfect harmony (br-effect our-mni, as their cola jingle went). After some time, the rest of society generally starts to join in, and the Brotherly chorus gets everyone else singing their songs, their chosen matrix interpretations.

The tree of knowledge

Don't leave reality to the false anarchy of those who have traditionally manipulated the tree of knowledge.

Khaled Abou El Fadl, The Great Theft - Wrestling Islam from the extremists, P.88

"A Muslim scholar spending a six month sabbatical in a Saudi Arabian university would make more money in the course of this sabbatical than he would make in ten years of teaching at the Azhar university in Egypt. Similarly, writers or imams espousing pro Wahhabi positions would qualify for very lucrative contracts, grants and awards... In fact, the most alarming development of the 1980s was that even Muslim scholars who were known for their liberalism and rationalism wrote defending Wahhabism -- portraying it as a movement most capable of confronting the challenges of modernity."

False anarchy and the scientific method

Look at the pompously named 'scientific method'. This is really just a codified form of false anarchy that we teach to our future scientists while they are still young and intellectually vulnerable. And like most anarchic systems, this one has a back door for our parasite's chorus (or clique) and its efforts to redefine consensus reality (the interpretive matrix).

Now for scientists acting in earnest, there is absolutely nothing wrong with the anarchy of the scientific method. The problem lies with our parasite's ability to exploit the false anarchy of the scientific method to stop the interpretive theories it doesn't like — as well as encourage other theories that it does like. Basically our parasite uses its core chorus, its "shadow government" to re-write reality, installing its chosen ideology that it can profit from in some way. This includes ideology like a flat earth, like CO2 as the cause of global warming, like all food additives are bad, and like all the world's oil-rich wetlands are precious habitat.

Now regarding the scientific method, the refuting question is this: Where does the consensus opinion come from exactly? I ask this because under the precisely codified anarchy of the scientific method, there is no specific mechanism, democratic or otherwise, for determining what the consensus opinion is. It just "magically appears", much like how a conclusion from Islam's umma just magically appears from the world's Islamic scholars.

Also notable is how under the scientific method, even widely held and obviously true ideas frequently go unsaid or are given no official status as the truth. Thus the scientific consensus on many things remains largely shrouded in mystery and never stated for the masses. So science remains much weaker than it needs to be in comparison to the vague, irrelevant, and incomprehensible revelations of the world's Mideast religions and their ancient Mideast "prophets".

As well, the anarchy of the scientific method maximizes the disunity and weakness of everyone except those who have quietly organized a scientific establishment, really just a chorus or clique. These Arab-friendly people are able to push (struggle for) ideas that they find useful. They can also resist (struggle against) ideas they find harmful to their cause.

Now it should be noted that this is the same sort of Mideast corruption as exists everywhere else. The scientists that are doing "the right sort of research" (in the eye of the parasite) get lots of grant money, lucrative job offers, and press coverage from the Brotherly media. Those that want to do the wrong sort of research tend to get pushed out of science while still in school, before they can become "Climate-science" or "Oceanography" PhDs — before they become valid, card carrying members of the scientific establishment, people with a franchise to comment on the scientific establishment.

In many ways, the scientific method resembles how Islamic "writers or imams espousing pro Wahhabi positions would qualify for very lucrative contracts, grants and awards," as quoted directly above. And remarkably, the "illustrious" Scientific Method leaves Western scientific consensus vulnerable to exactly the same trick that the Haremi Brothers use to steer the consensus opinion of Islam's Umma.

A Haremi clique

When the Brothers sing their propaganda and clique, we tend to think it is genuine and real. This whether it is Western science or Islam's Umma they are clacking or clique-ing about. The old meaning of Clacking incidentally was to chatter all day about something.

Touting is a political word

Intersect the meanings of touting. On one hand, it is praising, and on the other hand it is what some poor men do around the train stations in India. Basically, they approach tourists for the commission they get from the person trying to market someone.

Alexander Hawking

Strange how the man sort of billed as the world's most brilliant scientist can't actually speak for himself. Funny how he is an Alexander, a word-less-man that only makes these brief oracular statements through an outmoded voice simulator. Why didn't he upgrade his voice? How is it that there have been three feature-length films about him.

Sophoscites

How to stop the false anarchy

The only way to stop our parasite from exploiting our anarchy is to end the false anarchy and find our own true voice. We will poll our entire "genius" Sub-Senate and "super-genius" Main-Senate as to what they think is true on a variety of matters. We will hold SOPHOSCITES, something like plebiscites but with our Sub-Senate, Main-Senate and Over-Senate polled.

Here we will ask our Senators to vote (by secret ballot) on all the great questions we can think of, and we will all naturally respect their opinions, because it will be our society's opinion, as well as we can tell.

Sophoscites are better than plebiscites.

Plebiscites may not suffer from campaign corruption, but they do put our democracy in the hands of the average voter, with an average education, an average level of political sophistication and an average willingness to figure out what they are voting on. This leaves our democracy's decisions in the hands of the average everyman, and many of these people are quite vulnerable to media corruption and propaganda — as well as respected people repeating reasonable-enough arguments.

A better approach is to use a sophoscite vote from our 1,000,000 Sub-Senators or our 100,000 Main-Senators. This is a great tool for a democracy. It is broad enough to be a completely incorruptible proxy for the people. Yet it is not so broad as to suffer media corruption.

And besides, our 1:250 and 1:2,500 Senators should in general be smarter, better informed, and less gullible than the average member of their constituency. This will make them considerably less susceptible to our parasite's propaganda, matrixes, and other "Jedi" mind tricks. Here I reflect on the cynical 'flying' junk dealer from the mythology of Star Wars Episode I, a character that is not vulnerable to Jehudi mind tricks.

Less bias

Our government will not be dominated by experts or Brotherly baro-crats, or pre-screened scientists already committed to whatever ideas. It will simply be our democratically elected 1:250, 1:2,500, and 1:25,000 smart people acting as an unbiased jury of the truth.

Do you believe in democracy?

We are going to elect our smartest people. We will have some that are 1:250 smart people. These will elect another batch that are 1:2,500 smart people, and finally, these will elect another batch that are 1:25,000 smart people. We are going to poll these Senates as to what they think about all sorts of things, and we are going to respect what they say, although we will always be free to dissent and to have our own opinions. This polling will be called the sophoscite process.

The OS will be seen as the leading house, the MS as the acting and official house and the SS as the trailing house. The vote of the MS, the Main-Senate shall decide official policy. The vote of the OS shall be advisory and the vote of the SS shall be deemed the official opinion of the masses.

Precision in how respected ideas are

Let's not only have a way for our elected and respected wise men to vote on the believability of ideas, but let's also have an accurate way to discuss the outcome of those elections:
DOUBTLESS IDI = over a 50:1 (98%) vote by sophoscite
CONSENSUS IDI = over a 9:1 (90%) vote by sophoscite
QUADRUPLE IDI = over a 4:1 (80%) vote by sophoscite
TRIPLE IDI = over a 3:1 (75%) vote by sophoscite
DOUBLE IDI = over a 2:1 (66.6%) vote by sophoscite
MAJORITY IDI = over a 50% vote by sophoscite
THIRD IDI = under a 33% vote by sophoscite
QUARTER IDI = under a 25% vote by sophoscite
FIFTH IDI = under a 20% vote by sophoscite
TENTH IDI = under a 10% vote by sophoscite

TWENTIETH IDI = under a 5% vote by sophoscite
HUNDREDTH IDI = under a 1% vote by sophoscite
A TWO HUNDREDTH'S IDI = 2% by sophoscite.

The tools for MEMOPLASTY

OBIDI = ideas the Senate elects as untrue, ideas the Senate recommends for removal from the group mind.

INIDI = ideas the Senate elects for insertion into the group mind

The new matrix mechanism

Take all the consensus IDI that scores over 90% by sophoscite and call it CONSENSUS IDI. Next take all the fifth idi, the idi that score under one fifth and call these REMOVAL IDI. This shall be the new consensus reality of our Senate, our nation's democratically elected smart people.

I ask everyone to try to believe in these consensus ideas and try to disbelieve all the removal ideas.

Please have no blind faith in anything you have heard before. Please believe in a clear majority of your nation's democratically elected smart people instead.

Sophoscites: Settling divisive issues before attempting policy

It is remarkable that in America, the home of modern democracy, since 1776, we seldom ever have any sort of election regarding our most divisive issues. How does our nation stand on abortion? Smoking ads? Recreational drugs? The war on whatever? The war wherever? How much should we spend per capita for our national healthcare program? Should we weaken our currency against the Yuan and just deal with the inflation? Should we take our medicine now before our economy is terminally ill?

How can we call ourselves a democracy if we never vote to see how we stand on the most important and most divisive issues? Instead, let's use our Sub-Senate to hold regular sophoscites to democratically determine what we actually think as a society. And then, once we know that, we should all just accept it and move on until the next regularly scheduled sophoscite.

Sophoscites: Settle divisive issues for unity's sake

It is widely recognized that divisions weaken nations in wartime. However, it is not widely appreciated that divisions also weaken nations and their political resolve in times of peace.

Anyway, this is why our parasite always seeks to divide us. The more divided we are, the weaker we are, and conversely the stronger our outsider parasite is. So we must agree to disagree. We must settle our divisive issues as much as practical, and then get along under one policy agenda. If we do not do this, we just hand power over to our parasite, and get nothing but trouble in return.

Determining policy

The Sub-Senate shall use sophoscites to state government policy in the greatest detail practical. After this, Government shall be prohibited from saying one thing and doing another. Once a Sophoscite is held, government shall either abide by its own policy or officially change the policy.

Senate WIKIS

Sophoscites will return percentages of Senators that agree or disagree with a statement. This will come as a percentage. For example, perhaps one day we will see that 99.9% of

Senators in the most recent sophoscite did not believe that "the alignment of the stars could possibly influence the affairs of men on earth".

The Senate WIKI however, will work in another way. It will vote on a number of matters and the things that pass by a 2-to-1 margin, a 2/3 vote, will be put together into a single interconnected reality. The US version is going to be one of the biggest, and most objective versions of the truth in the world. It will exist for the Senate and people to use, so they have a democratically determined matrix.

Sophoscites are withering to matrix programs

Sophoscites will wither marginal and false ideas. And the more marginal the idea, the more withering the sophoscite's effects will be. I hope, I sorely do hope that mankind will finally kill off all the ancient Mideast scam ideologies like astrology, palm reading, ghosts, destiny, fate; and its feeding religions based on Mohammed, Jesus, Abraham, Buddha, and the Indian pantheon.

I hope that soon all these will get destructively low believability ratings as determined by our democratically elected genius democracy. Hopefully very high ratings will go to ideas like natural selection, and the idea that god and his churches don't need any money, and should not be allowed to collect any money or donations. Hopefully, soon we will all say that any church with an endless hunger for money is obviously one of our parasite's scams. Hopefully, In the future, people will be able to say things like: "You really think that the Pope is the vicarious presence of God/Christ on earth? You know, that idea polled less than 1% at the last Senate sophoscite."

Trending ideas in the Senate

Our Sub-Senate, Main-Senate and Over-Senate will each vote separately on a long list of questions and important ideas and theories. The scores for each question in each Senate will be given as a percentage. Also, the difference between the Senates and the way they trend should be studied as an indicator of thought leadership in our nascent group mind.

Are ecto-morphs, meso-morphs, and endo-morphs real?

Or are they Brolingo for how well haremi fit in? After all, Gr. ektos=outside, Gr. mesos=middle, Gr. endon=within, and morph = shape, form, thought, dream.

If we hold national sophoscites and vote on this ideology, we will have approval ratings for all sorts of things currently being taught in school. A protocol will help. Certainly we want to keep ideas out of school that 99% of our Senator/wise-men disapprove of. And clearly we want to keep ideas out of school that 85% of Senators disapprove of. But what about ideas that 30% of Senators disapprove of? What about ideas that 10% of Senators disapprove of? Certainly this question changes depending on the age of the students. Clearly the younger ones should be protected, and the older ones allowed to explore the fringes fully — with adults having the right to view whatever they want.

The false anarchy of schools

We should get rid of these Brotherly-run, insanely-expensive, garbage-laden, time-wasting, corrupt, opaque schools and colleges. Instead our Sub-Senate should compile a first-rate educational media library and first-rate educational testing. After this, we can make college and continuing education free for everyone.

The parasite struggles to gain backdoor power

The scientific method has back doors for the Arabs just like American-style democracy. And so does the media and so do our universities and courts. We have to start over. We have to elect a new reality with our new broad and incorruptible democracies. And every nation must vote on every thing especially the world's religions. How do the 1:250, 1:2,500 and 1:25,000 wise men of each nation stand on every subject.

Heraclitus, c.500BC, 111

"What use is your mind if you let yourself be lead around as a crowd by orators, without considering how many fools and cheats are among you [working in concert=con•sir•te with the orator, helping him as a clapping claue, shouting 'here here' and 'bravo'.], and how few men choose correctly. The best choose progress towards one thing [the truth], a word forever honored by the gods, while other eat their way toward sleep like nameless oxen." [Reader: Can you figure out the truth by yourself? Can you tell the truth from the lie by yourself?]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.19

"the constitution was reformed at that time, as I have explained, for the better, and greater security was thereby achieved. In fact, it would have been impossible for the people to have lived in safety under a republic [given all the Arab struggling and terrorism]. However, the events which followed that period cannot be told in the same way as those of earlier times. In the past, all matters were brought before the Senate and people [Que Roma, SPQR], even if they took place at a distance from Rome. Consequently, everyone learned of them and many people recorded them, and so the true version of events, even if considerably influenced by fear, or favor, or friendship, or enmity in the accounts given by certain authors, was still to a significant extent available in the writings of the others who reported the same happenings, and in the public records.

But in later times most events began to be kept secret and were prevented from becoming common knowledge. And even though it may happen that some matters are made public, the reports are discredited because they cannot be investigated, and the suspicion grows that everything is said and done according to the wishes of the men in power at the time, and their associates. Consequently much that never happened becomes common talk, while much that undoubtedly happened remains unknown. And in nearly all instances, the report which is spread abroad [widely] does not correspond to what actually happened. Besides this, the very size of the empire and the multitude of news events which take place simultaneously make it very hard to report them all accurately. In Rome, for example, and in the subject provinces, news events crowd upon one another, and in the countries of our enemies, there is something happening all the time, indeed every day. Concerning these matters, nobody other than those directly involved can easily obtain clear information, and many people never even hear in the first instance of what has actually occurred."

Plautus, d. 184BC, Amphitryon, 64-92

[Plautus was about 49 when the 2nd Punic War ended in 201BC. Here is a window on how the democratic forum in Rome was working at the end of the 2nd Punic War. Apparently the Roman/Pro-man people were aware of the claues. Here we imagine that Roman 'oratory' worked a lot like the British House of Commons with all its cheers and jeers. Here I am thinking of the way this house was presented in that vapid BBC series on the life of Benjamin D'Israeli. What a

time-wasting, unnecessarily humiliating way to run a legislature. What an easy-to-corrupt way to run a legislature.] "Here's the favor Jupiter [the sun god, the god of light and truth] asks: That for security, you assign inspectors [the footnote says 'conquaestores' meaning con•key•sirs] in each row to ferret out and indicate any hired claues and for security, that you remove their clothing [A slap on the wrist, a non-punishment.] Or anyone who is polled for his favorite by letter, messenger, or word of mouth. And if the Aediles [public administrators] give the prize [democratic decision] unfairly, Jupiter would have these men punished just as those who seek office for themselves or others [instead of doing so as their duty.]

How have we won our wars? By worth alone, and not by purchased votes or ambition. Let the same high standard hold for actors [brolingo for politicians] as in the army. No claquers, but only true artists [genius] should be crowned [elected]. An honest audience gives its applause only to those who really live the role. And Jove [Jupiter, the sun god, the supreme god] urged me further — that by law, inspectors check each member of the cast. If one of these has hired his friends to clap or made another actor [politician] look like a fool, they will cut to shreds his costume as well as his hide." [The Arabs always try to get control of our response to their evil doings. This way they can frequently redirect our anger against their enemies. These enemies (it is worth noting) are normally our true leaders.]

Retranslate all ancient works

Look at how absurdly hard it is to understand many ancient historical records in translation. This is obviously intentional on the part of the parasite. Accurately knowing what our forefathers said is of paramount importance to our future. We must be extremely careful to prevent our parasites meddling here. So why don't we use our Sub-Senates to:

1. Compile public lexicons of ancient Greek, Sanskrit, Sumerian, Babylonian, Arabic, Ancient Chinese, Celtic, etc.
2. Re-translate all ancient works in two versions. One should be for readability, and the other for accuracy. Both should be fully footnoted.

History & the matrix of today

History is the record of reality, right? What if that history is consistently not the truth? What if that is the truth bent to fit the needs of the parasite. What then is our political reality but a bunch of propaganda?

It is all infected you know. Only the facts are real. Three airplanes did crash into important buildings on September 11, 2001. That happened. It is just the interpretation and explanation that is Arab matrix lie.

Saudi Sheik Zaki Yamani, c.1973

"Civilizations will collapse if the world fights OPEC"

The World Trade Center collapse

Strange how these buildings and their collapse could be easily confused with a collapse of the world economy. Here we have a name that could easily be bent to confuse a timeline. Was this part of the plan when these buildings were named back around 1970? Perhaps the false anarchy of history has been set-up to record this event as the beginning of the end of the world economy, beginning in 2001.

False anarchy in business

Mar-tin Van Burr-en, r.1837-41

"The less government interferes with private pursuits, the better for general prosperity." [This is the parasite's carefully crafted matrix illusion at least.]

All free enterprise is false free enterprise

If free enterprise is a subset of anarchy, and all anarchy is false anarchy, then all free enterprise is false free enterprise. Someone is always there ready to run the economy if we don't get together as a society and assure basic business rights for all.

Free enterprise is doublespeak

In its most literal sense, this "free enterprise" is complete doublespeak. In fact, the more "free" our business environment is (beyond a point reached in the late 1800s), the more it is enslaved under large enterprises like of Standard oil and various other monopolies and cartels.

Standard oil & the US monopolies of the late 1800s

In 1859, Edwin L. Drake drilled the first oil well in Titusville Pennsylvania. In 1862, only three years after oil was "discovered" in Titusville, John D. Rockefeller's (D'Rock•our•feller's) Standard oil was building the world's first oil refinery Cleveland, about 100 miles away. This refinery was rolled into Rockefeller's famous oil monopoly Standard Oil, or S.O. which was renamed ESSO, and then renamed EXXON, today (154 years later) again the largest oil company in the world.

It is remarkable how the only Arab resource should again and again find itself under monopoly or cartel control in the land of the free. And every time this happens the land of the free finds itself enslaved in some way by the Arabs, that most ancient land of slavery to the Haremi cause.

Standard Oil, S.O., Esso, Exxon has always been an Arab puppet. The first time around, the Arabs reached too far, and we reacted by breaking up the Arab monopolies operating in the false anarchy of our "free enterprise" system.

Beware industry dominating enterprises

When they are young and changing the world, we should allow them. But once they become staid and sluggish, they become a danger for our economic freedom, and a likely agent for economic parasitism.

When businesses get uppity

When they abuse their market power, when they tax everyone, when they pretend to be the people, when they monkey with the workings of the free market, when they buy up small innovators to quash their disruptive innovations, when they stifle outside innovation, when they lobby government, or when they try to manipulate the minds of men, they should be punished by forced stock dilution in favor of the people and their national government.

CARTEL = an oligarchy acting as a monopoly. Let's all stop using this word and instead use the term MONOPOLY OF FRACTIONS so everyone can know what sort of evil they are dealing with.

Government always reduces private monopolies

Monopolies will form. However, as they form, it shall be

government's duty to erode and diminish them through a series of stock dilutions. Government should seldom privatize existing public monopolies.

Utility privatization was our parasite's idea

Our parasite needed a way to reinvest all the oil money it conned us out of. If it didn't do this, it couldn't keep the Western currencies strong and the other currencies weak. And without this currency disparity, it would not be able to make money on the Chinese slave trade, or raise China's industrial might as a tool for eliminating the Arab arch-enemy, the lands of free people.

Who decides about taking it easy?

Regarding the decision to take it easy, who makes this? Who gets to say: time to work hard, and more importantly time to take it easy? Is it the false anarchy of the parasite that tells us to take two days off in 7 to relax. Who came up with the 40 hour work week, and the 30-year mortgage? Was it the 20% of the world feeding on the other 80%?

What a stupid word we live in that 20% of humanity is not only not making anything at all, but it is feeding on the rest. And not only that, they are sabotaging our effort to make more as much as they can.

False anarchy has shifted the entire political spectrum

We live in a world where a parasite is actively sabotaging its hosts efforts to work together and cooperate — for this cooperation is harmful to the parasite's efforts to feed itself, and even to exist. Clearly this parasite has interfered and harmed most of our group efforts, and our socialist efforts to get together and co-operate (together-work), to get around of our parasite's many sphinxes. When our cooperation builds pipelines, railroads, canals and other infrastructure it reduces our need for the parasitic people of the "high seas". When our cooperation helps with unemployment and education, it reduces desperation and keeps people out of the clutches of the parasite. When our cooperation commands immunization and mosquito control, it keeps the parasite from using its many pathogens outlined in the plague and poisoning section herein.

Thus we can view the parasite's struggle as something that has interfered with most of our group efforts. Surely this artificial interference has steered our political continuum away from group endeavors (socialism) and towards the so-called free-market anarchy, the monopoly friendly "anarchy" our parasite enjoys most.

Marco Polo, Aladdin's tale, Divisament Dou Monde, Ch.1

[Clearly the ancient parasite race of the land of no resources was assassinating our leaders long before. When did it stop? And how far does their influence go?]

"The Sheikh was called in their language Aladdin [allowed in, Aladdin]. He had ordered made, in a valley between two mountains [THE proverbial valley between two mountains] the biggest and most beautiful garden [a walled and protected garden, a paradise or bar•adi•se] that was ever seen, planted with all the finest fruits in the world and containing the most impressive houses and palaces that were ever seen, ornamented with gold and with likenesses of all that is beautiful on earth, and also four conduits [canes, feeding tubes from all four cardinal directions]. One flowing with wine, one with milk, one with honey and one with water. There were fair ladies and damsels, the most beautiful in the world, unrivaled at playing every sort of instrument and at singing and dancing. And he told his men to understand that this garden

was Paradise [with a capital P]. That is why he had made it after this pattern, because Mohammed assured the Saracens [Sarah's kin] that those who go to Paradise will have beautiful women to their hearts' content to do their bidding, [Translation: if you help the cause of Mideast Inc. you will be given all the sex and babies you can make. This is what the devil's bargain is. And this is the paradise of the land of no resources.] and will find there rivers of wine, milk, honey and water. So he had this garden made like the Paradise that Mohammed promised to the Saracens, and the Saracens of this country believed that it really was Paradise. No one ever entered the garden [because it was harem or forbidden to enter] except those whom he wished to make Assassins. At the entrance stood a castle [citadel] so strong [impregnable] that it need fear no man in the world, and there was no other way in[to the paradise] except through this castle. The Sheikh kept with him at his court all the youths of the country from 12 to 20, all, that is who were well suited as fighting men. [Recall the start of the Disney film Prince of Persia where a boy of this age gets noticed by a Sheikh for his criminal abilities.]

These young men knew well by common knowledge that Mohammed, their prophet had declared Paradise was created in the way I describe, and so they accepted it as the truth. Now pay attention to what follows. He [the sheikh] use to put some of these young men in this Paradise [of his, sometimes] 4, or 10 or 20, according to his wishes. And this is how he did it. he would given them draughts [of hashish from a hookah] that sent them to sleep right away. Then he had them taken and put in the garden [that seemed like Paradise or heaven, especially if the drugs were opiates], where they would wake up. When they awoke and found themselves in there and saw all the things I have told you of, they believed they were really in Paradise. And the ladies and damsels stayed with them all the time, singing and making music for their delight and ministering to all there desires [especially their sexual desires]. So these young men had all they could wish for and asked nothing better than to remain there. [These boys seem to have been drugged with opiated hashish, opiated with some primitive version of hero-in. This made the sheikh's paradise as paradise-like as possible. It also made the heo-in withdraw unbearable, and the boys would literally kill for more of this paradise.]

Now the Sheikh held his court with great splendor and magnificence and conducted himself most nobly and convinced the simple mountain folk of the area that he was a prophet. And they believed it to be the truth. And when he wanted emissaries to send on some mission of murder, he would administer the drug to as many [of these 'simple' young men/ potential suicide bombers] as he pleased. And when they fell asleep, he had them carried out to his [outer] palace. When these young men woke up, and found themselves in the [outer] palace, they were shocked, and not at all happy, because the Paradise they just came from was not a place that they would ever willingly have left.

So they immediately went to the Sheikh and humbled themselves before him, as men who believed that he was a great prophet. When he asked them where they came from, they would answer that they came from Paradise, and that this was in truth the Paradise of which Mohammed had told their ancestors. And they would tell those listening all that they had discovered there. And the others who heard this and had not been there were filled with a great longing to go to this Paradise [of harems and hero-in]. They longed for death, so that they might go there, and looked forward eagerly to the day of their going.

When the Sheikh desired the death of some great lord, he would first try an experiment to find out which of his Assassins were the best. He would send some off on a nearby mission, at no great distance with orders to kill a certain man. They went without objection and carried out the orders of their commander. Then when they had killed the man, they returned to [the sheikh's] court — those of them that escaped, because some were caught and put to death. When they had returned to their lord and told him that they had faithfully performed their task, the Sheikh would make a great feast in their honor. And he knew very well which of them had displayed the greatest zeal, because after each, he had sent others of his men as spies, to report which was the most daring and the best hand at murdering. Then, in order to bring about the death of the lord or other man which he desired, he would take some of these Assassins of his and send them wherever he might wish, telling them that he was thinking of sending them to Paradise: [but] they were to go for that reason and kill such and such a man. If they died on their mission, they would go there all the sooner. Those who received such a command went and did all that they were commanded. They obeyed their command and cooperated fully. More readily than anything else they might have been called to do.

Thus it happened that no one ever escaped when the Sheikh of the Mountain desired his death. And I can assure you that many kings and many lords paid tribute to him and cultivated his friendship for fear that he might bring about their death. This happened because at that time the nations [of the Mideast] were not united in their allegiance, but turned by conflicting loyalties and purposes.

I have told you about the Sheikh of the Mountain [citadel] and his Assassins. Now let me tell you how he was overthrown and by whom. But first I will tell you something else about him that I had omitted. You must know that this Sheikh had chosen two other Sheikhs as aids. These adopted all his practices and customs. One of these he sent in the direction of Damascus [and Europe] and the other to the area direction of Kurdistan [and China. These also seem to have practiced assassination as a military tactic].

Let us now turn to the subject of his overthrow. It happened about the year of our lord 's Nativity 1262 that Hulagu, lord of the Tartars of the Levant, knowing of all the evil deeds this sheikh had been doing, made up his mind that he [the sheikh] should be crushed. So he appointed some of his barons and sent them against his castle with a powerful force. [However, history records this as starting in 1258] For fully 3 years they besieged this castle without being able to take it. Indeed they never would have taken it so long as the besieged had anything to eat, but at the end of the three years they had no food left. So they were taken, and the Sheikh, Alaodin [Aladdin] was put to death with all his men. And from that time to this there have been no more of these Sheikhs and no more Assassins [or at least that is what Mideast Inc. would like you to think, so it can leave us wondering "who killed the Kennedys", as the lyrics go.] But with him [Aladdin] there came an end to all the power that had been wielded of old by the Sheikhs of the Mountain and all the evil they had done."

4—BACKDOORS

Suetonius, The reign of Domitian 15

"nothing worried him as much as an answer given by the astrologer Asc•le•tario." [That is Ask•al•tarot = Ask•the•tarot. And this was about Roman emperor Domition.]

Plutarch, d. 120AD, Gaius Marius, 42

"A number of Chaldean astrologers, professional inspectors of sacrifices, and interpreters of the Sibylline books had induced him to believe that all would be well. Here was a man who seems to have been in other respects remarkable among the Romans for his good sense and particularly remarkable for upholding the dignity of the consular office free from fear and favor in accordance with the laws and customs of the land which he regarded as immutable decrees. Yet in this one direction he was unbalanced, spending more of his time with charlatans and soothsayers than with men of political or military distinction." [Any backdoor, or excuse will do. Leaders that believe in astrology are a backdoor for the Arabs.]

Plutarch, Alexander, 75

"Meanwhile Alexander had become so much obsessed by his fears of the supernatural and so overwrought and apprehensive in his own mind, that he interpreted every strange or unusual occurrence, no matter how trivial, as a prodigy or a portent, with the result that the palace was filled with soothsayers, sacrificers, purifiers and prognosticators." [When weak minded puppet leaders become paranoid, they become more dependent their advisors].

Ammianus Marcellinus on Roman Emperor Valens, d. 378 AD

"He was better at choosing between different options than coming up with them."

[This type of figurehead is easy for his administration (his metaphorical horse) to manipulate.]

Tacitus, Histories, 1.4

"The death of Nero [68AD] had been welcomed initially by a surge of relief. ... [However] A well-hidden secret of the principate had been revealed: It was possible, it seemed, for an emperor to be chosen outside Rome." [Imagine if this was the case in America today. Imagine if all that was necessary was to have an Islamic middle name like Hussein as Barak Hussein Obama had. Then all of Islam's umma would know to lean the boat, to jihad=struggle to support to the candidate with the Islamic middle name of Hussein. And at the same time they would all know to struggle against his opponent. All would give generously to the candidate with the Islamic middle name of Hussein. Here we see how dangerous it is to allow money to buy votes in any way and why we must change the nature of our democracy so that money will have as little influence as possible.]

Kryptonite kills supermen

KRYPTONITE is from Gr. kruptos = that which is hidden. This material can be used to blackmail any superman. All that has to be done is for the evil brother to manufacture a situation where the powerful superman is made to have a dirty little secret that will ruin all his power. After that, the superman is mastered by the holder of the kryptonite.

Few people know that the Superman comic strip only became famous after it added an absurd super-villain that made the harem brothers look absurd?

Rotting corpses — the #1 job qualification thumbs-men

There is a very good reason why so many Catholic priests are fucking the little boys of their parish. It is simply that the Arabs secretly running the Catholic Church's hiring department like to pick pedophiles over anyone else.

This is because they look for men with a horrible secret — and

someone who is deathly afraid of that secret getting out. These are men who will all do whatever they are told. These are dogs who will all come without fail when they are called, or their dog chain is jerked. All you have to do is threaten them about their secret and they will do as you say. They can be murders, or thieves, or pedophiles — any secret will do. However pedophiles have three other advantages.

1) It is very shameful for victims to come forward, so victims tend to stay quiet, and there is less employee churn as a result. 2) It is an accusation that is normally without any physical evidence against a respected 'man of god'. and 3) The priests are not only thumbs-men, but they literally 'fuck up' dozens of infidel boys/men so badly that they don't reproduce.

How to corrupt an institution through and through

Respected priest, or defrocked pedophile priest? It is a pretty stark choice. These men will generally do just about anything to keep their secret a secret. These are men that are firmly under the haremi thumb. These are men who will all help elect the parasite's choices of bishop. And the bishops in turn will help elect the parasite's choice for Pope, Vicar of Christ, or the vicarious presence of Christ on earth. Then all the world's Catholics can be steered as the parasite sees fit, just like in a corrupt government. In fact the Roman Church International was once the world government when it was named "The Holy Roman Empire".

Giovanni Botero, The Reason of State 1589, I:16

[Here the Arabs are talking about Christianity as a tool for ruling over their host races in Europe.] "Religion gives so much strength to governments that without it, all other foundations of state would collapse. Thus almost all those who have sought to found new empires have either introduced new sects or give new life to the old ones, as shown by the examples of Ismail [the Assassin creed], king of Persia, and the Sharif of Morocco. But of all religions, none prescribes laws more favorable to princely monarchy than the Christian [Catholic] religion; for it places under them [the Brotherly princes] not only the bodies and the possessions of the subjects, as is proper, but also their souls and their thoughts as well. [From the confessional.] It requires obedience to reckless princes as well as to moderate ones, and it demands that they suffer anything rather than disturb the peace [and rebel].

Furthermore, nothing releases a subject from due obedience to the prince unless [his command] runs counter to the laws of nature or of God. And [even] in these cases, [the Catholic religion] insists that everything be done [to reach a compromise] before arriving at an open break. Of this, the Christians in the primitive Church gave a great example. Even though they were persecuted and cruelly tormented in every imaginable way, we never read that they ever rebelled against the [Roman] Empire or revolted against their princes. They suffered [torture by] the wheel, iron, fire, and the savage cruelty and rage of tyrants and executioners, all for [the sake of] public peace. [What does this mean?] We must not think these [these horrible tortures] occurred because they [the Christians] lacked the power [to do otherwise]; for entire legions threw down their arms and let themselves be cruelly torn to pieces. [When did this occur? Is there some alternate history?] Even more astonishing is that with all this, they still prayed to God daily for the preservation of the Roman Empire. In our own times, we have seen Catholics persecuted by [Protestant] heretics everywhere: In Scotland, England, France, Flanders, and many parts of Germany. This shows the truth of the proposition that the Catholic faith makes subjects obedient to

[their prince, binds their consciences, and makes them desirous of peace and enemies of \[public\] tumult and scandals. But Luther, Calvin and the rest, straying from the truth of the Gospels, sow discord everywhere and \[cause\] revolutions in states and ruin to kingdoms.](#)

Now, since religion is so important for felicitous government and the tranquillity of states, the prince should encourage it and do his best to favor its spread. For, as Duke Emanuele of Savoy used to say, [people dedicated to religion and piety live much more obediently than those who govern themselves...](#)"

Apple dictionary definition of Inalienable

"Unable to be taken away from or given away by the possessor: Freedom of religion, the most inalienable of all human rights."

[Nonsense, the right to life, liberty, justice, health, free speech, free assembly, the right to bear arms, and the right pursue what we want are all more important than the freedom to practice a Mideast Religion. Who is saying this and why?]

Great synergy is achieved with confession

In seminary confession, the Arabs running the religion get to find out who has a rotting corpse, a black-mailable secret and is thus qualified to be a thumbs-man priest in their religion.

Giovanni Botero, The Reason of State, 1589, I:16

["In matters of government, give the bishops freedom to judge issues of doctrine and morals. Give them all the legal powers that church law and civil law allow them for the proper direction of souls... you should promote the carrying out of their decisions by all possible means -- by your authority, your power, your money, and your acts -- because the better your subjects behave \[according to church rules\], and the more zealously they follow the ways of God, the more pliable and obedient they will be to their prince. When a lawsuit involving Pope Symmachus was brought before the Goth king Theodoric, he put the entire matter into the hands of a synod \[court\] of bishops, adding that "he had nothing to do with ecclesiastical affairs, except to give them due reverence" \[and do as he was instructed by his masters\].](#)

Polybius, d. 118BC, 6.56, The Titan in Harness

"To me, the Roman constitution shows its greatest strength in its attitude towards Religion. I think a tendency that is reprobated [objected to] in other countries is actually the cornerstone of the Roman system. By this, I mean Superstition. [In Rome, this attribute \[superstition\] has been artificially exaggerated and introduced to private life as well as public affairs to the greatest extent conceivable. Doubtless many readers will find this extraordinary, but in my opinion the Romans have done this deliberately with a eye to the masses. If a community exclusively composed of intelligent beings were a practical possibility, such a policy might conceivably be unnecessary. But unfortunately, the masses everywhere are unstable and imbued with such anti-social passions as irrational temper and homicidal fury. There is therefore no means available for holding them in check except unseen terrors and the theatre of Superstition.](#)

From this point of view, [I feel that there was nothing random or irresponsible in the policy of our forefathers when they introduced among the masses the conceptions of Religion and the notions regarding Hell, and that it is far more irresponsible and irrational of the present generation to give up these ideas."](#)

Follow the fool

In our parasite's game of follow the leader, one key strategy is to keep the host societies following fools as leaders. And there are countless examples fools as leaders in modern society. There are music stars, athletic stars, film stars, there are people with dance moves, graffiti artists, and people who look good and dress well. How can we allow our parasite to make these vacuous thought-less people into leaders for our children and our society? Can't we all think of smarter people to make our leaders?

A great example is the ever-cool, finger snapping FONZE (Perhaps from L. FONS et origo mali = the FOUNT and origin of evil) Basically, in this lame TV show, the "Fonzie Show", better known as "Happy Days," millions of kids grew up seeing who was to be listened to and respected in society. It certainly wasn't the good hearted, hard working, honest, cooperative sincere character named Rich•ard Cunning•man. He got no respect through our parasite's propaganda prism of television. Instead, the boy who never finished school, the motorcycle-riding rebel, the layabout, only had to snap his fingers and everyone did his bidding.

Cicero, 46BC, The Brutus

[Here we see our parasite's propaganda about why some people so fail at leadership, which in ancient times was confusingly called oratory and eloquence. I guess some people (namely the harem brothers) had the gift and some did not.]

(25) ["...what I am proposing to do is not to sing the praises of oratory/eloquence, or to describe its power, and to list the high positions it brings to those who possess it; for there is no need to do so. But there is one point that I want to insist upon, without hesitation, and it is this: Whether oratory is a creation of rules, or of training, or of natural gifts, it is the most difficult of all things to achieve. It is said to consist of five elements \[Invention, arrangement diction, action, memory\] And each of the five is a great art in its own right. Just imagine, then, the potency of something that is made of of five great arts! And just imagine the problems involved!"](#)

Cicero, The Brutus, 46BC

(82) ["Servius Sulpicius Galba ... was the earliest Latin orator to make use of the techniques which an orator should employ ... such as digression for the sake of embellishment, entertainment of his listeners, appeal to their emotions, embroidery of his theme, the introduction of pathos \[suffering, tearjerking\] and the insertion of appropriate generalizations."](#)

Cicero, The Brutus, 46BC

(89) ["There are two main qualities that an orator should to possess. One is a capability of convincing argument and presenting the facts. The other is expertise in kindling the emotions of his listeners. What Rutilius' account shows is that the speaker who arouses his audience's emotions is far more effective than the man who merely seeks to instruct it."](#)

The Apple dictionary definition of demagogue

"• a political leader who seeks support by appealing to popular desires and prejudices rather than by using rational argument.
• (in ancient Greece and Rome) a leader or orator who espoused the cause of the common people."

[Dem•agogue = Gr. demos = the people + Gr. agogos = leading.]

He can't be dumb, he wrote that book that everyone is talking about

He can't be dumb, he made that documentary everyone is talking about

When the parasite has a real dummy on its hands — when it has a frontman perceived by the public as too stupid to rule, what does it do? Well, it frequently has Mr. Moron write a book. Then the dummy can't be so dumb because he "wrote a book" that was widely praised by the openly corrupt paid commercial media (and the parasite's flee circus = eff•ally ak•our•ak•us). For example, let's take someone like Al Gore: Without his book, could this plodding speaker/thinker have been a serious candidate for leader of the free world? Look at the immense help Al Gore got writing his book and making his film. Look at the backdoor that writing a book creates for our leaders.

Advanced degrees are a back door

Frequently when one is trying to get an advanced degree, there are these crucial subjective steps where between 1 and 8 appointee professors vote on either admission to the program or the value of the material. Should a group this small (let alone a group of appointees) be given any consideration whatsoever in deciding who is fit to be elected as one of society's intellectual leaders? Should we give such easy-to-corrupt academic degrees any standing in our decisions about who we will vote for?

Education is irrelevant for true leaders

Let's distinguish between education and learning. Education is really ex•duction, or leading out. Education is something passive that one receives. It is mostly the ideas of others that are remembered. Thus education is for followers. Genuine leaders have very little need for education as they generate their own ideas.

Real leadership

To teach real leadership, teach young people to come up with their own ideas before you show them the accepted ideas of others. Give them the problem, tell them to solve it and then only show them what the "official" or "optimal" solution is, afterwards.

Education and the bell curve

Visualize the value of education relative to intelligence as existing on a bell curve. At both ends of the curve, the value of education becomes insignificant. On the left, we have the dumb kids unable to learn and apply the abstract, world-changing ideas of others. And on the right, we have the smart kids who are able to learn these ideas very well. These however, we don't learning the ideas of others. These we don't want to be habituated towards intellectually passivity. And more importantly, we don't want the old traditional memes blocking the advancement of new and better memes. Instead, we want the people on the right, our leaders figuring stuff out for themselves with child-like freshness as adults. Thus the value of education declines sharply for both the super dumb and the super smart.

Pablo Picasso

"Every child is an artist. The problem is how to remain an artist once he grows up." [This quote is not merely about art — it is a metaphor for all education, problem solving and human group intelligence. Perhaps, given our universally delivered and significantly uniform educations were designed to destroy

all metaphorical artistic ability in our young people by filling their minds with mostly useless garbage memories.]

Every fact you teach

Every fact you teach displaces real problem-solving/leadership ability.

Every fact is "another brick in the wall" blocking genuine leadership ability.

Jerome Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient Rome, Ch. 4

The primary school of Rome might thus debauch [debase, corrupt, molest, abuse] the children it was supposed to instruct; and on the other hand it rarely awoke in them any feeling for the beauty of knowledge. ... The master's sole ambition was to teach his pupils to read, write, and count; as he had several years at his disposal in which to accomplish this, he made no attempt to improve his wretched teaching methods or to brighten his dismal routine. Thus he taught his hearers [students] the names and the order of the letters before showing them their form -- a method which Quintilian strongly condemns -- and when the pupils had painfully learned to recognize the written characters by their appearance, they had to make a fresh effort to combine them into words and syllables [The Brothers seem to have done this on purpose]. They progressed as slowly as they liked, and when they passed on to writing they came up against a similar irrational and backward procedure. Without any preliminary training in holding or using a reed pen, they were suddenly face with a pattern to copy. Their finger had to be held by the master or guided by someone else to trace the outline of the letters placed before them, so that innumerable lessons were necessary before they acquired the necessary skill to make the simple copy for themselves.

Is the education process harmful to true leaders?

Let's talk about our brightest young people, our natural born leaders. I argue that conditioning smart young people to readily accept the instillation of other people's ideas is a step in the wrong direction — something that tends to actually reduce the leadership abilities of our leaders. I mean, do we want to habituate our leaders to be ideologically passive followers? Do we want to encourage following as even a part-time modality in our leaders of tomorrow?

Respected degrees as a backdoor

Don't use educational degrees as credentials in your democracy. If you do this, you will hand a back door to the non-elected people running your universities.

Highly regarded and commonly cited

The problem with this is so obvious in some websites. A links/likes B, B links/likes C, C links/likes D, ... Y links/likes Z, and Z links/likes A — all are thus popular. Beware the respected authorities as many are frauds.

How to spot a genuine leader

Insight and diversity of outlook are everything. Look for people who make you say, "None of us ever thought of that aspect of the issue", or "gee, we never looked at it that way". And it doesn't matter if they are frequently wrong. Look for people who have different experiences and outlooks from normal. Look for people who don't accept what other people say and are quick to disagree for plausible reasons. You want more than anything else, people who see things differently. You want lots of mutations in your ideological breeding population

— Then thanks to a fair and incorruptible democratic survival mechanism, the fittest ideas will survive and thrive, while the unfit ideas are killed off in mindspace.

Again, please do not consider someone's college degree, occupation, or whether they wrote a book as any indication of their ability as a Senator. Only listen to what they say. And remember, I was a C student that didn't finish college and hated school. I couldn't stand being told what to read/learn and what ideas to hold in my mind.

Your newspapers are corrupt

Pretty much all of your "respected" newspapers exist as corporate entities that sell voting rights out in the open on a stock market. If they are not corporations, they are owned by individuals or partnerships.

A great example of the corruption of your newspapers is how all of the Wall Street Journal's sidewalk vending boxes in the US were for years decorated with a front-page that said "Oil Find Will Spur Industry Change". Then if you looked closer you would see "Drilling in waters up to two miles deep, oil companies are making some very large discoveries". Obviously this is Arab propaganda, and obviously the Arabs have great influence at one of the most respected US newspapers.

We don't want to tip our hand

Shareholders can do pretty much whatever they want at a company. They can even hire Arab moles as CEO, news director, editor in chief, marketing director, etc. The only rule is that these Arab moles not tip their hand and look obviously biased.

Perhaps you have under-estimated the power of shareholders to steer and corrupt the news.

Crisis Councils

Since at least the time of Julius Caesar, our parasite has used emergency situations as an excuse to grab "temporary" dictatorial power. Then these puppet front-men never give up their power and the dictatorship becomes permanent. For this reason, any truly incorruptible form of government must have proper organs for dealing with temporary emergencies. If it doesn't have these, some group is eventually going to come along and make them up as they see fit. Also, these organs must have clear rules, and sharp divisions of power, as well as the harshest of penalties for those attempting to exceed the powers granted to them by society.

Decentralize government input

Another back door to government occurs when ideas are submitted to the group. Here we have to be on the lookout for people who would do things like intercept a patent application. The best solution seems to be that all Centi-Nomes and all recorders may serve as a collection and logging point for any patent or trademark, or anything that needs to be publicly recorded.

Extra-democratic status should be inadmissible

Never confer status on the basis of anything that exists outside your democracy. Never listen to what the media says, or you will give a back door to entities that sell voting rights by the share on the open market.

Never use status conferred by a corrupt, opaque, or biased sub-democracy like an Academy Award, or Noble Prize. If you do this, you will give the "board of deputies

appointed by the Swedish learned societies" a back door to your government.

And never use an advanced university degree or you will give a back door to the opaque non-democracy that is academia.

All non-democratic institutions in a democracy are potential back doors.

When sham sub-democracies are allowed to influence a national democracy, they are by definition a back door to influencing that democracy. A perfect example is the Motion Picture Academy of America, the Academy Awards people.

Here are 3 immensely influential propaganda films that the Academy Award vote helped legitimize as "Best Picture" of the year: Lawrence of Arabia, The Sting, and Casablanca. Lawrence got us thinking that the Arabians were dumb, disorganized, bumpkins just before the Arab oil embargo. The Sting placed an upper limit on the scale of the big con in the same year as the 1973 embargo. And Casablanca (perhaps the most malevolent film of all time) framed Nazi concentration camps as something other than where millions of innocent civilians were being gassed to death and incinerated. Please people, we can not afford to allow sham democracies like these to influence our real democracy.

Getting swallowed by the whale

Our parasite must come to our land and infiltrate our society so it can make us do its bidding. It must be swallowed by the whale (our society) and it must hijack our institutions so we facilitate its various rackets. It must gain political influence so we build and enforce its Trade Walls. We must be made to spend huge sums to erect barriers to stop drug imports, so our parasite can profit from the international drug trade. We must be made to over-regulate oil drilling so that our parasite can sell its oil for \$100/barrel at times. We must be made to wage horrible wars so that our parasite can profit immensely from the ensuing shortages. Again, our parasite lives to be swallowed by its host, where its people can move into our society and influence us to do the things our parasite needs to survive.

The Doors — Any door will do

The desperate people from the land of no resources use a multi-pronged approach on its host. They will climb inside of any institution that can serve as a back door to power over our societies. All corruptible institutions are potential tools of our parasite, be they government, business, religion, science, or education. Government and religion are just the most powerful, and for that reason the most important.

If there is no way into our institutions, the Brothers will work (or fight) like crazy to create them. They have a multi-generational time horizon, and they are locked in a life or death struggle to feed themselves, so they generally succeeded given even a few moments of weakness on our part.

Divisive issues and the parasite's party

Now Roman Church International (the Roman Catholic Church) is a powerful force in American Politics. It is not so powerful by itself, but powerful as part of an orchestra used by the land of no resources to sway America's democracy. This orchestra also includes many of our big corporate advertisers, as well as other institutions of all sorts. These are all used in concert to sway America's public opinion pendulum in one direction or another.

One of America's most divisive issues is the right of people to abort their gestating offspring. This one issue is so

powerful for America's Catholics that they will frequently support just about any candidates that stands opposed to abortion. If possible, the parasite will cultivate a number of other single issue groups. These it will often cobble together in a voting alliance that supports the parasite's agenda. Each group within the alliance accepts anything at all for our national agenda, so they can satisfy their one GOTTAHAVE = a categorical imperative. Each group within the block votes for things unpalatable to most people.

Here we come to understand the true reason for the absolute positions that so many religions adopt. They are often intentionally unpalatable to non-believers. This way, sharp divisions are created, a "cleaving" that may be exploited for centuries to achieve political power. Islam is about the greatest example of this sort of religious absolutism. Islam is made intentionally unpalatable to non-believers so as to maximize the unity and power of its adherents.

5— FREE SPEECH

Jim Lehrer

"If we don't have an informed electorate we don't have a democracy."

[Make this a mantra]

James Madison, 1798.12.21, Virginia Resolutions

"The right of freely examining public characters and measures, and of free communication among the people thereon... has ever [always] been justly deemed the only effectual [effective] guardian of every other right."

[To simplify the intentionally prolix:

The right to examine our leaders and their activities has always been the best guardian of every other right.

Thomas Jefferson

"Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government."

[Make this a mantra]

Fisher Ames, 1807, Review of the pamphlet on the State of the British Constitution

"We are, heart and soul, friends to the freedom of the press... It is a precious pest, and a necessary mischief, and there would be no liberty without it."

Peter Singer

"In a democracy, citizens pass judgement on their government, and if they are kept in the dark about what their government is doing, they cannot be in a position to make well-grounded decisions."

Robert A Heinlein

"When any government, or any church... [says] to its subjects: This you may not read, this you must not see, this you are forbidden to know, the end result is tyranny and oppression no matter how holy the motives."

James Madison

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives."

James Madison

"A popular [democratic] government without popular [democratic] information or the means of acquiring it, is but a

prologue to a farce, or a tragedy, or perhaps both."

Tom Clancy

"The control of information is something the elite always does, particularly in a despotic form of government. Information, knowledge is power. If you can control information, you can control people."

David Brin

"Only a knowledgeable, empowered and vocal citizenry can perform well in democracy."

[In other words, a democracy will not work well unless all of the following take place:

1. There is knowledge of the truth.
2. There is means to share that truth.
3. A will to communicate that truth with each other exists.]

It is all based on freedom of information

As much as possible, the people in a democracy must know what the truth is. And in order to know the truth, they must be able to freely and safely discuss their world, and the problems they face. Without this freedom of information, their democratic decisions, no matter how fairly measured, will tend to be poorly thought out.

Enslave their minds and enslave their society

Without freedom of information, the people informing us are able to rule our minds, and then we rule ourselves (or just go along) under their various parallax matrix realities. Examples include: the CO2 theory of climate, church taxes, the idea that the war is going well, the need for a need for a US — USSR cold war arms build up, and the recent struggle of Islam.

Thus freedom of information might even be seen as something outside of democracy, and indeed government — for our shared governments are only capable of going where our shared mind (matrix) directs them.

Another way of seeing it: That once the minds of men have been corrupted, it doesn't matter what mechanisms we use to measure their votes, their decisions will always be corrupt.

Free speech, the primary right

Not all rights are equal. Some rights come before others. The right to free speech, for example, must come before all other rights in a democracy. This is because the right to explain and learn the truth is the foundational aspect of people ruling themselves. Without this, the people will not know who and what they are voting for.

In fact, it could be argued that the voting system is not so important as the public opinion that it measures. I mean, for example, here I am exercising my right to free speech and this alone (hopefully) is going to change a faulty voting system.

Freedom of information is the citadel right

It is the primary right, the cornerstone right, the citadel right of the human citizens in a democracy. It comes before all other freedoms and mechanisms in a democracy. Everything else is lower and less important than the right to know and discuss the truth in safety.

Democracy is the building, free speech is its foundation

If the foundation is faulty, the structure will fail, no matter how strong. Democratically build a strong library as a foundation for your democracy.

Free Speech — anonymity

The Arab parasite spirit wants to kill your smartest

[Gr. aristo = the best, highest or tallest. And Thr•asy•bulus breaks down as Gr.thur=sacrifice, kill, burn, destroy + asy=us + Gr. boule=the will, or a directive.]

["Thrasylbulus invited the [messenger] to walk with him from the city to a field where corn was growing. As he passed through the cornfield, he kept cutting off and killing all the tallest and best stalks of corn which he could see, until the finest and best-grown part of the crop [generation] was ruined ... Peri•ander [surrounding man] seized the point at once; it was perfectly plain to him that Thrasylbulus recommended the murder of all the people in the city who were outstanding in influence or ability. He took this advice, and from that time forward. [This was Herodotus 5.92. Bear in mind that the parasite gathers "Facebook" and "Gmail" information for decades before it stages a storm, a program/pogrom, where it cuts off the tallest lines in great purges. In Saddam War I, many of the tallest were sent to gorge on the plunder of Kuwait. Then when they retreated, all died in a great fiery holocaust.]

Freedom of speech is freedom from fear

When the people have any fear at all of expressing or accessing political ideas, the completeness and accuracy of the information they are using to make democratic decisions declines. And as a result, their democracy's decision making ability suffers. So there must be absolutely no fear at all of speaking about any political matter if we are going to have an impartial discussion, and a fair trial of the things our democracy is considering.

Also, this freedom from fear with respect to free speech is not only about our government. It also includes organized crime, business interests, and foreign governments as well as "independent" fanatics. We must have freedom from all forms of political expression fear, or our beautiful democracy, no matter how well designed and measured will have a back door to those who would use violence to drive men as a herd.

Truly free speech includes anonymity

The only way to guarantee the safety of those expressing controversial ideas — the only way to truly preserve our cornerstone democratic right to free speech — is to assure the right of the people to anonymous free speech. This is especially so in today's electronic age. A recent dramatic film called The Tourist (set in Venice) offers a fairly reasonable looking account of how easy it is to bribe and corrupt a modern intelligence people, thus gaining access to the most advanced government surveillance technology. Here we ponder the immense buying power of Mideast Inc. and its billions. We might also assume that our parasite has a few Brotherly moles in all the intelligence agencies worldwide.

Personally, I fear the intelligence gathering apparatus of my own country under the so called Patriot Act. (This is an Orwellian doublespeak name, for this is surely the find all the patriots act.) I worry that our parasite's billions will buy it access to information gathered by my country in the name of counter terrorism. Or maybe one man working for my government will trust the wrong person and do his buddy a favor to "catch a bad guy."

Anonymous free speech & secret lawmaker voting

Both can be absolutely critical for a democracy. Anonymous

voting is always critical for our lawmakers — so their votes cannot be sold, swapped, blackmailed, or intimidated. Anonymous free speech is critical for our thought leaders. Just imagine if our Arab parasite could identify its host's 1,000 or 10,000 top political luminaries, and then quietly snuff them out before they become famous.

It ain't a democracy unless

- 1) People can safely talk about and hear about what they are voting for.
- 2) People can discuss things anonymously, because only anonymity will guarantee safety.

Safe free speech and corrupting evil

There are no doubt countless Arabs in the world that would like to secretly give strategic intelligence to the cause of freedom. However, with all the spying and security breaches of recent years, many people are frightened from taking a chance for the public good. None can be sure that they won't be discovered and subjected to the worst death imaginable. But if our system provided for fool-proof anonymity in the promulgation of information, then it would be much easier to get people to offer up information in support of the greater good of mankind.

It is never safe

From an early age, quite a number of people hinted or just came out and said that I should hide my intellect and play the fool. This particularly with respect to politics and history.

One of the simplest things you can all do to make the world a better place is to take every single thing of any value that you can find related to politics, history, elections, media manipulation, propaganda, cultural brainwashing, brotherly gazettes, etc. and put it all on a great digital library that is free to download and copy as a library. In fact, most people should own this great library as a matter of civic duty. Call it sacred civic knowledge, or whatever. This way, nobody will ever be able to use our Kindle download records to know who is politically savvy and and who is not.

Also, never assume it is safe to say original or remarkable things about politics, history, society, etc. Save your best and most transcendental ideas for your anonymous writings. In fact we should all probably assume that our parasite is alive and still looking to eliminate humanity's brightest stars. We should assume this perhaps for centuries.

Intersect PLAGUE and PLAGE

Eng. plage = a place by the sea, such as a beach or marsh

Eng. Plague = a contagious disease, something that comes from a plage.

Eng. plage = an unusually bright region on the sun, the opposite of the moon, the symbol of Mideast Inc.

Thus the word for a particularly bright spot on the symbol of light is also the same as the word for an epidemic. If one of these spots gets too bright and insightful, there may be a great plague.

Sub-Senators as anonymity membrane

If someone approaches a Senator wishing to remain anonymous, the Senator should be duty-bound to keep that person's identity as secret.

The citizen journalist

Real citizen journalists don't care about being paid or rewarded for their work. They inform society because it is their duty.

The political and historical encyclopedia

There is no longer much need for the local book repositories known as public libraries. Instead, we should take our public books and put them into large knowledge sections of say 60GB that are publicly posted and downloadable for free.

All the Political, historical, and anti-fascist material will be scattered randomly in the rest of the library so nobody will be able to tell who has those parts of the library and who does not. This way, nobody will know what we know simply by viewing our download list.

An act of honor

If an author wants to stay anonymous for a time, and people front for him. The people fronting for him are undertaking danger as his human shields. This is a act of honor.

Child porn and stalking vs. democracy

These things are certainly horrible problems. But the ability to communicate anonymously and safely is the cornerstone of free speech, making it the cornerstone of democracy and freedom. Are we really supposed to give up our democracy and our freedom in a vain attempt to stop child pornography and stalking? And do we really think that giving up our first and most important freedom is going to substantially reduce the number of people harmed in this way?

There should be no doubt that our ability to exist as a democracy is at stake here. The ability to safely discuss the things we vote on in our democracies can never be diminished in any way, and for any reason - ever. Even if whole cities are being held hostage, there can be no compromise here. People must be able to speak safely and anonymously, or all will be lost.

Big Brother is watching you

Big brother is definitely able to watch you online. Everywhere you go online, big brother has an electronic record. Every book you check out, every library search, every web-search you make, every bookstore point of sale system is married to a video record. There are cell phone transcriptions, two-way cell-phone video and stereo microphones. There are all sorts of ways to find the smart and politically aware among us. And today, our parasite even has these social networks to make the devil's job easier. How easy will it be to get rid of our 1:100 best minds once our parasite's civil unrest eventually starts up again.

As always, it is dangerous just to be smart. Realize that we are talking about the same force that gave the world the French Reign of Terror where most of France's intellectuals went to the guillotine. It is the same force that purged Cambodia of the top quarter of its population. And it is the same force that got "Nazi" front men to go after all the intellectuals and Jews in Nazi occupied Europe. So, social networking is really terrifying because it makes our parasite's efforts so efficient: Because now they can focus like a laser beam on the lines who seem likely to make trouble for them in our society.

Epictetus (d.135AD), Lectures Collected by Arrian, 4.13.5

"In Rome, reckless men are trapped by soldiers [party officials] in the following manner. A soldier [party official] in civilian clothing sits down beside you and begins to criticize the emperor. Then if... you add what's on your mind, you will a moment later be bound and lead away." [The Arab parasite race wants you to feel comfortable, and they want you to say

what is on your mind. This way they can find our smartest and eliminate them.]

September 11 and free speech

I judge the September 11 attacks by their long term effects. 15 years later, the main effect I see is that we now put terrorism safety ahead of our primary right in our democracy — the right to free and safe communication about what the truth is.

Today, due to the threat of terrorism, we have given up our right to safely and anonymously read and write about the truth. Today the government collects information on the media we buy and the books we check out of the library. Today the government scans our emails and phone calls for keywords. Today, our parasite thanks to its billions can corrupt this apparatus and find out which people are intellectually in our top 1%. It can see which people see through which of its lies.

We must always put our right to free and anonymous communication ahead of our own personal safety. If we don't, our parasite can use violent terrorism to barb us into giving up our citadel right. Free speech must be absolute. The truth must be the citadel of all citadels, or our democracy, and our humanity cease to see with its own eyes, and starts to see only what our parasite allows us to see. Without free speech, our democracy starts measuring a sort of parasite censored truth, as it has been doing recently with climate science.

The #1 free speech underminer

Whenever you read or see news media that talks about shocking acts that justify restrictions on freedom, it is best to assume that it is the parasite manipulating its human flock, particularly if the following are also true:

- 1) The shocking acts were committed by Arabs.
- 2) The shocking acts seem to dissolve our resolve.
- 3) The shocking acts were maximally covered by the news media.
- 4) The news media explains to us how we must make a decision about our freedoms due to the shocking acts.

It is everyone's duty to repeat political messages

Anonymous media terminals and free speech

It may sound a little kooky, but a simple way to keep our speech safe and anonymous is for some portion of society to be in the habit of buying their communications platforms (and sneaker-net media) wearing a cloak. Pay in recycled cash. Wipe the cash of fingerprints and use gloves, Leave your cell phone at home. Park a good distance away so that there is no trace. Scan your text in afresh. This way, when someone needs to publish some information anonymously, they will be able to obtain an anonymous electronic platform.

Another thing we might do is manufacture a type of web access device that uses hardwired chipsets that can not be reprogrammed and can not store information except on a throwaway removable memory card. This approach will allow people to swap devices by simply removing their memory cards. Devices like these should foil most attempts to figure out who exactly is saying or downloading what in the political arena.

An added benefit of these devices is that they will be generally virus-proof because the browser is hard coded: Although going forward, that will not matter much, as our parasite is probably the main virus/ spam generator in the world. It does this because computer viruses (and spam) do obviously reduce information sharing.

Face recognition technology

Those of us concerned with safe and anonymous free speech should also consider it our responsibility to buy communication platforms wearing face cover. This will normalize people to those doing so in anonymity.

Its political

When people hand material out that is genuinely "political", those handed this information should consider it their civil duty to immediately look at the political information.

Anonymous municipal WIFI

The economic advantages of free municipal WIFI are explained elsewhere. This WIFI access should definitely be anonymous and require no account information whatsoever. Just to be safe, we want to have multiple, overlapping protections for our electronic anonymity.

Anonymity in the Internet age

Today we have unique IP addresses, digital watermarks on electronic documents, GPS, cell phone location triangulation, widespread video surveillance, face recognition technology, and search engine records among other threats to our anonymity. We can't go to web cafes, because they one and all have video cameras sitting on top of their monitors. We can't buy a computer without appearing on the store video cameras. How can we exercise our right to safe free speech with all these ways to be located? How can we criticize our secret Arab masters or their religion of submission and slavery in safety? How can I post this message without risking my life?

It was so hard to do my research safely and anonymously. And it is almost impossible to communicate with the public anonymously today. Why must I as someone writing for the good of free people everywhere be concerned about my safety? Why must I, as an American fear the long arm of the law, the feudal (fee•oo•de•al) slave's law of Mideast Inc. in any way?

The patriot act was a fool's trade

Believe it or not, the main excuse for all this intrusive government surveillance is actually the September 11 attacks. And clearly a subtle police state has been instituted under the find all the Patriots Act. And clearly in our effort to stop more terrorism we have given up the right of our brightest minds to safely and anonymously pose ideas about the secret force attacking us.

This was a fool's trade that we now our cards and give up our all important right to safe anonymous communication to stop the Arab terrorism. Why must our best citizens risk everything now if they want to help the world to be free?

The right of safe anonymous free speech is the cornerstone of our house of freedom. We must never allow anything, under any circumstances to interfere with the ability of our best minds to speak the truth to the public.

We have national security backwards

All the surveillance just makes the evil secretive enemy stronger by helping them to find our really tall/smart stalks of corn (as in Herodotus 5.92) and cut them down.

It is never safe

Even after this message comes out, you should not think it safe to say anything about the Mideast's great secret. Their

men will come for you and your line just like they did in the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany and many other places.

The violent spasm is the rapid climax of a long process

The names are gathered over years, but the violence comes suddenly in a great 'spasm' (s•peh•us'n). Then we will have lost all our best minds of a generation and it will be too late. Who will then argue against the war our parasite is trying to instigate? The next step is the purging wars. This is when most the men in our society fit to fight are drafted and culled from the flock. Just look at what happened to Iran under that murderous theocracy run by that Arab Hejazi figurehead Ayatollah Khomeini. Look at the hundreds of thousands of Persian men and boys sent to certain death in purges euphemistically described as machine gun charges and mine clearings.

From Black Gold, the Story of oil in our lives Ch. 6

"Khomeini ordered ["human-wave" attacks, mass assaults on Iraqi positions without artillery or air support. Iranian soldiers went to the front carrying their own coffins, for the ayatollah told them that "the purest joy in Islam is to kill and be killed for God". Khomeini also urged \[tens of\] \[thousands of boys as young as 12 to become "martyrs" in the "holy war" and gave them "Passports to Paradise", plastic keys their spirits could use to unlock the gates of heaven. Iraqi soldiers could hardly believe their eyes. An officer reported: 'They chant 'Allahu Akbar' \\[God is Great\\] and they keep coming, and we keep shooting... My men are 18, 19, just a few years older than \\[these kids\\]\\(#\\). I've seen them crying, and at times the officers have to kick them back to their \\[machine\\] guns.'\]\(#\) "](#)

[This is what happens to people when all the people capable of saying something are silenced.]

e-books, copyrights and Big Brother

The ability to put thousands of e-books on a tiny e-reader is definitely one of technology's great minor blessings. However, this technology also potentially has a loose everything downside to it. See, we really do risk everything, absolutely everything by keeping track of who downloads what content. This gives our parasite the ability to know which people are their biggest threats. With this information, we let them know who to eliminate in the next purge hidden in a war or a spasm of widespread violence.

GPS and wireless that you can switch off

What if you had to carry your phone and it was always listening and always logging your GPS position? The s•myths would sure have an easier time finding people. What if your computer's wifi and bluetooth really didn't turn off? What if the microphone was always on? Just as a 1984 precaution, society should mandate a tiny physical slide switch on every single communication device for power to: 1) all, 2) wireless connections, 3) microphone, and 4) camera.

It should be common practice for people to turn these switches off when not in use. This is to prevent Big Brother from asking, "why did you turn your tele-screen off?"

Wikipedia

It is easy to see the Mideast's Ministry of Truth at work monitoring Wikipedia: Just look at the absurdly overstated role the Mideast has in world affairs. The word choice and grammar are also often off in certain commonly repeated ways.

Perhaps Wikipedia's success over all other wikis has to do with the ease of maintaining the Mideast's political

propaganda. The current design makes it easy for our parasite to manage reality. All Mideast Inc. has to do is appoint full time minders to make sure that its posts are kept up and outsider posts are taken down. In fact, Wikipedia even gives the Arab Ministry of Truth the ability to find the really dangerous posters and eliminate them. So basically, Mideast Inc. chose Wikipedia's design by funding it. That is why Wikipedia (with its "anarchy" approach) is now humanity's default encyclopedia.

Wikipedia is a false anarchy

Wikipedia appears so free and open and objective; and it appears to work great. But it actually has an easy-to-exploit back door for people determined to change certain narrow aspects of reality.

Wikipedia eliminates the pesky reporters

With Wikipedia, the disinformation process is easier than with journalists and newspapers. Wikipedia replaces all those troublesome outsider journalists with insider article minders or perhaps even search-&-replace engines. Thus today, the Mideast's Ministry of Truth is much better able to effectively maintain its tree of knowledge.

The impervious internet

The overall internet may be impervious to attack, but little parts of it are probably quite easy to suppress until the dangerous information can be gotten rid of it.

Thomas Paine, Letter #1 to the Citizens of the United States, 1802

"There is in America, more than in any other country, a large body of people who attend quietly to their farms, or follow their several occupations. [These are people] who think for themselves, and judge of [their] government, not by the fury of newspaper writers, but by the prudent frugality of its measures, and the encouragement it gives to the improvement and prosperity of the country. ~~and who~~; [These people] acting on their own judgement, never come forward in an election but on some important occasion. When this body moves, all the little barking and scribbling and witless curs [curs = street dogs] pass for nothing."

[Here our parasite talks about the range of its powers. It doesn't stand a chance when the entire populace is riled up. However, if it manages public opinion well enough through its various news outlets and matrix interpretations, it can get suck and steal much.]

Pliny, c. 110AD, letters, 10.34

Pliny to the Trajan administration: "a huge fire broke out in Nicomedia [across from Istanbul Turkey] destroyed many... buildings... The fire spread as far as it did thanks to both high wind and because the... bystanders chose to do nothing but watch the fire burn. But apart from that, the town has no pumps or buckets, or any kind of fire fighting equipment at all. These I have ordered to be procured. But please consider, Sir, whether you think a corps of professionals should be formed, limited to 150 persons. I will undertake to make sure that none but actual firemen are allowed, and that they do not misuse the right of assembly granted them. As this body of men will be so small in number, it will be easy enough to keep them under proper control.

Trajan to Pliny: Your idea that a company of firemen could be formed at Nicomedia has many precedents in other cities. But we need to remember that these associations have [a record

of] greatly disturbing the peace [which Islam loves] in these provinces and cities. Whatever name we give them, and for whatever purposes they may be founded, those who come together for a purpose will not fail to form themselves into political associations before long. Therefore it is safer to provide equipment which will be useful in fighting fires. However, tell the residents to use these themselves, and if circumstances require, they can call in help from the populace." [Our parasite really not want its subjects organizing]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

" 'One of the greatest sources of social unrest and bitterness', stated the Final Report of the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations, in 1916, 'has been the attitude of the police toward public speaking. On numerous occasions in every part of the country the police of cities and towns have, either arbitrarily, or under cloak of a traffic ordinance interfered with or prohibited public speaking. [This was] both in the open and in halls, by persons connected with organizations of which the police or those from whom they receive their order did not approve. In many instances such interference has been carried out with a degree of brutality which would be incredible if it were not vouched for by reliable witnesses. Bloody riots frequently have accompanied such interference, and large numbers of persons have been arrested for acts of which they were innocent, or which were committed under the extreme provocation of brutal treatment of police or private citizens'. "

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.16

"We have seen, in an earlier chapter, how the Pennsylvania Railroad's official, during the great strike of 1877, ordered their agents to set a number of worthless freight cars at Pittsburgh on fire, in order to charge the strikes [strikers] with being riotous, and so have a pretext for calling out the military."

US Senator Robert LaFollette's defense of wartime dissent, 1917.10.06

"Six members of the Senate and 50 members of the House voted against the declaration of war [WWI]. Immediately there was let loose upon those Senators and Representatives a flood of invective and abuse from newspapers and individuals who had been clamoring for war, unequaled, I believe, in the history of civilized society.

Prior to the declaration of war every man who had ventured to oppose our entrance into it had been condemned as a coward or worse, and even the President had by no means been immune from these attacks.

Since the declaration of war, the triumphant war press has pursued those Senators and Representatives who voted against war with malicious falsehood and recklessly libelous attacks, going to the extreme limit of charging them with treason against their country. ...

But, sir, it is not alone Members of Congress that the war party in this country has sought to intimidate. The mandate seems to have gone forth to the sovereign people of this country that they must be silent while those things are being done by their Government which most vitally concern their well-being, their happiness, and their lives. Today and for weeks past, honest and law-abiding citizens of this country are being terrorized and outraged in their rights by those sworn to uphold the laws and protect the rights of the people. I have in my possession numerous affidavits establishing the fact that

people are being unlawfully arrested, thrown into jail, held incommunicado for days, only to be eventually discharged without ever having been taken to court, because they have committed no crime. Private residences are being invaded, loyal citizens of undoubted integrity and probity arrested, cross examined, and the most sacred constitutional rights guaranteed to every American citizen are being violated.

It appears to be the purpose of those conducting this campaign to throw the country into a state of terror, to coerce public opinion, to stifle criticism, and suppress discussion of the great issues involved in this war.

I think that all men recognize that in time of war, the citizen must surrender some rights for the common good which he is entitled to enjoy in time of peace. But sir, the right to control their own government according to constitutional forms is not one of the rights that the citizens of this country are called upon to surrender in time of war.

Rather, in time of war, the citizen must be more alert to the preservation of this right to control his Government. He must be most watchful of the encroachment of the military upon the civil power. He must be wary of those precedents in support of arbitrary action by administrative officials, which excused on the plea of necessity in war time, become the fixed rule when the necessity has passed and normal conditions have been restored.

More than all, the citizen and his representative in Congress in time of war must maintain his right of free speech. More than in times of peace it is necessary that the channels for free public discussion of governmental policies shall be open and unclogged. I believe, Mr. President, that I am now touching upon the most important question in the country today -- and that is the right of the citizens of this country and their representatives in Congress to discuss in an orderly way frankly and publicly and without fear, from the platform and through the press, every important phase of this war; its causes, the manner in which it should be conducted, and the terms upon which peace should be made. [had they done this, millions of fine infidel men might not have died in repeated futile charges against machine-gun fortified positions] ... that this most fundamental right is being denied to the citizens of this country is a fact: The tremendous significance of which, those in authority have not yet begun to appreciate.

I am contending, Mr President, for the great fundamental right of the sovereign people of this country to make their voice heard, and have that voice heeded upon the great questions arising out of this war. [This] including not only how the war shall be prosecuted, but the conditions upon which it may be terminated with a due regard for the rights and honor of this nation and the interests of humanity.

I am contending for this right because the exercise of it is necessary to the welfare, to the existence, of this Government, to the successful conduct of this war, and to a peace which shall be enduring and for the best interest of this country. [Here we must note that the impossible war reparations Germany had to pay after WWI are normally cited as a prime cause of WWII.] Suppose success attends the [they are successful who] attempt to stifle all discussion of the issues of this war, all discussion of the terms upon which it should be concluded, all discussion of the objects and purposes to be accomplished by it, and concede [. And suppose we concede to] the demand of the war-mad press, and war extremists, that they monopolize the right of public utterance upon these questions unchallenged. What think you would be the consequences to this country not only during the war but after the war?...

It is no answer to say that when the war is over, the citizen may once more resume his rights and feel some security in his liberty and his person. As I have already tried to point out, now is precisely the time when the country needs the counsel of all its citizens. In time of war even more than in time of peace, whether citizens happen to agree with the ruling administration or not, these precious fundamental personal rights -- free speech, free press, and [the] right of assemblage so explicitly and emphatically guaranteed by the Constitution should be maintained inviolable..."

Margaret Chase Smith, I speak as an American 1950.06.01,

[This speech was a response to the communist witch hunt of Senator Joseph McCarthy fronting for G. David Schine. Schine incidentally later produced the propaganda film French Connection, the "best picture" of 1971, where the French were blamed for the influx of drugs hitting America just before the Arab oil embargo.]

"I think it is high time that we remembered that we have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution. I think that it is high time that we remembered that the Constitution, as amended, speaks not only of the freedom of speech, but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation.

Whether it be a criminal prosecution in court, or a character prosecution in the Senate, there is little practical distinction when the life of a person has been ruined.

Those of us who shout the loudest about Americanism in making character assassinations are all too frequently those who, by our own words and acts, ignore some of the basic principles of Americanism:

The right to criticize;

The right to hold unpopular beliefs;

The right to protest;

The right to independent thought.

The exercise of these rights should not cost one single American citizen his reputation or his right to a livelihood nor should he be in danger of losing his reputation or livelihood merely because he happens to know someone who holds unpopular beliefs. Who of us doesn't? Otherwise none of us could call our souls our own. Otherwise thought control would have set in.

The American people are sick and tired of being afraid to speak their minds lest they be politically smeared as "Communists" or "Fascists" by their opponents. Freedom of speech is not what it used to be in America. It has been so abused by some that it is not exercised by others."

Thomas Paine, Letter #4 to the Citizens of the United States, 1802

"... In my publications, I follow the rule I began with Common Sense, that is, to consult nobody, nor to let anybody see what I write till it appears publicly." [Here Paine is saying, "nobody helped me with any of my works, no siri" <dual meaning of siri/ siree>. Of course it is easy to see through this lie. hard-to-read Common Sense was published in 1776, just like Edward Gibbon's hard-to-read Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. It is notable that people were saying that Gibbon did not seem capable of writing such as work.

Now despite being lying propaganda, this quote actually gives quite valuable advice. You see, it can be construed to advise revolutionary authors to keep their work confidential until it is promulgated.]

6— UNITED NATIONS

Arabia's empire has much more influence than you think at the United Nations.

(Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Oman, Somalia, Maldives, Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Algeria, Mauritania, Tunisia, Djibouti, Morocco, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Libya, Jordan, Qatar, Senegal, Egypt, Gambia, Mali, Niger, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Syria, Guinea, Kuwait, Bahrain.)

These 33 NATIONS are 90%+ Muslim.

(Kyrgyzstan, UAE, Brunei, Albania, Sudan, Malaysia, Sierra Leone, Lebanon, Burkina-Faso, Chad, Nigeria, Eritrea, Ethiopia.)

These 13 NATIONS are 50% - 90% Muslim.

(Singapore, Bosnia, Cote D'Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau, Tanzania, Macedonia, Surinam, Serbia, Mozambique, Cameroon, Malawi.)

These 11 NATIONS are 20% - 50% Muslim.

(Angola, Ecuador, and Venezuela.)

These 3 NATIONS are non-Muslim OPEC members.

(Palau pop. 20,000.

Nauru pop. 9,000

Tuvalu pop. 11,000,

Sao Tome & Principe pop 157,000)

These 4 NATIONS, Island nations reportedly sell their votes for Saudi foreign aid.

(North Korea, Myanmar)

There are also 2 NATIONS that tend to vote with the the land of no resources for other reasons.

("66 nations")

That makes 66 nations that either pray facing Arabia, or are otherwise aligned with Arabia.

("66 nations... an axis of power" on map with arrows radiating from mecca)

Here are 66 nations that look to one point on the map for guidance. And that is not counting the nations that are less than 20% Muslim. But we will just stick to 66 countries. 66 votes at the UN acting at the very least like a loosely organized political party.

(193 UN Member nations, 50%=97 votes)

For the UN to act, a simple majority is needed to pass a measure, or 97 Votes.

(2/3 vote on assembly seats = 129 U.N. seats)

But when the UN votes on "important issues", like security issues, or political intervention, or whenever the UN spends money (basically all the things the UN was founded to accomplish) a 2/3rds vote is necessary. This is 129 votes.

(193 UN member states

- 66 islamic votes

= 127 non islamic countries)

Now the strange things is that once we take away those 66 nations aligned with Arabia, there are only 127 votes left. So

the way the UN is currently set up, the other 80% of the world can't do anything, unless the Islamic 20% of the world agrees.

(security council photo at UN)

Effectively, the global community of Muslims, or what the Muslims call their "Umma" can block any spending or any political intervention it wants at the UN, just like a seat on the security council.

(tipped scale... "security council seat" and Islam's UN power "Veto + appearance of consensus +X +Y +Z)

But the Umma's power at the UN far exceeds that of a mere security council seat, and here is why:

(bicameral government illustration)

Most nations with bicameral legislatures have two legislative houses — a primary house and an secondary house.

(Capitol hill)

The US House of Representatives is a primary house and the US Senate is a secondary house. Britain's House of Commons is another primary house and its House of Lords is a secondary house.

The primary houses is supposed to negotiate the exact language of new government actions — while the secondary house acts as a double check on the bill that the primary house already approved.

The primary house sets the agenda, makes most of the compromises, and (supposedly) writes the actual language of the new laws. The secondary house only says yes or no, sort of like a presidential veto — and the power to say yes or no is weaker than the power to draft the laws.

**(primary house = lower house
secondary house = upper house)**

Most people don't realize that primary houses are much more powerful than the secondary house. They don't realize because today the houses are called LOWER-&-UPPER, rather than PRIMARY-&-SECONDARY. And curiously, confusingly, these names, LOWER-&-UPPER make the primary house look like it is less important than the secondary house.

The apportionment of political power would be much clearer and more accurate if we called these houses as PRIMARY-&- SECONDARY houses instead.

(U.S. Government dwg)

As well, in most bicameral legislatures, the houses are clearly labeled at least as LOWER-&-UPPER houses. They also normally have different names and different members. America for example, has Representatives in its powerful primary "lower" house, its House of Representatives. And it has Senators in the weak secondary "upper" house, the US Senate.

(UN assembly floor)

But in the United Nations, the two houses have names that are confusing.

(add "UN General Assembly= Lower House, UN Security Council = Upper House")

The primary house negotiating language is called the UN General Assembly, and the secondary house that double checks is called the UN Security Council.

("The UN's Upper house is extra weak")

And at the UN, the secondary house is extra weak because all its members must vote yes unanimously if they are going to pass something. If even one of them disagrees, the measure will not pass.

So pretty much all power at the UN resides with the primary house, the General Assembly, which Mideast Inc. pretty much has a veto over. And this suits the needs of Mideast Inc. just fine.

Intentionally confusing

In nearly all bicameral legislatures, the two houses vote at different times in different places. But at the UN, they vote in the same room, in the same session. And all the members of the upper house are also members of the lower house.

(Islamic gordian know art

"Who proposed these confusing names?")

The UN's architecture is so confusing, that it seems almost designed to confuse — confuse the fact that the UN works pretty much like a normal bicameral legislature.

And this means that at the UN, true power lies not with the secondary house, the UN Security Council—despite what the parasites CNN (ak•an•an) coverage would have us all believe. At the UN, the real power lies with the General Assembly, or the primary house, as is the case with all bi•cameral (bi•chamber= two•house) legislatures.

("<list> 7 votes vs. Islam 66 votes")

Now we see Islam's great power over the UN in a fresh light. America, China, Russia, Germany, Japan, India, and the UK together only have 7 votes in the UN's all important primary house. Arabia's imperial umma by contrast has 66 votes in our world government. Why do we allow this?

("India-1 vote

China-1 vote

Arabia-66 votes")

The population of India is about 1.2 billion, and the population of China around 1.35 billion. Each nation/empire has one vote at the UN. Arabia's empire has a similar population, but it has 66 votes in the world's government.

Is this merely an unjust coincidence? Clearly the form of world democracy we use today was brought about by the Arabs for their own benefit. Clearly the Arabs managed to manipulate the very design of our world democracy we use today.

You have greatly underestimated Arab power

Is there any greater demonstration of power than this? Clearly the parasitic land of no resources is running the world.

If the UN is corrupt...

And none of our national governments do anything about it. Doesn't it mean that our national governments are corrupt too?

Percy Shelley

"The Unacknowledged legislator of the world."

(3 step veto process)

Arabia's imperial Umma has a UN-vetoing one third vote, right from the start. In fact, the Umma can effectively block any measure in the UN's primary house, before the measure even

makes it to the UN's secondary house, the Security Council. In other words, Security Council vetoes are secondary to the the de facto veto of Arabia's empire.

(stamp "vetoed by the Umma")

Again, the UN can not take any political action or spend any money unless the Umma, its perpetual, de facto, ruling party approves and let's the UN vote the 2/3rds needed to start an action.

And one more thing, when measures doesn't even pass the General Assembly, they appear to fail a vote of the world's nations, when in fact, they only failed to satisfy the Arabs and their slave empire with a slave's religion: Islam.

United Nothings

Basically, if the entire non-Islamic world, 80% of humanity wants the UN to do something important, and Arabia's Umma party members all stick together, the measure WILL NOT pass the UN.

Here is why the UN is so powerless to act against the interests of Mideast Inc. It is also why the UN so often acts in Arabia's interests. For example, when Saudi Arabia needed protection from Saddam Hussein during the first Gulf War, or the Bosnian Muslims needed protection. Except for the defense of Arabian interests, the UN has mostly been gridlocked. Not always, but mostly.

One-country, one-vote was part of the Arab plan

Pretty much all important international bodies are either part of the UN, or they use a similar one-country-one-vote system of "democracy". All important international bodies are thus run by the land of no resources and its Umma. Here is why the UN, and other international organizations modeled after the UN are so ineffective.

A controlling block of all international bodies is run by a secret superpower, with a secret emperor and a secret parasite's agenda. This is an agenda diametrically opposed to more and better for the rest of the world.

Here we see why so many of those so-called "international bodies" are such a failure — and also why they are so anti-American and anti-Western. The secret Arab superpower running them automatically gets 1/3 of the vote (and a veto) right from the start.

(complex islamic art)

And because the Umma only exists in the minds of men, it does not get blamed for gridlock at the UN, or in America's Congress. The gridlock is just supposed to be some mysterious and inexplicable phenomenon, like islamic terrorism.

(add puppet cross on top and 2 small men below named "gridlock" and "terror")

The effects of both gridlock and terrorism are real enough, it is just the cause, the puppet strings that are a little hard to follow back to their source in Arabia. But we can see these strings if we hold the light in certain ways.

"Alex Alexiev, U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, 2003.06.26

"Between 1975 and 1987, the Saudis admit to having spent \$48 billion or \$4 billion per year on 'overseas development aid'. It is instructive to put these figures side by side with the \$1 billion per year said to have been spent by the Soviet Union..." [The Arabs were spending four times as much money as the Soviets. I think we can safely call this empire scale spending.]

("A secret empire")

Why does the land of no resources need to spend so much on foreign aid? Clearly the Arabs are spending empire scale amounts on foreign operations. And clearly, they benefit from appearing not to have an empire.

(Sphinx icons over Arabia's empire)

But they do have an empire, one they take great pains to make invisible. They have an ancient underground empire that has been quietly going about its imperial business in secret for around 5,800 years.

(blood diamond photo)

Recall all those low budget guerrilla insurgencies in so many oil-rich tropical parts of the world? Recall how most of these started either just before or after the Arab oil embargo? Recall how it was "the Soviets" who were supposedly backing them all as proxies against the US. Recall this and recall the Axis of Evil that traditionally ran from Mosque•o to Mecca, and existed to get a chunk of the trade moving between Asia and Europe. Here we see how the Soviets were in fact, working with the Arabs, and working to increase the value of their oil.

Procopius, c.565 AD, Secret History, 10.3

"When a man cares nothing for the infamy of his actions [because he is using an escape goat] and does not hesitate for fear of being known as a revolting character, no path of lawlessness is closed to him, but armed with the shamelessness visible at every moment in his face, he advances cheerfully and without any misgivings to the most loathsome deeds" [This is a figurehead king, an Odious Rex, a puppet, a bari'n•ette saying this for a we'n•terri•ill•loquist, a man behind the man.]

(Russian school massacre picture)

Because the Arab empire operates in relative secrecy, and because nobody really even thinks it really exists, it can use any means at all to achieve its ends. It can use terrorism, genocide, sabotage, poisoning, propaganda, intimidation, and assassination, a word they invented.

In fact, they routinely use the most hideous violence against innocents, like with the Bieslana elementary school massacre. The only rule being that there must be a scapegoat. Someone else, some other group must always be to blame.

Now some may say that such a huge conspiracy would be impossible to keep secret. Well, it is not really a secret. It is happening right out in the open as a bunch of disconnected bad things — most evil government, most organized crime, most of the drug trade, most terrorism, and most human trafficking — once known at the slave trade.

Funny how we never ask if the desperate land of no resources might be lying about itself and its religion of submission. I mean, Islam claims to be a decentralized religion of peace, when clearly the opposite is true. It is a centralized religion designed to maximize the power of its

people in their struggle to obtain something for nothing from the outside world.

A NEW UN

(line drawing of two faced person from the side)

The Mideast is not disunited and weak. In fact, it is probably the most cohesive and powerful force in world government. However, all of Islam's UN power hinges on an interpretation. It hinges on the infidel world allowing Islam to define itself in two contradictory ways.

(islamic reach map - "Our boarder-less umma" and "infidels ")

At the United Nations, Islam is 60-odd separate nations. Yet, at most other times, and among the faithful, Islam calls itself a single nation of Islam. Under the circumstances, why do we as dumb sheep permit Arabia's hypocrisy?

Why do we allow Arabia's empire to have more than one seat at the United Nations? We need to impose a reverse split on Arabia's secret empire, declaring the one nation of Islam (and all enthralled nations like North Korea, Nauru (pop. 9,000) and Tuvalu (pop. 11,000) to be one empire, single state at all international bodies.

(Kashmir, Chechnya, Palestine, Bandeh Ache, Thailand, Philippines)

One-nation, one-vote UN democracy also incentivizes break-away movements, and wars of independence in Arabia's empire. This is because each new Islamic nation/division gets another UN vote for Arabia's empire.

Here we understand that in order to maximize its international power, Arabia has funded a number of breakaway movements. Are we smart to have a UN voting scheme that incentivizes war in any way? In my Broad democracy section, I offer another system of voting that does not incentivize war in any way.

(league of nations newspaper headline)

Anyway, back in the early 20th century, the whole push for world government came primarily as a way to stop war. The League of Nations was created in response to the horrors of WWI, and the UN to the horrors of WWII.

Strange how our world government came to be dominated by states that are not only strategically inconsequential, but states that work together to frustrate our attempts to intervene and stop the wars they profit from.

Why is Arabia 12 nations at the UN?

Israel — 7.2 million
Jordan — 6.2 million
Lebanon — 4 million
Syria — 21 million
Saudi Arabia — 28.6 million
Yemen — 22.8 million
Oman — 3.4 million
United Arab Emirates — 4.8 million
Bahrain — 0.7 million
Qatar — 0.8 million
Kuwait — 2.7 million
Iraq — 28.9 million
Palestine — included in Israel
Average population = 11 million
Total population = 131.1 million

How come the Arabs get 12 nations at the UN and China

and India with 10 times the population (each) get only one seat?

Any excuse for a nation at the UN

Here are another 26 Islamic or significantly Islamic nations.

The average population is 8.1 million:

Somalia 9.8
Djibouti 0.7
Eritrea 5.6
Libya 6.3
Tunisia 10.5
Mali 13.4
Burkina-Faso 15.7
Chad 10.3
Senegal 13.7
Sierra Leone 5.1
Guinea 10.1
Cote D'ivoire 20.6
Guinea-Bissau 1.5
Mauritania 3.1
Maldives 0.4
Bosnia and Herzegovina 4.6
Macedonia 2
Surinam 0.4
Mozambique 21
Cameroon 18.9
Malawi 15
Tajikistan 7.3
Turkmenistan 4.9
Kyrgyzstan 5.4
Brunei 0.4
Albania 3.6

Tiny nations are unjust

The following 52 nations have less than 160 million people, or about 2.3% of the world's population. Today they have 27.5% of the UN vote.

Nation	Population
Nauru	9,000,
Tuvalu	11,000
Palau	20,000.
Sao Tome and Principe	200,000
Maldives	300,000
Bahamas	300,000
Brunei	400,000
Surinam	400,000
Malta	400,000
Djibouti	500,000
Equatorial Guinea	500,000
Bahrain	700,000
Guyana	700,000
Fiji	800,000
Quatar	800,000
Gambia	900,000
Mauritius	1.2m
Estonia	1.3m
Trinidad and Tobago	1.4m
Botswana	1.6m
Namibia	1.8m
Macedonia	2.0m
Kuwait	2.3m
Latvia	2.3m
U.A.E	2.5m
Oman	2.9m

Mauritania	2.9m
Panama	3.0m
Uruguay	3.4m
Liberia	3.4m
Albania	3.5m
Central African Republic	3.7m
Lithuania	3.7m
Lebanon	3.8m
Turkmenistan	3.9m
Costa Rica	4.0m
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4.0m
New Zealand	4.0m
Singapore	4.3m
Eritrea	4.4m
Moldova	4.4m
Norway	4.6m
Nicaragua	5.4m
Togo	5.6m
Sierra Leone	5.8m
Israel	6.1m
Laos	6.1m
Honduras	6.3m
Tajikistan	7.0m
Benin	7.2m
Switzerland,	7.4m
Haiti	7.6m

Who says that there has to be a single world government

that includes all nations? The world has two adversarial blocks with diametrically opposed agendas. One is the all powerful host and the other the weak parasite civilization with a parasite's un-winnable agenda.

The world would probably be much better served with two world governments that negotiate asymmetrically, until the parasite civilization can be converted and assimilated. The parasite agenda of the land of no resources is diametrically opposed, and it can not be reconciled within the same house. Besides, it has repeatedly cheated the system, and threatens to do so again. Can we afford to allow the land of no resources to participate in any way with our efforts to rid ourselves of its massively destructive parasitism?

Now that the world oil shortage has been revealed as a hoax, and we in the outside world realize that we simply do not need the Mideast for anything at all — why do we permit Arabia to have any role at all in our world government? We should by rights completely disenfranchise its entire Islamic empire from our decision making process.

We are 4/5 of the world, and we have the right to organize as we wish. We have the majority, resources, the power. We can stop the parasitic blood sucking in every way we can conceive of. Let the other 20% of the world come over to our way of life entirely, unequivocally, and without its awful Islam and Ishtar religion of parasitism. Let the parasite come over to our way of life, or let it live without any goods from our part of the world. That is what I say. Give them nothing at all until their nation utterly destroys Islam and obeys my scheme entirely.

Other related thoughts

1) With only a thought we can sweep our parasite and its slavery religions away. With only a thought we can usher in a new world based exclusively on more and better.

2) Please everyone, taunt them by calling them "Arab slaves",

or "slaves of the devil", or just "slave". And call Islam as "The Arab Slave's Religion" or TASR for short.

3) Supposedly, because of Arabia's religious angle, its bloodsucking is nothing like the bloodsucking of the colonial powers. Are we really going to allow this flagrant violation of common sense? Integrating a religion into your empire shouldn't make the empire any less of an imperialist — especially when that religion's name means "Submission".

Funny how the Arabians and their spokesmen call the West colonialist and imperialist when they are the original, 5,800 year old colonialist imperialists — the world's secret superpower. Apparently, they do not like competition, especially the competition that freedom and capitalism offer their monopolistic slave empire.

4) Given the single timeless nation of Islam, what are we to make of the PLO, Hamas, Al Qaeda, Islamic Jihad, Isis, etc. etc.? Certainly they are not separate creatures, but tentacles of the same creature. See, there is one Arabian empire, one Hydra with many regenerating tentacles. Kill Saddam Hussein and a new tentacle grows.

The immortal head of the Hydra lives in a land that is sacred and holy. What an amazing coincidence this is. Why do we allow Arabia to declare its capitol as sacred and holy? Why do we allow its empire to be called a religion, simply because of its veneer of religion? To hell with this self serving lie. And to hell with all those who don't immediately and entirely confess and repent their evil ways once their devilish gorgon creature has been shown its own hideous reflection — i.e. now.

5) One of the surest bets I have ever seen is that whenever the land of no resources advocates black, it is in our best interests to do white. In Arabia's well funded Star Trek mythology, there is a "prime directive," that warp capable planets (industrial nations) should never interfere in the affairs of pre-warp planets (pre-industrial nations). It certainly looks like somebody doesn't want the United Federation of Planets (the UN) interfering and helping the most backwards of planets (nations). Doing that sort of thing would undermine all the desperation that Arabia has generated in its empire.

6) Is it fair that 6 former Portuguese colonies with a combined population of less than 6 million people (less than 0.1% of world population) have 6 votes on the UN? This is 3% of voting rights on the UN. How can we allow this corruption when these nations are widely rumored to sell their votes in exchange for relatively small amounts of foreign aid? One nation, one vote democracy is a terrible idea.

7) The Arabian subcontinent is 12 nations. The Levant alone is 4 nations, Mesopotamia is 2 nations and the rest of Arabia is 6 nations. The Arabian subcontinent has 12 nations with an average population of only 8 million.

8) A design for a new UM(=united majority) is presented herein as an alternative to the current United Nations. This is part of my design for a broad and incorruptible democracy for mankind.

This system uses 7 regional voting blocks, each with one vote. And I want to say that in making my divisions I have tried to balance fairness with democratic buoyancy. Therefore, despite smallish populations, I have given North America and the EU region (Where the freest people live) each one vote.

1) China,

2) India,

3) English speaking America,

4) Spanish and Portuguese speaking America,

5) Roman alphabet West Europe, Japan and free Korea,

6) Former USSR, and Cyrillic Europe,

7) Africa and all other parts of the free world.

9) No portion of Arabia's empire of 66 nations shall have any vote until it destroy's all mosques and all islamic cultural facilities, and burns its Korans and musters up into a broad democracy.

10) To assure that we live in a free world and to keep Mideast Inc. from seizing power, I ask you all to permit the following injustice: That until the land of no resources is completely depopulated, that America and Europe be given double voting rights. Therefore, the people who have four times freed themselves from Mideast tyranny will have 4 of 9 votes at the UM. I ask for this because these countries have a longer history of democracy, and are slightly less corrupt than the rest.

11) No UM voting block should put its own selfish interests ahead of the interests of all mankind. The long term good of all mankind should always come first at the UM.

7— WAR

Pliny the Elder, Natural History, 8.69

"The Colophonians [Haremi Arabs] had s-quadrans [squares, Roman battle formations] of [human] war-dogs that were put in the front of the battle-line, and were never known to retreat. They [The Arabs] called these their trusted auxiliaries [volunteers], and ones that never needed pay." [The Arabs never pay money to anyone's army when they wage war for them. So technically this is the truth. They Arabs never paid their war-dogs to go kill people for them.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1775.02.23, The Farmer Refuted

"There is a certain enthusiasm in liberty, that makes human nature rise above itself, in acts of bravery and heroism."

[See previous]

Tacitus Agricola, c. 98AD, 36

"Agricola called up four cohorts of Batavians [from the Netherlands] and two cohorts of Tungrians [Belgians] 6,000 men to close [in] and fight it out at the sword's point. These seasoned soldiers had been well drilled in sword-fighting, while the enemy were awkward at it, with their small shields and unwieldy swords, especially as the latter, having no points, were quite unsuitable for a cut-and-thrust struggle at close quarters. [like heavy single edge sabers that can only hack] The Batavians, raining blow after blow, also sticking them with the bosses of their shields [metal bayonets in the center of the shield], and [then they would] stab them in the eyes/face"

[HASTA LA VIS-TA this was perhaps called. (L. HASTA = spear or stab, while L. vista=eyes, face) The sharply pointed double-edged razor-sharp spear of the guy in the 2nd row of the Roman battle square sometimes got caught in the eye socket or mouth, but mostly it would slice across the victim's face bones, fall on his shoulder, and get pulled back on the neck, fatally cutting the victim's arteries. The original meanings of hasta la vista was spear to the face, or 'goodbye, you are now dead'.

Who do you think supplied the British trade cheaters with those saber-taged and unweildy sabres? Might it have been the same people who sent the Romans across Europe to kill them for daring to export grain to Rome?]

Strabo, 4.4.2

"The whole race, which is now called Gallic or Galatic [Kal·ak = green·shoots], is madly fond of war. They are high-spirited and quick to battle, but otherwise straight-forward and not of evil character. And so when they are stirred up, they assemble in their bands for battle, quite openly and without forethought, so that they are easily handled by those who desire to outwit them. [clearly outsiders were manipulating the Gauls] For at any time or place, and on whatever pretext you stir them up, you will have them ready to face danger, even if they have nothing on their side but their own strength and courage. On the other hand, if won over by gentle persuasion they willingly devote their energies to useful pursuits and even take to a literary education. Their strength depends both on their mighty bodies and on their numbers. And because of this frank and straight-forward element in their character, they assemble in large numbers on slight provocation, being always ready to sympathize with the anger of a neighbor who thinks he has been wronged..." [Thus a provocation by the Romans, or people dressed as Romans could be used to lead large numbers of men into war.]

Diodorus, 5.31

"In conversation, they use few words and speak in riddles, for the most part hinting at things and leaving a great deal to be understood. They frequently exaggerate with the aim of raising their own status and diminishing the status of others. They boast and threaten and are given to pompous self-exaggeration. And yet they are quick of mind and are naturally able to learn.

They have lyric poets who they call bards. These use lyre-like instruments when they sing, sometimes a eulogy [to those who die in battle], and sometimes a satire [mockery of those who do not]. They also have certain religious wise-men called Druids [G·oo·ids]. They also use and highly value seers. The latter, by their observances of omens and animal sacrifices can foretell the future, and everyone is subject to them

When enquiring about matters of great importance, they have a particularly strange and incredible custom. They sentence a man to death and stab him with a dagger in the region above the diaphragm. They foretell the future from the way he falls, from the convulsions of his limbs and the spurting of his blood — placing their trust in ancient and long-established observations of these practices. [In other words, their Arab priests had them practicing human sacrifice. Normally the priests were sacrificing the sheep that their half-brother the tribal chief was having the most trouble with.]

Their custom is that nobody should offer sacrifice without a [Mideast] religious man. For they say that only those who can speak the language of the gods and those skilled in divine practices, should offer thanks to the gods, or ask for benefits from them. And it is not only in peace, but also in war that they carefully obey these men [these Arab priests] and their singing poets. And this is true not only of their friends, but also of their enemies. And frequently as armies approach each other on the battle line, swords drawn and spears raised for the charge, these men come forward between them and stop the conflict, as though they held some kind of wild animals spellbound. Thus even among the most savage barbarians

anger yields to wisdom and Ares does homage to the Muses."

Strabo, 4.4.4

"Among all the tribes, generally speaking, there are three classes of men held in special honor. The Bards, the Vates, and the Druids. The Bards are singers and poets, the Vates are interpreters of sacrifice and natural philosophers, and the Druids in addition to the science of nature, also study morality. They are believed to be the most just of men, and are therefore entrusted with the decision of [all] cases affecting either individuals or the public. Indeed, in former times, they arbitrated in war and brought to a standstill the opponents when about to draw up in battle lines. And murder cases have been mostly entrusted to their decision. When there are many such cases, they believe that there will be a fruitful yield from their fields. These men, as well as other authorities, have pronounced that men's souls and the universe are indestructible, although at times fire or water may (temporarily) prevail. [Thus they convinced the Barbarians that they would only die temporarily, and it did not matter much if they died in war. This made these people much easier to manipulate into wars.]

To the frankness and high-spiritedness of their temperament must be added the traits of childish boastfulness and love of decoration. They wear [expensive imported] ornaments of gold, necklaces, and bracelets on their arms and wrists."

Anastasia

"Stuck around St. Petersburg when I saw it was a time for a change [the Russian revolution]. Killed the tzar and his ministers, Anastasia screamed in vain. I rode a tank, held a generous rank, when the [Nazi] blitzkrieg raged".

[Here we see a little gloating from "the devil" behind both the Russian revolution and Hitler's administration. This is the devil that killed 6 million of its cousins, along with 45 million others. Many of these were the best people in Europe and America: The people who stood up and laid their life on the line to do what they thought was the right thing. But in reality, they were just dying for real in a matrix, an interpretive matrix, an artificial reality, a 'game' created by an ancient parasite race from a land of absolutely no resources.

Robert Goodloe Harper, 1798.06.18

"Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute"

[The Arabs have spent thousands of years honing their ability to use violence and cessation of violence to extract money from people. However, all of their ability collapses if we see that they are really the most unified force on earth. Once we see that, then we realize that we must fire bomb Dresden to stop the terrorism of civilians. The next time there is an act of Arab terrorism, you take 10 fold retribution. Start in Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem and the west coast of Arabia. The people you think are your greatest friends in the Mideast are really your greatest enemies.]

Heraclitus, 102

"The gods, like mortals revere the men who die for them in battle."

[Now that you know that humanity has a parasite, this quote sure says a lot about the cause of all war.]

Euripides, Rhesus, 509

"No man of courage thinks it right to kill his enemy by stealth, but only in face-to-face confrontation." [The Arabs want to be

the only ones killing by stealth. Here they are manipulating the tree of knowledge to preserve their advantage.]

Thomas Jefferson

"Never was so much false arithmetic employed on any subject, as that which has been employed to persuade nations that it is in their interest to go to war."

The arms industry is key

Dominate the arms industry and you dominate war, dominate war and you dominate the world.

Let nobody profit from war

Please, whatever it costs, the international community must prevent people from benefitting from war. When we allow this, people struggle to keep the hatred and fighting alive.

The objective of the matrix

It is the Harem race struggling to prosper, damn everyone else. It has hijacked human consciousness, so that it can more easily make money and places for its chosen people, the spawn that are chosen to be the G•oos as opposed to the Our•abs. The G•oos get to fly out on wings (sailing ships), the Our•abs walk out. And to motivate everyone, nobody gets anything really, so long as they stay in the hell that is the land of no resources. What a stupid system this is.

How to profit from war

- 1) Figure out (and foster) a variety of the economic vulnerabilities on each side.
- 2) Buy up supply in each vulnerability.
- 3) Start the war.
- 4) Sell your merchandise at fat war-time profits as a profiteer, like the Arabs did with ball bearings in Nazi Germany.

Stop war profiteers to stop most war

Now what is more evil than war profiteering? For to be a war profiteer, one is actually a part of the organization starting the war. If you really want to stop war: stop the people who profit by supplying the war.

War frees up places

One way the Haremi better their cause is by getting the outies to go and kill one another in war. This is not only profitable, but it helps free up paces for new Arab immigrants.

War frees up women

One way the Haremi better their cause is by getting the outies to go and kill one another in war. This is not only profitable, but it helps free up their women for breeding purposes.

Nothing will be achieved by Arab violence any more

This path is now precluded by my insistence on collective punishment. You will no longer benefit from violence or sabotage. Now you will suffer for them.

Harry Truman, The Truman Doctrine, 1947.03.12

"At the present moment in world history, nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one

One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

No combat without representation

Considering how fallible many military appointees have been (i.e. Charging machine guns in WWI, and in the Iran-Iraq war), The People really could use some sort of democratic oversight. Given that we will have many thousands of Senators, we can afford to send some of them along with our combat people. This way, our democracy will have democratically elected eyes and ears to report on what is actually happening. These will report without bias (unlike our openly corrupt paid media, and our appointee CIA).

Perhaps half of these people should be for our military personal to communicate with, and the other half should serve as "under cover reporters". This method serves to maintain military secrecy, while assuring that our government gets numerous, independent, unbiased, first-hand views of what is actually going on.

And one more thing. Don't fall into the trap of thinking that people willing to risk their own lives for the public good will automatically make the best leaders. Dangerous service should only be one of a number of considerations for the re-election of our Sub-Senators (to the Main-Senate or Over-Senate).

Intervention and easy rust firearms

During WWII America made pistols that were stamped out of sheet steel and welded together. They were designed and constructed so that they were a little hard to load, fired a single shot. And then, because they could not be lubricated or taken apart to be cleaned they would become completely useless in some months, due to rust. Thanks to immense production runs, these guns cost little more than toys and were widely distributed.

When a country forms up into a broad democracy and there is a dictatorship that refuses to surrender power, we the free people of the world have an obligation to intervene. But this obligation is not to police or protect, it is to simply arm people against oppression by those who are armed. We will send in our military for no longer than two weeks, and distribute some number of this sort of short-lived, easy-rust weapon in various configurations, pistol, sniping rifle, etc. After two weeks' time, we will leave.

The easy-rust firearms will use non-standard ammunition that uses an explosive that breaks down in 6 months to one year. This hardens into the thin-walled shell casings and cannot be easily removed. Also the casings are designed to rupture in firing.

Military strength is not our first defense priority

Our main priority is to strengthen democracy and freedom against the forces of tyranny, so we can point our military in the right direction.

T.E. Lawrence (of Arabia), Seven Pillars of Wisdom, Ch.6

"the Arabic peoples... a prolific Semitic agglomeration... great in religious thought, reasonably industrious, mercantile, politic, yet solvent rather than dominant in character."

Get the Arabs out of our military

We are fighting a solvent and infiltrative enemy, not a dominant one. Don't even trust them completely as interpreters. See the Rise and Fall of Athens section herein for more on this subject.

We need strict anti-sphinx laws.

An example is probably best here. Let's say that we put in an international rail backbone connecting the Americas so that we can move goods for practically nothing between say Argentina and New York. But let's say that the route becomes dangerous or interrupted by some attacks or a string of accidents or anything really that sphinxes the flow of trade. What the international effort needs to do is make sure that the net cost of using the system does not change for anyone due to political risk. Otherwise, we may have people attacking our systems to create sphinxes and profit from violence, terrorism and war.

The assault rifle guitar men

In the film Hologram for the King, we see a windshield ornament in the form of an assault-rifle shaped guitar. What a fitting description of the Arab race — part liar, part infiltrator, and part gun-toting criminal. Beware the lies of this government infiltrating race, especially when it comes to war and disarmament.

The timing of the advent of atomic weapons

Look at the timing of the development of atomic weapons. They came too late to be used against the USSR's territory grab, but just in time to be demonstrated on Japan. It is all a matrix illusion you know.

What the atomic weapon really is

You can say all that you want about atomic weapons, but they have one really great function as far as I am concerned. They are a one way you-all-die button for the Arabs who must live densely for a variety of unchangeable reasons.

See, in the outside world, we live too spread out in comparison to the Arabs. So the Arabs are always much more vulnerable to atomic weapons than we are.

And no matter what our parasite does, they will never be able to kill more than about 1/3 of us with all the world's atomic weapons. However, we in the outside world will be able to kill

90% of the world's Arabs, particularly the worst ones, the people of the central desert, the Medes, or the Medinas.

So for this reason, atomic weapons are a blessing as

- 1) Our parasite will do everything in its power to keep them from being used.
- 2) If we all can wake up from our matrix, then we can simply demand the unconditional surrender of our parasite.

We don't want to be playing "who will China arm?"

The Kingdom's war

Combine cheap Chinese toy drones with the hate filled masses of the Mideast raised. And remember that these are raised on first person shooter video games. All they have to do is score high and they don't have to go to school. You can see this at the end of that recent Kingdom film.

Terminator machines are not absurd

I have spent a very long time studying Arab history. I have seen the mechanized Arab death factories brought about under the cover of the Nazi police state. I find nothing absurd or unlikely about the Arabs getting their host to make these for

them.

They will not look at all humanoid. That part is wrong. They will probably look just like those plastic toys that DJI makes. If we do nothing, I fear that soon they will put grenades on self-driving infra-red equipped toy drones. Find targets with this shape heat signature and explode. Or maybe they will use vape pens filled with nerve gas. When I see those DJI drones, I get nausea. Please everyone, stop this future. Stop it or the Arabs will kill the top 15%, and then the next 15%, and then the next 15%, and on and on and on and on until it is just a Morlocks and Eloi.

Do you want this? do you want to see people hunted down by robots in war? This is what you will have if you allow the Arab parasite spirit called Ishtar and Islam to live on.

The Arabs have already told the world about their intentions

In all of those movies where machines are fighting to either massacre or enslave mankind, the key idea, the missing idea is that there are Meccans, Haremi that are always secretly running the machines and Meccanisms for their own benefit. Once you realize this, all those movies become a statement of long range intent for the Arabs.

Exploding dog collars

Maybe some of the collars will carry exploding dog collars for the new Arab slaves. Here we imagine drones appearing form above and saying to people, "Put this exploding dog collar on or we will spray you with nerve agent. The tiniest drop on your skin and you will did in agonizing convulsions." So people surrender and are herded to the mideast as slaves and hostages.

Defense = ADT = anti-drone technology

- 1) Interrupt their signals
- 2) shoot them down

AI drones on stealth bombers

How do you defend against this?

Self sufficiency

It is vital that America and Europe become economically self sufficient if we are going to defend ourselves.

Roman emperor Diocletian's Price Edict, 301AD

"Everyone knows that wherever national security requires our armies to be sent, the [Mideast] war suppliers quietly but rudely attack the public welfare, not only in town, but on every road. They charge extortionate prices for [military] merchandise, not just fourfold or eightfold, but on such a scale that human speech cannot find words to characterize their profit and their practices. Indeed some soldiers are stripped of their pay and signing bonus in a single transaction.

So all the money the [free Roman] world spends to support its [defensive] armies falls as profit into the hands of these plunderers [who work like organized criminals by scaring off, poisoning, or killing the competition] Thus our soldiers seem to bestow with their own hands the rewards of their military service and their veterans' bonuses upon these profiteers. The result is that each day, these pillagers of the [Roman] state seize more than they know how to hold."

[Rome and indeed Western civilization really started going downhill fast at this point in history. It was only 29 years later that Constantine 'the Great' (r. 306-337) moved Rome's capital from Italy to Byzantium or present day Istanbul in

Turkey. Constantine also made "the Jews" (as escape goats for Mideast Inc.) the official monopolist provisioners of the Romans. (see codex Theodosianus book 16, sec 8 §3&4).]

The underground was actually the parasite's left hand

In Europe during WW2, the resistance, the underground was a sham run by the Arabs to find all the people who had any sense of decency and backbone. They would always keep a few humans (eu•mans) around in the underground and to help lure in more more people. But after too many had accumulated and started posing a risk, they would stage a "Nazi" raid from the right hand and take them away to be executed.

Look carefully at the WW2 media with references to the resistance. Look and you will see the repeated mentions of the pro•pagan•da = for•pagans•give messages. It is just like with the going back for fallen comrades in war battles messages. Note how everyone in the media seeks out an organized resistance for help. Nobody drives a truck into a column of German soldiers.

If you ever find yourself in a resistance situation, you might want to avoid looking for an organized resistance. And certainly don't trust any Arabs, or any Arab looking people or any typical Arab thumbs-men about who to see. The best thing to do, is to make sure you are well armed before the war starts, particularly with long-range sniping rifles. And when the war starts, kill all the Middle Eastern looking people, especially the ones you think are faking at not being Middle Eastern.

Some new war words

WAR PURGES = when the smartest or most moral people are sent to die in futile war actions.

a **WAROCRACY** = a military leadership of shape-shifting Arab infiltrators that is secretly trying to maximize infidel death in war.

THE WAR TRICK = how the Arabs get us to suspend democracy when it is most critical and important and life and death.

WAR TYRANNY = how democracies lay our lives on the line to execute decisions made by military appointees that are very often secretly trying to kill as many infidels as possible.

a **EUGONOT**= someone loyal to their nation's government no matter how murderous and or corrupt. eu•go•not

DIESELLS = people who keep fighting a lost cause when they could just surrender and have peace. These are die•sells, or people sold on dying in war. This is also a Brolingo word and it is actually the root of the engine type.

DIESELLIZING = Killing, or harming war captives. This more than almost anything else sells the other side on dying in war.

BARB ATTACKS = shocking violence designed to provoke violence in response. note that BARB is a 'regrammification' of ARAB and that BARBARIAN is an anagram of ARRABBIAN.

BARBI D'AL = a woman captured in war. These are kept hungry and thin on their trip to the Harems so they will agree to have sex with otherwise repulsive men.

to **BARBARIZE** = when the Haremi use violence to provoke one of their enemy nations against another.

1—PRESIDENTS AND OTHER MONARCHS

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"There is to be a great and mighty president, with very extensive powers; the powers of a king."

Thomas Paine, letter to the Earl of Shelburne, 1782.10.29

"The situations of the two countries are exceedingly different. We have been the seat of war: You have seen nothing of it. The most wanton destruction has been committed in our sight; the most insolent barbarity has been acted [out up]on our feelings. We can look [a]round and see the remnants of burnt and destroyed houses, once the fair fruit of hard industry, and now the striking monuments of British brutality. We walk over the [buried] dead whom we loved in every part of America, and remember by whom they fell. There is scarcely a village but brings to life some melancholy thought, and reminds us of what we have suffered, and of those we have lost by the inhumanity of Britain. A thousand images arise to [in] us, which, from [your] situation, you cannot see, and are accompanied by as many ideas which you cannot know."

[Clearly we rebelled against royalty in 1776, and clearly we thought we were instituting a democracy. Why did we then institute a constitutional monarchy with 4-year elected kings that cannot be removed from office?]

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"There is to be a great and mighty president, with very extensive powers; the powers of a king."

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"This Constitution is said to have beautiful features; but when I come to examine these features, Sir, they appear to me horribly frightful: Among other deformities, it has an awful squinting [when one eye looks off in a different direction]; it squints towards monarchy: And does not this raise indignation in the breast of every American? [This was only 6 years after we won our Revolutionary war for independence from monarchy.] Your President may easily become King: Your Senate is so imperfectly constructed that your dearest rights may be sacrificed by what may be a small minority; and a very small minority may continue forever unchangeably... Where are your checks in this Government? Your strongholds will be in the hands of your enemies: It is [only] on a supposition that our American Governors shall be honest, that [they will have] all the good qualities of this Government are founded: But it's defective, and imperfect construction, puts it in their power to perpetrate the worst of mischiefs, should they be bad men: ... Show me that age and country where the rights and liberties of the people were placed on the sole chance of their rulers being good men, without a consequent loss of liberty? I say that the loss of that dearest privilege has [always] followed with absolute certainty, every such mad attempt."

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.05

"We have heard that there is a great deal of bribery practiced in the House of Commons in England. And that many of the members raised themselves to preferments [appointment to highly profitable positions in government], by selling the rights of the people."

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Administration, n. An ingenious abstraction in politics, designed to receive the kicks and cuffs due to the premier or president. A man of straw, proof against bad-egging and dead-catting."

Jerome Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient Rome, Ch. 3

"The arbitrary favor of an emperor who might delegate his powers indefinitely to the same favorite."

James Madison

"There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power, than by violent and sudden usurpations."

Thomas Jefferson, 1788.05.27, to E. Carrington

"The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and [tyrannical] government to gain ground."

Thucydides, d. 400BC, History, 2.65

"In theory, Athens was a democracy, but in practice it was ruled by just the one leading man."

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.03.14, Federalist 69

"Energy in the executive [president or elected monarch] is a leading character in the definition of good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attacks. It is not less essential to the steady administration of the laws; to the protection of property against those irregular and high-handed combinations which sometimes interrupt the ordinary course of justice; to the security of liberty against the enterprises and assaults of ambition, of faction, and of anarchy."

[The is simply not true. Hamilton, the Arab Federalist was arguing the Arab parasite's agenda of monarchy in the land of the free.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1787.12.17, Federalist #23

"The circumstances that endanger the safety of nations are infinite, and for this reason, no constitutional shackles can wisely be imposed on the power to which the care of it is committed."

[To simplify:

Nations face infinite dangers. therefore, no constitutional shackles should be imposed on the commander in chief.

Livy, 3.49?

"Only in name was the word 'consul' less hateful than 'king'.... For they had accepted two masters instead of one. These had had unlimited power, and were free from all restraints and checks on their power. These punished the plebs and made them fear the law."

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 29.1

"Their property was collected by the treasury and used by the [Arab figurehead] emperor for his own purposes, while the condemned were ground down by fearful poverty and reduced to beg for their bread"

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"There is to be a great and mighty president, with very extensive powers; the powers of a king."

Aristotle, 400.14

"The law of a city gives rise to all life in that place. And it is

permanently fixed in the hearts and minds of everyone who lives under it. For in obedience to it, the police do their duties, the judges go to their various courts, the lawmakers go to their designated meeting places, and one man dines in the pyrtaneum [The Athenians had a council of 500. This was supposedly divided into 10 divisions of 50, each called a prytany. A pyrtaneum is apparently like a White House.] Another man makes his defense before a jury, and another dies in prison.

As well, the annual public holidays/festivals and feasts take place, along with [costly] sacrifices to the gods, and libations [poured out] in honor of dead heroes. The various activities of the people obeying lawful authority are aptly expressed in the words of the poet: 'The whole town is full of [costly Arab] incense smoke'."

All monarchy is absurd

What if a nation elected presidents to serve for 30 years? Is this any real improvement over a lifelong monarchy? What if these presidents served for 10-years at a time, but relied on the same immortal baro•cracy as the presidents serving for 30 years? What if they served for 4-years but relied on the same immortal baro•cracy?

Look, it doesn't matter that much if the lone monarch inherited his rule from his father, or you elect him annually. The idea of one man running an entire nation is just absurd, and it always has been. How on earth is one man going to have anything but the most superficial understanding of an entire nation? This man is not going to understand anything about what is going on, let alone be able to make intelligent management decisions about how to run the nation. Under these monarchs, the critically important powers of enforcing, upholding and implementing the actions of our democracy devolve into the hands of a non-elected administration of appointees. And basically, our presidential administrations are just as easy to infiltrate and manage, as any monarch's court of past centuries.

It doesn't matter how long a monarch serves

It doesn't matter if they are elected or only serve for a few years. It doesn't matter if they are called king, president, prime minister, chancellor, canceler, veto-er, dictator, field marshal, or whatever. It doesn't even matter if they share power with a legislature. They are all monarchies and humanity is long past the age of monarchy. Humanity is also long past the age of oligarchy and plutocracy. In fact, we should even agree that except for emergency measures of less than say 14-Days, we are even past the age of democracies narrower than 1-in-1-million.

How a lone presidency can be like a malevolent genie

We have all heard the Mideast legend of the genie in a bottle. You rub the bottle, and a genie comes out to grant your wishes. Well, in some of these legends, the genie is malevolent. It grants your wishes alright, but it interprets them in a way that is maximally opposed to your obvious intent. Anyway, this seems a pretty good characterization of a non-elected Bro•cracy administration of our lone presidents executing the wishes of the people's legislature — no matter how carefully stated.

Be allergic to monarchy

You who love freedom, it is time to develop and allergy to monarchy and ligarchy. You should become violently allergic to all forms of monarchy and ligarchy. You must take the shot or better yet, if you can, burn these people alive slowly.

Great plans corrupt contractor

Here is another similar vision. Let's conceive of our legislature as a great democratically elected architect. But let's conceive of its executive and his appointee baro•cracy as a corrupt builder.

No matter what plans our legislature comes up with, no matter how wonderful, the implementation will always be in the hands of our president's non-elected baro•cratic administration. If we resolve something that will harm our parasite, then it will be implemented in a way that is doomed to fail, or it will literally "take forever" to be implemented. If we resolve something neutral, it will be implemented in a way that our parasite can profit from. Only if we resolve to do something that helps our parasite will it be implemented in a reasonable way.

Resisting the first national highway in America

Since Roman times, our parasite has resisted road construction in the houses of its host — this so it could sell more imported goods from its sea shipping monopoly/cartel. A great example of this resistance is how the US Congress authorized the first national highway in 1806 from Cumberland, Maryland westward. However, construction did not start until 1811. And by 1818, the highway only reached Eastern Virginia. By 1850, the road only reached Illinois.

It is a two-step process

Turning the will of the people into action

First we figure out what the people need and want, and then second, we make it happen. Both functions need to be handled by a large number of elected officials, or we have a narrowing of our democracy, a concentration of power that Mideast Inc. can exploit to block or steer our group efforts for their benefit. Here is why we need a broad representation ratio for both our legislative and our executive decisions. It is also why all our top 10,000 (or so) executive/ administrative positions must be run by elected officials, rather than appointed bureau•crats or baro•crats.

The illusion of checks and balances

What of America's much praised system of checks and balances? Two of our brilliant democracy is in the hands of just 10 people. We have a lone 4-year elected president/ monarch that is almost impossible to impeach, no matter how unpopular he becomes. And we have the 9 people our presidential monarchs have appointed - FOR LIFE - to run the judicial house of government. How are these 10 people any sort of check or a balance on the of power in our legislature? These 10 people actually do they opposite, they reduce the power of the only barely democratic institution America has, its one-in-one-million Congress.

Unimpeachable Presidents are more like kings

It is remarkable how no US president has ever been impeached. I mean, even Richard Nixon was allowed to resign after participating in a conspiracy to break into, and bug, the opponent Party headquarters in the Watergate building. Then after this, he appeared on TV and famously avowed, "I am not a crook". Reader, do you understand exactly why Nixon wasn't impeached?

Maybe it is because our parasite wants unimpeachable 4-year, or 8-year kings as figureheads. It wants to help these people to feel fearless about being dishonest while in office.

US President Richard Nixon

"Under the doctrine of separation of powers, the manner in which the [lone figurehead] president personally exercises powers is not subject to questioning by another branch of government."

John Adams 1800.11.02, to Abigail Adams

"I pray heaven to bestow the best blessing on this house and on all that shall hereafter inhabit it. May none by honest and wise men ever rule under this roof!"

[This is engraved on the fireplace in the state dining room of the White House. 1) This sounds disingenuous, or like Adams was part of a secret fraternity. 2) The easiest way to deal with the huge problem of finding truly exception men to be our monarchs is to have a form of government with no monarchs.]

Thomas Jefferson, 1801.03.04, First Inaugural Address

"Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted with government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him?"

Hesiod, Hymn 24

"it is through the Muses and Apollo that there are singers upon the Earth, and players upon the lyre. But kings are from Zeus. Happy is he whom the Muses love. Sweet speech flows from his lips"

Aeschylus, d. 456BC, Seven against Thebes, line-1

"The man who sets the course and steers his ship of State,
With hand upon the tiller and sleepless eyes,
When all goes right, men will thank heaven.
But when things go wrong, heaven forbid
The name Etocles will be the word on the street.
[Etocles/Extol•cles and Poly•nikes=many•victories, were the sons of Oedipus Rex, the Odious rex]
He will bear the roar of the rumor [Rum•ora = Rome•mouth] of the time
Down with Etocles will be the clamorous curse
A mournful song of ruin"

Appian of Alexandria, d. c.160AD, Studies in Roman History, introduction

[The Romans] "of this period lived under a monarchy, while for the remainder—after expelling their kings and taking a solemn oath never to tolerate government by monarchs again—they maintained an aristocratic regime under the presidency of annually elected officers."

Livy, d. 17AD, 3.49?

"Only in name was the word 'consul' less hateful than 'king'.... For they had accepted two masters instead of one. These had had unlimited power, and were free from all restraints and checks on their power. These punished the plebs and made them fear the law."

Justinian, c. 530AD, Digest 1.1.3

"Whatever the emperor decides shall have the force of law. This seeing as how the people passed a law that transferred all their power and authority to him and made him their dictator. Therefore, whatever the emperor has laid down in writing and signed, or decreed in court, or pronounced extra-judicially, or ordained by edict, constitutes a law beyond any question. And clearly, some of these will only be applied to individuals, and are not intended to be used as a precedent. Whatever

penalties or extraordinary aid he calls for, it applies only to that individual."

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.07

"There is to be a great and mighty president, with very extensive powers; the powers of a king."

A lone president in a staunchly anti-royal America of the 1780s?

Where did the idea of a lone president come from in staunchly anti-royal America of the 1780s? Remember we had just overthrown the British monarchy and our British governors. How did we come by this new "checks and balances" monarchy 2.0, a more cleverly disguised monarchy? Is this idea homegrown or is it one of our parasite's bizarre or bazaar ideas?

Edgar Allen Poe, Ligeia

"And the will therein lieth, which dieth not. Who knoweth the mysteries of the will, with its vigor? For God is but a great will pervading all things by nature of its intentness. Man doth not yield him to the angels, nor unto death utterly, but only through the weakness of his feeble will."

US constitution, Article 3, §2 -3

"The President shall be commander in chief of the army and navy... he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons... He shall have the power... to make treaties...he shall nominate, and ... appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for... The president shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States."

Presidential veto power — official and unofficial

Let's now distinguish between creating laws/policies VS. enforcing, upholding, and implementing those laws/policies. Let's reflect for a moment on the situation of a highway patrol officer enforcing the rules of the road. We are all aware of the de facto power of police officers to selectively enforce the rules of the road: To warn us and let us go, or to give us a costly speeding ticket. Our lone president has similar de facto powers of selective enforcement with respect to any of congress's laws. And this de facto power to selectively enforce the laws passed by our elected legislature is in addition to the president's many de jure powers

But this statement needs rephrasing to account for our presidential buro•cracy: Regardless of our president's official veto powers, his massive non-elected baro•cracy (Brotherly administration) has a sort of de facto veto over the laws passed by our elected legislature.

James Madison, 1788, to John Brown

" Refusing or not refusing to execute a law to stamp it with its final character... makes the Judiciary [and executive] department paramount [supreme] in fact to the legislature, which was never intended and can never be proper."

[Here James Madison explains how our democratic legislature is subject to execution/enforcement both by the non-elected administration of our 4-year monarchs, and their appointee supreme court. It is also worth noting that James Madison is saying that our legislatures were "never intended and can never be proper".]

1512 Luca Landucci, 'Florentine diary', Aug. 29

[In Brolingo, mari•ani = bari•ani = bros•new. To the Spanish however, it meant Muslims who had pretended to convert to Christianity.] "When the cruel Marrani and infidels entered [Prato], they seized a great booty by killing everyone they met, sparing nobody. And when took captives, they seized them and held them —whether rich or poor— for an exorbitant ransom, and whoever could not raise payment was tortured in the most awful and terrifying ways. Furthermore, they sacked the monasteries and butchered women and children, inflicting every imaginable cruelty and shame. It is said that five thousand persons were killed. It must have been by divine will that our leaders acted so slowly: We had more troops than they, since we had 18,000 men. We had already prevented supplies from getting to them, so they couldn't have lasted more than three or four days."

It took the Portuguese 200 years

Marco Polo's book of propaganda was published with much media fanfare in 1298. Many Portuguese however interpreted this book to mean that they should take advantage of their location and sail around Africa and the Arabs as legend said they could.

So, after much stalling and redirection, the Portuguese are lead into explore the Canary Islands in 1335-41. They surely must have known about these islands, because such memes are not easily forgotten by a society.

Then maybe 6 to 9 years later we see the Black Death strike all of Europe. Portuguese exploration is yet another reason for the plague occurring when it did. This was perhaps combined with a wave of targeted killings so Portugal fell asleep again until just before 1419, when the Portuguese were lead, once again to islands off the coast of Africa. This time they re-discovered the Madeira Islands.

After reaching the Madeira Islands, everyone in Portugal probably wanted to explore the coast of Africa even more. It was an idea that was so logical for sea-faring Portugal, and so obviously a good idea that, it was impossible to stop. So what the Arabs did was manage and stall the Portuguese "space race". They delayed, and they stalled, so that it took another 79 years to reach 2/3 of the way down the coast of Africa. And this was 194 years since Marco Polo.

Apparently people were talking about how Columbus' only took 35 days to sail to America — while Portugal had been at it for 194 years and had not yet even reached the end of Africa. So there was probably great resolve on the part of the Portuguese, and 5-years later we see Vasco da Gama reaching India, and 10-years later we see a large spice convoy finally reaching Portugal. Then again, they probably really did get rid of most of their Ishtarians like Spain.

So from Marco Polo, it took 200 years for the Portuguese national effort to do something that their Arab masters didn't want.

It was only the Spanish kicking the Arabs out and

Columbus taking advantage of a momentary lapse in power that ended Arab resistance to Portuguese exploration.

Make a bar graph of Portuguese distance by date.

The distance in the first 194 years is about 1/3 of the ultimate distance reached in year 200.

A brilliant example

The Portuguese took 200 years to reach 60% of the way to the end of Africa. The Spanish took 35 days to reach America.

What a brilliant example of what the Arabs will do to your nation's efforts if you let them. Just look at how they strung the Portuguese along for 200 years! It took the Portuguese 200 years to drain the swamp. It took them 200 years to build a 300kph steel-on-steel wide-gauge railroad system. It took them 200-years to stop driving 3-ton SUVs. It took them 200-years to shake off Arab influences.

Procopius, The Secret History, 11.40

[This was c.560-570 AD., just before the lights went out on Western civilization.]

"After that he passed a law forbidding offenses against boys, not inquiring closely into [focusing on] those committed after the law was passed, but seeking out men who had succumbed to this moral sickness some time in the past. The prosecution of these offenders was conducted in the most irregular fashion, since the penalty was imposed even where there was no accuser, and the word of a single man or boy, even if he happened to be a slave forced to give evidence most unwillingly against his owner, and was accepted as final proof. [slaves under investigation in Rome were brutally tortured.] Men convicted in this way were castrated and exposed to public ribaldry. At first, however, not everyone was treated in this shocking manner, but only those who were thought to be either Greens or very well off, or who happened to have come up against the rulers in some other way."

I promise to faithfully uphold

That silly oath, where the US presidential monarch vows to "faithfully uphold" the laws that congress makes and the supreme court doesn't strike down. What a bunch of doublespeak that is. That is the parasite telling a diametric and fundamental lie about the presidency and presidential Baro•cracy. The implementation is not being faithfully upheld. In fact, it is anything but faithfully upheld. The parasite's presidential administration helps what it likes, and struggles against any of our efforts it doesn't like.

"The powers of a king" — Patrick Henry

Listen to Patrick Henry. "The powers of a king", "The powers of a king" say it a couple times. Funny how the land of the democratic and free has monarchs on its greenbacks.

The king of the US

In the United States, we still have a figurehead monarch, and a monarch's Brotherly administration running our country behind the scenes.

More power than they can use

The Arab bar•ocracy have so much power, that their only limit is what they can get away with under that watery, and vague bill of rights we have in America, a bill of rights emphatically opposed by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison. (If you want to see the textbook example of a nonsense bullshit argument, this is it.)

This is also a good vantage point to see how

important a bill of rights is? This one document is the biggest thing keeping America (and by extension, most of the free world, and by extension the entire world) from the mass purges.

A presidential veto isn't a check on power, its a backdoor to it

A chain is only as strong as its weakest link, and a water pipe is only as wide as its narrowest section. Likewise, democracies are in many ways only as broad as their narrowest part — for that part is where the parasite will try to acquire power. And today, in most democracies, the narrowest part is the singular monarchy of a lone president and his huge appointed/ non-elected staff. So all over the world, we still have democracies with monarchies, and the rest of our governments are mostly just for show.

Look at how our textbooks teach us that our elected monarchs are a check on the power of our legislatures. It is absurd that we even have these elected monarchs, let alone giving them a commanding, ruling, reigning veto over our legislatures. I mean, just look at how the US, the legislature must vote 2:1 to override the veto of the elected monarch's Brotherly administration.

If we all believe in democracy and the people, how can we allow a monarch to have a veto over the action of our legislature? How can we allow the unelected administrations of our lone presidents so much sway over our legislature?

The record speaks for itself

Look at the US congressional voting record. Look at how hard it is for America's congress to override a presidential veto. You see, despite the propaganda, presidential vetoes are actually hugely influential in shaping our nation's legislative policy, thanks to that 2-to-1 vote needed to override them. What immense sway that is for the most mon•cratic and least demo•cratic branch of our democracy.

Do we want to give our figurehead's Brotherly baro•cracy the right to cancel any legislative vote that can't pass 2-to-1?

Gustav Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"He [Vanderbilt] was at this time 69-years old, a tall, robust vigorous man with a stern face of remarkable vulgar strength. [1] The illiteracy of his youth survived; he could not write the simplest words correctly, and his speech was a brusque medley of slang, jargon, dialect and profanity. It was said of him that he could swear more forcibly, variously and frequently than any other man of his generation. Like the Astors, he was cynical, distrustful, secretive, and parsimonious [stingy]. [2] He kept his plans entirely to himself. [3] In his business dealings he never was known to have shown the slightest mercy, he demanded the last cent due."

[1. Illiterate people simply sign what their advisors tell them to sign. In other words, Vanderbilt would sign what his trusted Arab helpers told him to sign, just like so many other poorly spoken and illiterate 'Alexic' Arab front-man leaders.

2. This is a tip to future bros. Keep your plans and your tactics to yourself.

3. The saying "Al•A the merciful" is doublespeak. The A, the acme is anything but merciful, except to its obedient slaves.]

Thumbs-men and D'ot•ards

There are a few paragraph in the book Rise and Fall of the Third Reich where the author talks about the bunch of outlaws

that made up Hitler's top men. The true meaning of this is that all of these men were under someone else's thumb. Such men could be defamed and eliminated at any instant. So these were all thumbs-men.

Plutarch, d. 120AD, Sulla, 9

"The [Roman] senate, no longer its own master, did what it was told to do by Marius and Sulpicius." [Sulla died in 78 BC]

Aeschylus, libation bearers, 695

"May their law-makers holding lifelong office,
whose power rules the State,
watch over the people with wise forethought and careful
deliberation.
May they grant foreigners in their city
The right to create legally binding and appealable contracts"
[Some lies tell out the truth with perfect clarity.]

Plato, Menexenus, 238c

"Our present system of government is the same as it nearly always has been in the past. Some call it a democracy, whereas others call it whatever they like. It is actually an aristocracy approved of by the masses."

MONOMANIA = the process by which a Mideast front monarchy, either royal or presidential, attempts to consolidate power in the hands of one monarch.

PRINCE is from L. **PRINCEPS** = first man, best man

Chancellor = cancellor = the lone man with the veto

Adolph Hitler was Germany's Chancellor. This word supposedly comes from Old Fr. cancelier, from L. cancel•larius. In other words, the chancel•lor was the lone man with veto or cancel•larius or cancel•crown.

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

Illustrious, adj. Suitably placed for the shafts of malice, envy and detraction.

Laurence J. Peter

"Democracy is a process by which people are free to choose the man who will get the blame."

Hesiod, Works and Days, 293

"The wisest man considers all things himself and asks if he will be better afterwards, at the end. He also listens to good advisors. He who neither thinks for himself, nor keeps in mind what others tell him is an unprofitable man" [weak decision maker]

Aristotle, d.322BC, 398.19

"the most distinguished and important men had their appointed place. Some were the king's bodyguard and attendants, others the guardians of each of the enclosing walls [fiefdoms, trade paradises, walled areas, like the Great trade Wall of China created], the so-called 'listeners' and janitors [secret police and assassins j•ani•terr=j•new•earth] These helped their king, who they called their master and deity, to see and hear all things [in his kingdom].

Besides these, others were appointed as stewards of his revenues and leaders in war and hunting, and receivers of gifts, and others charged with all the other necessary functions. All the Empire of Asia, bounded on the west by the Hellespont [Hellenes•pontus = Greek Bridge at Istanbul] and on the east

by the Indus, was apportioned by race to generals and satraps and Kings. Slaves of the Great King, there were [many jobs for] couriers and watchmen and messengers and superintendents of signal-fires." [And it was a great age for the land of no resources. in 322BC. What an ancient parasite was have. How evolved it must be. How co-evolved we must be as parasite and host.]

Cicero, On the nature of the Gods, 3.40

"When we call corn 'Ceres' or the vine 'Bacchus' we are using a familiar figure of speech. But do you think that there is really anybody so mad as to believe that the food which he eats is [actually] a god? As for the human beings who are said to have become gods, can you give me some rational explanation of how this could happen in the past but not in the present? If so, I will be happy to hear it." [Super powerful monarchs make good figureheads, but they are even more powerful as figureheads if they are deified and considered god-like by their people. Here you see the force that put up those giant murals of Saddam Hussein and the King of Thailand.]

Aeschylus, Persians, 583

"Persia lost its sway over all of Asia [After the "bloom of Asia" died in a suicidal attack of Athens]. They have stopped paying tribute [to Mideast Inc.], on their king's command. And they no longer bow their faces to the earth [like slaves] in homage. For the [figurehead] king's power is now lost and vanished. Fear shall no longer bridle speech. And uncurbed, even the common man will prattle about about freedom. For the yoke of State lies broken on the bloody beach and fields of Salamis."

Thomas Paine, Letter #5 to the Citizens of the United States, 1802

"but if the plotters against the Constitution understood their business, and they had been plotting long enough to be masters of it [their business], a single article [clause] would have comprehended [included] every thing: which is that the President (thus made) should be governed in all cases whatsoever by a private junto appointed by themselves. They could then, through the medium of a mock [straw-man] President, have negatived all bills which their party in Congress could not have opposed with success, and reduced representation to a nullity."

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.5

"There is something exceedingly ridiculous in the composition of monarchy [and a lone presidency]. It firstly excludes a man from the means of information, yet empowers him to act in cases where the highest judgement is required. The state of a king shuts him [off] from the world, yet the business of a king requires him to know it thoroughly: Wherefore the different parts, by unnaturally opposing and destroying each other, prove the whole character to be absurd and useless."

Polybius, History of the World, 6.12.5

"The consuls have absolute authority in preparing for war and in military operations in the field. They can give any order they wish to client states, appoint military tribunes, draft/conscript soldiers. Also, while in the field, they have the authority to punish whomever they might wish of those men under their command. And they have the power to spend from the public treasury any amount that they may decide upon, and they are accompanied by a quaestor who readily does everything they bid of him. Therefore, if anyone were to look at this branch of government, he might with justification say that the constitution

is simply a monarchy or kingship."

A lone presidency is an impossible job

The title of this paragraph is meant literally. The job of leading a nation is simply too much work, vastly too much work for one person to do effectively. There is too much information to be gathered, processed and decided upon. The only question is whether we want our executive roles falling on a corps/core of non-elected appointees serving under one elected official, or on a corps/core of elected citizens so broad and fast changing, that it is impossible for the parasite to infiltrate effectively.

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Monarch, n. A person engaged in reigning. Formerly the monarch ruled, as the derivation of the word attests, and as many subjects have had occasion to learn. In [Russia and the Orient](#) [Russia and the Mideast, the axis of evil], [the monarch has still a considerable influence in public affairs and in the disposition of the human head](#), but in western Europe political administration is mostly entrusted to his ministers."

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.5

"That the crown is the overbearing part in the English constitution, needs not be mentioned, and that it derives its whole consequence [relevance] merely from being [the lone executive], [the giver of places and pensions, is self-evident.](#)"

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.14

"If we inquire into the business of a king, we shall find that in some countries they have none. And after sauntering away their lives without [dis]pleasure to themselves, or advantage to the nation, withdraw from the scene, and leave their successors to tread the same idle ground. In absolute monarchies, the whole weight of business, civil and military, lies on the king. ...But in countries where he is neither a judge nor a general, as in England, a man would be puzzled to know what is his business.

The nearer any government approaches to a republic, the less business there is for a king [or lone 4-year monarchic president]. It is somewhat difficult to find a proper name for the government of England. [Sir William Meredith calls it a republic; but in its present state it is unworthy of that name, because the corrupt influence of the crown, by having all the places in its disposal, hath so effectually swallowed up the power, and eaten out the virtue of the house of commons \(the republican part in the constitution\) that the government of England is nearly as monarchical as that of France or Spain. Men fall out with \[argue over\] names without understanding them. For it is the republican and not the monarchical part of the constitution of England which Englishmen glory in, viz. the liberty of choosing an house of commons from out of their own body -- and it is easy to see that when republican virtue fails, slavery ensues. Why is the constitution of England sickly? but because monarchy hath poisoned the republic, the crown hath engrossed the commons.](#)

[In England, a king \[and his non-elected administration\] hath little more to do than to make war and give away places \[positions, monopolies offices, etc.\] which in plain terms, is to impoverish the nation"](#)

Hate all monarchs

It is a central part of the Arab struggle to get its host nations to be ruled by monarchs, bet they kings, emperors, chancellors, presidents, or dictators. Any time this happens, the Arab bar•ocracy is strongest. Thus no nation with a powerful

monarch is truly free.

It is the duty of all free nations to hate and struggle against all forms of monarchy whenever they can, and to purge the world of this evil. All free nations shall be duty bound to use their national forces to kill these men wherever they exist on earth. And these national forces shall make the monarchs suffer hell if possible—so the world can see what happens to kings and queens and chancellors and lone presidents that dare front for Arab tyranny. Get rid of the parasite's frontmen worldwide. Do not tolerate them anywhere.

I say this

In 48 hours, any monarch or president that has not resigned shall be regarded as the face of Ishtar and a democide and punished accordingly by the people.

William Penn

"Let the people think they govern and they will be governed."

Thomas Jefferson

"That government is strongest of which every man feels himself a part."

Vladimir Lenin

["Democracy is indispensable to communism"](#)

[Rather the illusion of democracy was indispensable to the murder of all those millions under doublespeak title of "democracy". Here we see the greatest risk of democracy — that everyone THINKS himself a pat and everyone THINKS his people is governing itself — and that everyone THINKS he can trust his government. What if your democracy is actually corrupt and a parasite puppet master is in control, but sabotaging you as and when he can get away with it.]

Christopher Marlowe, The Massacre at Paris, c. 1592, 1.2.43

["Set me to scale the high Pyramids,](#)
[And set the diadem \[royal crown\] of France there on;](#)
[I'll either rend \[tear\] it with my nails \[claws\] to naught \[into nothing\]](#)

[Or mount the top with my aspiring wings](#)
[Although my downfall be the deepest hell;](#)
[For this I wake, when others think I sleep;](#)
[... For this, this head, this heart, this hand, and sword,](#)
[Contrives, imagines, and fully executes,](#)
[Matters of importance aimed at by many,](#)
[But understood by none.](#)

[For this heaven has put me of \[on\] earth;](#)
[For this, earth sustains my body's weight](#)
[And with this weight I'll counterpoise a crown](#)
[Or with seditions \[I will\] weary all the world.](#)
[For this, the Spanish send me Indian gold](#)
[For this, the Catholic state, French ecues;](#)
[For this, have I a largess \[letter\] from the Pope,](#)
[A pension, and a dispensation \[letter\] too...](#)

[dispensation= exemption from the law, license to kill]

[My policy has framed religion. Religion! O Devil!](#)

[Fie, I am ashamed, - however that I seem](#)
[To think a word of such a simple sound](#)
[Of so great matter should be made the ground \[whole earth\]!](#)
[The gentle king, whose pleasure is uncontrolled](#)
[Weakens his body, and will waste his realm,](#)
[If I don't repair what he ruins \[like ruin nation\]](#)
[Him \[the king\], like a child, I win \[over\] daily with words](#)
[Proving that he barely bears the name \[king\];](#)

I execute, and he sustains the blame.
The Queen Mother works wonders for my sake
And in my love entombs the hope of France,
Rifling the bowels of her treasury
To supply my necessities and wants."

Will Rogers

"On account of being a democracy, and run by the people, we are the only nation in the world that has to keep a government for four years, no matter what is does wrong."

The UK can fire its figurehead, why can't the US?

Once America's democracy elects its lone 4-year presidential monarch we are pretty much stuck with him, no matter how unpopular he becomes. On top of this, there is a heavy bias in favor of presidential incumbents, so very often we get stuck with our presidents for 8 years. Now our parasite prefers hereditary monarchies where there is as little change as possible in their administrations. But if that is not possible, they can also work with monarchs for years as with America's president. Here we see why it is so hard for America to get rid of a bad president. It is because our democracy is basically run for the benefit of our parasite and having mostly "unimpeachable" presidents helps our parasite with that objective.

Line item veto — More power for the monarch

It is amazing how most of the governmental changes seriously brought up in Washington consolidate or centralize our parasite's power over our democracy even further. Here, the line item veto is a good example in how it hands more power to America's lone executive, its monarch of up to 8 years. Under the line item veto the appointee administration barocracy of Barak Hussein Obama would have the power to block any specific energy programs it wanted.

Anti-Federalist papers, 1787.07.23

Why America does not have a prime minister. Do these reasons make sense?]

"Mr. [James] Madison [a federalist and the author of the record of the US Constitutional Convention] (said)... 1. The election of the Chief Magistrate would agitate and divide the legislature so much that the public interest would materially suffer by it. Public bodies are always apt to be thrown into contentions, but into more violent ones by such occasions than by any others. 2. The candidate would intrigue with the Legislature, would derive his appointment from the predominant faction [political party], and be apt to render his administration subservient to its [the political party's] views. 3. The Ministers of foreign powers [the Arabs] would have and make use of, the opportunity to mix their intrigues and influence with the Election. Limited as the powers of the Executive are, it will be an object of great moment with the great rival powers of Europe who have American possessions, to have at the head of our Government a man attached to their respective politics and interests. No pains, nor perhaps expense, will be spared, to gain from the Legislature an appointment favorable to their wishes. [clearly our parasite prefers mono-lected presidents for fixed terms over di-lected prime ministers that serve for as long as the legislature has confidence in them. It also prefers that this one powerful president be elected directly by the people, where media corruption is greatest.]

...The Legislatures of the States had betrayed a strong propensity to a variety of pernicious measures. One object[ive] of the National Legislature was to control this

propensity. One object of the National Executive, so far as it would have a negative [veto] on the laws, was to control the National Legislature, so fare as it might be infected with a similar propensity. Refer the appointment of the National Executive to the State Legislatures, and this controlling purpose may be defeated."

An Arab choice/ bar·gain

How come getting rid of the Arabs must be packaged with Donald Trump? Note that Trump got the Catholic Church to sell him the air rights over their church and got membership in the Atlantic City gambling cartel.

How come in Poland, keeping the Arabs out was packaged with a corrupt right-wing party that outlawed all forms of abortion?

When you see something that most agree is good package with something that most agree is bad, you should suspect that you are being manipulated by an Arab choice.

The recent inept New York bombing

Isn't it funny how lame it was that nobody died. Isn't it funny the lameness of the bombs? That is about Arabs inc. trying to get their man Trump into office while not increasing hatred for Arabs too much. Those bombs were not supposed to harm anyone.

Excalibur

This is the sword embedded in a stone of king Arthur legend. Ex·cali·bur=formerly·green·brothers and the stone symbolizes the Mideast. Basically the sword in the stone is like the wooden stake in the heart of a vampire. Remove the sword and the Brothers will make you king. Of course, to do this, you have to set the horrible blood sucking demon free to plague the world. What sort of awful person would want to be king under those circumstances?

James Madison, 1787.07.11, at the 'Constitutional Convention'

"All men having power ought to be distrusted to a certain degree."

(likelihood of war to number of decision makers curve)

One finger on the Armageddon button

In today's thermonuclear world, we obviously do not want one man making decisions about nuclear war. How can we allow any particular man to have so much world changing power? How did we ever come to such a crazy state of affairs?

I will tell you how, the devil's economic agenda, the agenda of our parasite; it profits from more war in the house of war. Having one leader makes it easier to bring another Adolph Hitler puppet, Kaiser Wilhelm puppet, or Pol Pot puppet to power and use that "lone gunman" to once again march the world off a cliff and into a great war.

The easiest way to reduce the amount of war is to take such decisions out of the hands of small groups of men. The larger the bodies making the decision to wage war, the less likely war is to happen. However, in matters of self defense, such as after the Pearl Harbor attack, having a large bodies of representatives making the decision does not seem to make much difference.

Anti-Federalist papers, 1787.06.28

"Mr. Madison: ... A standing military force, with an overgrown Executive will not long be safe companions to liberty. The means of defense against foreign danger, have been always

the instruments of tyranny at home. ... Throughout all Europe, the armies kept up under the pretext of defending, have enslaved the people. It is perhaps questionable, whether the best concerted system of absolute power in Europe could maintain itself, in a situation, where no alarms of external danger could tame the people to the domestic yoke. The insular situation of Great Britain was the principal cause of her being an exception to the general fate of Europe. It has rendered less defense necessary and admitted a kind of defense which could not be used for the purpose of oppression." [So a big reason our parasite instigated all its many wars and conflicts was to keep the armies and secret police around. Then these apparatuses could be hijacked and used to eliminate people who might harm our parasite's ability to feed on our societies.]

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.11

"Few or no records were extant in those days, and traditional history [was] stuffed with fables. It was very easy, after the lapse of a few generations, to trump up some superstitious tale, conveniently timed, Mahomet-like [Mohammed-like], to cram hereditary right down the throats of the vulgar [common people]. Perhaps the disorders which threatened, or seemed to threaten, on the decease [death] of a leader and the choice of a new one (for elections among ruffians could not be very orderly) induced many at first to favor hereditary pretensions. by which [these] means it happened, as it hath happened since, that what at first was submitted to as a convenience was afterwards claimed as a right.

England since the [Norman] conquest, hath known some few good monarchs, but groaned beneath a much larger number of bad ones. Yet no man in his [right] senses can say that their claim under William the Conqueror is a very honorable one. [Here we have] A French bastard landing with an armed banditti, and establishing himself king of England against the consent of the natives... It certainly hath no divinity about it. However, it is needless to spend much time in exposing the folly of hereditary [monarchic] right...

Yet I should be glad to ask how they suppose kings came at first? The question admits but of three answers, viz. either by lot, by election, or by usurpation."

The Anti-Federalist Papers, 1787.06.01

"Mr. Sherman [who wanted to abolish state governments all together], said he considered the Executive magistracy as nothing more than an institution for carrying the will of the Legislature into effect, that the person or persons ought to be appointed by and accountable to the Legislature only, which was the depository of the supreme will of the Society. As they were the best judges of the business which ought to be done by the executive department, and consequently of the number necessary from time to time for doing it, he wished the number might not be fixed, but that the Legislature should be at liberty to appoint one or more [presidents or czars for specific purposes] as experience might dictate. Mr. Wilson [vile•son] preferred a single magistrate, as giving most energy dispatch and responsibility to the office. ...Mr. Randolph strenuously opposed a unity in the Executive magistracy. He regarded it as the fetus of monarchy. We had, he said, no motive to be governed by the British Government as our prototype. ... the fixed genius of the people of America required a different form of Government. ... Mr. Wilson said that unity in the Executive instead of being the fetus of monarchy would be the best safeguard against tyranny."

From the Secret History of Procopius, 565AD, 6.17

"It was a long established custom that the Roman Emperor should sign all his decree documents. Emperor Justin, however, was incapable of either drafting his own laws, or taking an intelligent interest in the measures contemplated. The official whose luck it was to be his chief advisor - a man called Pro•cl•us, who held the rank of 'Quaestor' [The Quaestors were tax collectors.] - used to decide all measures as he himself thought fit. Here would secure approval for these in the Emperor's own handwriting. The men responsible for this business proceeded as follows: On a short strip of polished wood they cut a stencil in the shape of four letters [LEGI] spelling the Latin for I have read. Then they used to dip a pen in the special ink reserved for emperors and place it in the hands of Emperor Justin. Next they took the strip of wood described above and laid it on the document grasped by the Emperor's [illiterate] hand, and while he held the pen guided it along the pattern of the four letters, taking it round all the bends cut in the wooden stencil. Then away they went, carrying the Emperor's directives, such as they were." [The heavily supported kids activity LEGO means in Latin "I read". Obviously, these kids are not reading — hence the matrix name LEGO.]

John of Salisbury, Policraticus, c. 1150, Bk.4

"...it is crystal clear how necessary a knowledge of letters is to princes... If however, out of consideration for other distinguished virtues [like being held up as a great man], it should chance that the prince is not literate, he will have to take advice from men of letters [his baro•cracy] if his affairs [of state] are to prosper rightly."

Leon Batista Alberti, On the Family, 1428

"Letters are indeed so important that without them, one would be considered nothing but a rustic, no matter how noble his birth. I would much rather see a young nobleman with a book than with a falcon in his hand [a bird that eats messenger pigeons. Falconry or eff•al•con•ouri is a big sport in Arabia.] I've never had much use for the old saying [we tell our figurehead kings,] that all you need to learn how to do is sign your name and figure out how much money is left" [after we are done ripping off your nation, otherwise known as "whaling," or "kettering," or "getting".]

Angela Merkel = An•G•al•A Br•kal

Apparently Germany has a mole as a constitutional monarch, just like the US. She opened her nation to immigration by a million Arabs. She also threatened to prosecute a comedian in Germany for insulting the Arabian monarch of Turkey.

Drug and energy czars are monarchs too

As far as our parasite is concerned, a monarch need not run the entire nation. He can also run some fiefdom within that nation or that nation's government. Either way, the administration of appointees has a back door to our government. Also, we should all note the sectors our lone presidents have appointed czars=caesars to run. Wherever we have czars, we have a big Arab racket — for example the US drug czars and our energy czars.

The illusion of choice

Mostly, everyone in politics in America is either a follow the herd type, or they are a Brother. Those who are not, and those who make waves are quickly driven out of politics.

Decision in Philadelphia, Ch.19

"[the Brotherly administration of] King George III was intensely jealous of his power, and he [they] had managed, also through offers of government contracts, cabinet posts, and jobs in which a man might get rich, to sidestep Parliament. This had obvious corrupting effects: a legislator beholden to a governor for his job as, say a tax collector, would be under considerable pressure to vote as the governor wanted; and furthermore, he could hardly vote disinterestedly when tax matters came up. The whole political experience of America prior to the Revolution, as well as their wide reading of history, had taught them to beware of tyrants—kings and governors who would, through force and guile, set themselves up as arbitrary rulers of the country. It also taught them that protection for the people lay in the legislature, a body elected by the people, from the people, which the people could upset at the next [annual] election.

As a consequence, when Americans began to write their own constitutions after the Declaration of Independence in 1776, they created governments dominated to one degree or another by legislatures. According to Gordon Wood, in an important study of the matter, governors became "little more than chairmen of their executive boards." Although the rules varied from state to state, in general, legislatures made most major appointments, including judicial ones, elected the executive, and even tried certain kinds of cases in their own chambers. Government was concentrated in one branch, and we have seen what happened: legislatures kept running from one extreme[ly good idea] to the next according to the passions of the day, establishing paper money [the devalued our parasite's gold], putting in stay and tender laws [that substantially reduced our parasite's ability to profit from its intentionally induced foreclose crises], and in general behaving erratically, often dominated by minority factions. Or so, at least, most of the men at the [US Constitutional] Convention believed.

Nonetheless, the memory of King George and his royal governors was only 12 years old. Many of the men at the Convention had lived under tyrannical governors longer than they had under fickle legislatures. [The fickleness was only in the congress of the 13 state legislatures, and this only because the congress of 13 state legislatures was constituted as a meta-democracy] There were not about to substitute one tyranny for another. And thus the ambivalence on the subject of the executive most delegates brought to the Convention: they had suffered under strong executives, suffered under weak ones, and they wanted neither. [ambivalence? Here it seems that the public didn't wanted an executive.] A balance would have to be struck. [between those who didn't want a monarch and the parasite that did.] And in the course of striking that balance they worked out a way, there on the Convention floor, [odd to mention] to put into practice the idea that is at the heart of the American Constitution, the theory of the separation of powers. The recent authority on the subject, Gordon Wood, writes, "Perhaps no principle of American constitutionalism has attracted more attention than that of separation of powers. It has in fact come to define the very character of the American political system." [He is talking about the American-style carefully-cloaked, neo-monarchy that Mideast Inc. uses to run the world today.]

As the Founders eventually came to understand it, the doctrine of the separation of powers required the government to be split into several branches or departments, each with its own rights and prerogatives, worked out in such a way that no man, or group of men, would be able to rule by fiat. The

Founders found inspiration in a famous passage in Montesquieu's *L'esprit des Lois*, with which they were all familiar. The passage is worth quoting...

"When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistracy, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner.

Again, there is no liberty, if the power of judging is not separated from the legislative and executive powers. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control; for the judge would then be the legislator. Were it joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with all the violence of an oppressor." [Of course this is just our parasite making an excuse to keep its figurehead monarchs/ oligarchs where they matter most, in executing and judging the law. Was George Bush a check on the power of America's 535 congressmen? Do we really want any one man to have so much power? Doesn't his power devolve to his appointed helpers, whoever they might be? Look, executive monarchs and judicial oligarchs aren't a check on the powers of a broad and democratic legislature, they are a backdoor to this power.]

Monarchs are fickle not legislatures

There are many legends of fickle monarchs suddenly deciding to kill their friends and allies. Legislatures by contrast are anything but fickle. In fact, groups of are far more stable than individuals by nature — and everyone knows that.

You see, we have all fallen for a trick. It is like someone saying that our national capital should be far away from our people so it will be less corruption prone. They lie to you and say, "these are not the droids you are looking for", and you believe them. Why do you believe them?

Plutarch, Alexander, 42

"Above all, if anybody spoke ill of him, his judgement was apt to desert him and his mood would become cruel and merciless, since he valued his good name more than his life or crown." [In order to get rid of trouble makers, just say they spoke ill of Saddam Hussein, Alexander, or whoever is the current figurehead.]

The Patriot Act

The Patriot Act is really the find all the patriots act. This helps the parasite produce the proscription lists.

Say this to everyone in the Military everywhere

The Arabs were King George, Thomas Paine and Alexander Hamilton. They played both sides in the American revolutionary war. If this war was not real, what about your war, the war you have been called to fight in. Hitler wasn't real, Pol Pot wasn't real. Joseph Stalin wasn't real. Most war is Arab figureheads killing infidels — puppet theatre.

Most wari•ours never realized that the Arabs were inside all our monarchies and presidencies, and that these Arabs have always quietly struggled to enslave our people as their host.

Eva Braun, Hitler's mistress

Adolph Hitler was the all powerful fuhrer of Germany. Funny how he didn't have a whole harem of Arian beauties. Funny how it never occurred to him that he could have sex with a different beauty morning noon and night, or just every evening, at the end of his work day, like Jayavarmin of Angkor Wat.

Funnier still is how none of our kings and princes ever live like Jayavarmin.

Now maybe Hitler was a sexually repressed, and that is why he was monogamous with Eva Braun. It is a little bit hard to believe, but OK, let's say it is true. I grant you this one. But how come all of our all-powerful monarchs are monogamous. That is very hard to believe. Even Saddam Hussein only had two sons. Can you see that someone doesn't want you thinking outside the box — the matrix their lines spent ages creating for your lines?

Look over here you dumb livestock

Look at all the hate-hate-hate Hitler and hate-hate-hate Nazi media still being produced. Boy the parasite wants you to hate that red cape you dumb animals. Hate it! Go ahead, hate the red cape! Come on everyone, Hitler was not real. He was/is just a hate figurehead of the Arabs, a red cape waved in front of your eyes.

Gore Vidal

"Democracy is supposed to give you the feeling of choice, like painkiller X and painkiller Y. But they are both just aspirin."

US presidential choices in 2016

- 1) Hillary Clinton who is clearly not competent
- 2) Br•nee Sand•ours
- 3) Donal Trump who runs casinos for the Mafia, and somehow got the Catholic Church to sell him the air rights over one of its churches at a huge profit to Trump.

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.24

"according to what is called the present constitution, that this continent can make no laws but what the king[']s administration] gives-leave-to [permits]. And is there any man so unwise, as not to see, that (considering what has happened) he [the king] will suffer [allow] no law to be made here, but such as suit[s] his purpose. We may be as effectually enslaved by the want of laws in America, as by submitting to laws made for us in England. After matters are made up [reconciled] (as it is called) can there be any doubt, but [that] the whole power of the crown will be exerted, to keep this continent as low and humble as possible? Instead of going forward, we shall go backward... We are already greater than the king wishes us to be, and will he not hereafter endeavor to make us less? To bring the matter to one point: Is the power who is jealous of our prosperity, a proper power to govern us?" [The king's veto right over his colonies, or rather the veto right of his non-elected administration of Brotherly appointees was called "disallowance". Also, the American colonists did not have the same rights as the citizens of England.]

Xenophon, Athenian constitution, 5

"Throughout the world, the aristocracy are opposed to democracy"

John DeWitt, 5 November 1787

"There is a charm in politics. [Those] persons who enters reluctantly into office becomes habituated [habituated], grow fond of it, and are loath to resign it. They feel themselves flattered and elevated, and are apt to forget their constituents, until the time returns that they again feel the want [need] of them [i.e. at election time]. They uniformly [without exception] exercise all the powers granted to them, and 99 in 100 are for grasping at more." [The first underlined part is not valuable knowledge. Most teenagers know this already. The last

sentence however is something different, for it actually defies human nature. Just look at the ultra-rich. Do these people always grasp for more and more? Some do, but mostly they become lazy, incredibly lazy, indolent and completely unmotivated to make more money, no matter how easy it is.

Why on earth do people with political power and honor (and great wealth) all behave in the opposite way than the merely rich behave? Perhaps it is because these people are the parasite's figureheads and they are greedy not for themselves, but for their secret masters, the Sphinx Mafia.

Normal people get satisfied and lazy. The parasite race on the other hand is a bottomless pit because they always need more money to bring more Haremi pilgrims to the promised land.

In Star Trek myth we were told how "absolute power corrupts absolutely". This is the parasite repeating the very same propaganda message, 180 years later. You see, our parasite needs us all to believe that there is something inherently wrong with human nature, that those who reach our artificially narrow pinnacles of political power all have a broken greed thermostat. In truth, the real reason for the greed of our leaders is that they are the figureheads of an ancient parasitic race from a land of no resources.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1775.02.23, The farmer refuted

"A fondness for power is implanted in most men, and it is natural to abuse it, when acquired" [Maybe this is mostly so with Arab figureheads]

The two brands of Ukrainian chocolate

In Ukraine there are two big brands of grocery-store chocolate. There is Svitoch which is now Nestle and Roshen which is the domestic Ukrainian brand. Roshen (Russian) is owned by the Ukrainian president.

Here we see the parasite controlling both choices on a menu, Coke or Pepsi style. Do you want the chocolate sold by the parasite's international arm Nestle? Or do you want the domestic chocolate sold by its domestic arm, a company owned by its domestic figurehead leader? Make no mistake about it, both choices use the illusions or figureheads of the parasite.

Mr. Never Enough

When you get a billionaire running your government, (for example, a Poroschenko, a Shinawatra, or a Trump), you don't get someone who has enough money and doesn't need any more from your people — You get almost certainly get someone holding assets on behalf of the parasite — especially if it is in a parasite/Mafia dominated industry like gambling or commodities, transports, or utilities. This man will bleed your nation dry for the parasite.

Do men really love power that much?

Clearly, our political leaders are presented as having an extreme and inordinate love of power by the media. And we are certainly told, repeatedly told, by our parasite's TV shows and films, how much some people love political power and money. But do normal really love power so much? Is that what is really going on — or are these oligarchs really Mr. P's frontmen?

Oligarchs

The true term is lig•archs = string•rulers, meaning puppets

End all narrow forms of government

It is time to end all monarchies, and all oligarchies, and all other narrow forms of government on earth. Please, no more kings or presidents anywhere — even it is only for a few days. No single person should have so much power. The idea that they should was our parasite's idea — and this one idea has helped our parasite cause just so much suffering for our ancestors.

Queens are absurd

We read how Alexander the Great took a wife, a queen. We also read how countless kings took queens. We even read about Hitler's mistress/ wife Eva Braun. But how many men would settle for one woman when they could have a harem (Arabic harem = forbidden to have or discuss.) I mean, why didn't Alexander and Hitler have more than one women? The could have had everyone they wanted. All they had to do was ask.

"Excuse me miss, the king asks that you to come to the castle tonight." Given the immense potential risks and rewards, and the frequent obligation of absolute royal obedience, few women in tough times would dare act with anything but complete compliance.

So as individual cases, queens are a little hard to believe. I mean, we might see some kings becoming so enamored with one woman that they make her queen. And certainly we will see arranged royal marriages to cement alliances. But how can queens be the historical norm. And how come so many kings have so much trouble producing heirs, even illegitimate heirs? I think that this queen idea constitutes a hard-to-believe rupture in our interpretive matrix. I also think that the reason we learn about queens as 4-year olds says something about how absurd the idea is.

Voltaire

"The ideal form of government is democracy tempered with assassination."

The US Vice president is absurd

Think about how the vice president of the US does practically nothing. How could our "brilliant" founding fathers have omitted to give this man any important duties? Well the answer is that we have to have a line of people standing by as replacements for our presidential monarchs. This is because if we did not have people standing by to take over, a council, or a group of people might come to temporarily replace our lone president. Then, because the council works so much better, we might take the idea and use a council to replace our presidents entirely.

So we must have someone there standing by. But we can't have di•archs or dual presidents as these are much harder to assassinate together. And if both are not killed at once, the surviving di-arch will lash out and kill many harem brothers. And furthermore, on the slippery slope towards broad democracy, the first step is the greatest, for it doubles the size of the figurehead relative to the bar•ocracy. It also allows the di•archs to ask each other about the way to go. So the parasite definitely does not want di•archs, but mon•archs.

Now, on the other hand, if the Vice president ever found himself with any responsibilities while in office, we might come to expand those responsibilities and soon find ourselves with 2 executives, and then maybe 5 or 27 or 500, and again, our parasite always wants as much concentration of power as possible. So this anyway is why the US Vice President does nothing. Impotent Vice Presidents are exactly what our

parasite needs to concentrate and maximize its power under a lone executive.

Andromache 364 or 458

"Chorus: Never shall I approve of two loves for one man, or two women in one house. It means strife, anger, and pain in the household. My husband must be content with one wife, sleeping with nobody else.

And in cities, two rulers are worse than one. It means civil strife, and many burdens for the people. So when there are two craftsmen, or two creators of song, the Muses love to case strife.

When the swift [trade] winds sweep the sailors along, if two minds are in control, it is bad for proper steering. A whole crowd of the most skilled helmsmen is less useful than a single mind in supreme command, though its skill is less. Therein lies the efficiency, in houses and cities alike, whenever decisions are to made."

Thomas Paine, Common sense p.10

[If the following underlined was in a foreign language I might translate it as: "Monarchy is evil, and this evil is compounded by hereditary succession. And while monarchy demeans and disgraces this generation, hereditary succession, claimed as a matter of birthright is an insult and imposition on our descendants."]

"To the evil of monarchy, we have added that of hereditary succession; and as the first is a degradation and lessening of ourselves, so the second, claimed as a matter of right, is an insult and an imposition on posterity. For all men being originally [born] equals, no one by birth could have a right to set up his own family in perpetual preference to all others for ever. And though [he] himself might deserve some decent degree of honors of [from] his contemporaries, yet his descendants might be far too unworthy to inherit them. ... [and although the people] might say, 'We choose you for our head,' they could not, without manifest injustice to their children, say, 'that your children and your children's children shall reign over ours for ever'. Because such an unwise, unjust, unnatural compact might (perhaps) in the next succession put them under the government of a rogue or a fool. Most wise men, in their private sentiments, have ever [always] treated hereditary right with contempt. Yet it is one of those evils, which when once established is not easily removed. Many submit from fear, others from superstition, and the more powerful part [of society] shares with the king the plunder of the rest. [the weaker parts of society]

This is supposing that the present race of kings in the world to have had an honorable origin. [Translation of underlined follows] Whereas it is more than probable, that could we take off the dark covering of antiquity, and trace them to their first rise, that we should find the first of them nothing better than the principal ruffian of some restless gang, whose savage manners or pre-eminence in subtlety obtained him the title of chief among plunderers; and who by increasing in power, and extending his depredations, overawed the quiet and defenseless to purchase their safety by frequent contributions."

[Translating the underlined into plain English: But let's say we could see into time's dark depths, and trace our monarchs to their first rise. If we did this, we would find them no better than a head gangster or Mafia boss — a man whose savage ways earned him pre-eminence and the title of plunderer #1. We would find a man who by increasing in power and extending his plunder, would frighten and intimidate

the quiet and defenseless to purchase their safety through frequent payments.]

CAESAR = SEIZER

Julius Caesar seized power and dissolved Rome's democracy. Clearly these are the same word. Can you imagine more different spellings of the same word? Can you see someone 'struggling' to hide how these words come from the same man, an impersonization? Who could that be but Jew•ally•us Seizer, from a time when the Arabs were called Jews.

Lucius Catilina, 63BC

[Lucius Catilina stood against Marcus Cicero for the consulship in 64 BC. He ran on a platform of radical land redistribution and debt cancellation. Catilina appears to have been a death spasm of Roman democracy in the face of the creeping Mideast take-over.] "Day by day, my burning passion for action grows more excited when I consider what our future living conditions will be if we don't assert our right to freedom. Ever since the government has fallen under the power and jurisdiction of a few men [fronting for Mideast Inc.], a steady flow of nations have become their tax paying tributaries. But all the rest of us, no matter how brave or worthy, whether noble or plebeian, have been regarded as a mere mob. We have no authority or financial interest, and are now subject to men to whom, if the state were in a sound condition, we should rightly be afraid of. Hence all influence, power, honor, and wealth are in their hands, or where they dispose them. To us they have only left insults, dangers, persecutions, and poverty. To such indignities, O bravest of men, how long will you submit? Is it not better to die in a glorious attempt, than, after having been the sport of other men's insolence, to resign to a wretched and degraded existence."

All politics is just puppet theatre

That last part about the quiet and defenseless purchasing their safety through frequent payments. I submit that normal people don't think that way or say such things. Only Arabs think that way and say such things. So here it looks like Common Sense was written by the left hand of the Arabs. And in the right hand we obviously have King George. Here it looks like the whole American enterprise was carefully planned and staged. Just look at how Columbus just happened to discover America 6 years before Vasco da Gama. Look at how Columbus gets all the attention and this helps hide the Arab spice trade. you see, it is all just a matrix and most of it is not real — not the discoveries, the politics, the history, or the global economy.

Donald Trump

- 1) He got his start buying air rights over a Catholic church in New York (see art of the Deal book).
- 2) He bought one of two gambling concessions near New York.
- 3) He has hundreds of companies, like so many Arab front men.
- 4) He blames China for concocting the myth of climate change when OPEC is clearly the main beneficiary.

IPAL = its probably a lie

The Arabs have lied about anything they could make money on and get away with. I would even go so far as to say that they are behind anything that people are really irrationally fanatical about, despite having insufficient evidence to justify their certainty.

Star Wars film, episode 2

"Dumb pawn: In response to this direct threat to the republic, I propose that the senate give immediately emergency powers to the supreme chancellor.

New dictator: It is with great reluctance that I have agreed to this calling. I love democracy. I love the Republic. The power you give me, I will lay down when this crisis has abated. And as my first act, with this new authority I will create a grand army of the republic to counter the increasing threats of the separatists."

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.13

"Another evil which attends [goes with] hereditary succession is, that the throne is subject to be possessed by a minor [child] at any age. All [at] which time, the regency acting under the cover of a king, have every opportunity and inducement to betray their trust. The same national misfortune happens, when a king, worn out with age and infirmity, enters the last stage of human weakness [and becomes sen•ill. sen=old] In both these cases, the public becomes a prey [foreigner English alert] to every mis•crea•nt, who can temper [alloy] successfully with the follies either of age or infancy. [Mis•crea•n't = mouth•believe•not = say but not believe]

The most plausible plea, which hath [has] ever been offered in favor of hereditary succession, is, that it preserves a nation from civil wars. And were this true, it would be [a] weighty [consideration]. Whereas, [in truth] it is the most barefaced falsity [lie] ever imposed upon mankind. The whole history of England disowns the fact [disproves the claim]. 30 kings and 2 minors have reigned in that distracted kingdom since the [Norman, or "North•men"] conquest, in which time there have been (including the Revolution) no less than 8 civil wars and 19 rebellions. Wherefore [Therefore] instead of making for [helping bring] peace, it makes against it, and destroys the very foundation it [peace] seems to stand on. ... In short, monarchy and succession have laid (not this or that kingdom only) but the [whole] world in blood and ashes."

Hemophilia in Europe's royalty makes perfect sense

Hemophilia is a genetic condition where the blood fails to clot and people frequently bleed to death from minor injuries. Hemophilia is quite deadly, and lines with the mutation definitely tend to die out. This makes hemophilia a bazaar and impossible genetic trait to evolve under normal circumstances. On the other hand, hemophilia for disposable frontman figurehead monarchs of an economic parasite makes perfect sense. They simply bread easy-whack aristocrats with bleeder's disease. Here we understand how Hemophilia came to be so common among Europe's royalty.

VICE•ROY = vice king, vice president

2— KINGS

Thomas Paine, 1776, Common Sense

"we ought to remember that virtue is not hereditary."

David Hume, 1754, The History of Great Britain

[quoting someone else] "his majesty was an absolute king, and therefore not bound to give an account to any of his actions... An absolute monarchy... [as] opposed to a limited [monarchy, a rex•publica]: And the king of England is acknowledged not to be absolute. So much has matters changed, even before the Civil War."

Procopius, Secret History, c.565 AD, 14.10

"[The Emperor and his consort](#) [Brotherly puppet-master] for the most part made a show of taking sides in the questions at issue"

St. Bede, c. 731AD, History of the English people 1.32

[Pope Gregory to King Ethelbert 601.06.22 AD]

"[The reason why Almighty God elevates men to govern entire nations is that through them, he may bestow the gifts of his mercy on all whom they rule.](#) [God's mercy is when the Brothers leave you alone rather than struggling against you.] ... [I beg you to listen to his \[Bishop Augustine's\] advice without holding any grudges. Follow it exactly and store it carefully in your memory \[making him your master\] for if you listen to him when he speaks in God's name, God himself will listen more readily to the prayers he utters on your behalf. But if you ignore his advice, which God forbids, and disregard him when he speaks for God, how should God pay attention when he speaks for you?"](#)

Kings own everything in the land

In the old days, the king or sovereign owned everything in the land. And he could kill anyone he wanted. Thus, he was the perfect figurehead for the Arabs. And his administration was the perfect black box for our parasite to quietly hijack the group effort of a host society. Whenever you see a genuine monarch, an all powerful king or dictator, you are looking at a total parasite infection. The reason why the Arabs hate America so much is because we are the least tolerant of this sort of parasitism.

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 29.1

"[Their property was collected by the treasury and used by the \[Arab figurehead\] emperor for his own purposes, while the condemned were ground down by fearful poverty and reduced to beg for their bread](#)"

I inherited the kingdom from my dad

Are nations really personal property that is to be inherited? Now there is a crazy idea. How on earth did we ever come up with that idea?

Marco Polo, Ch.5

"[It was decreed by their king \[The 'Great Khan'\], 'in the days of his rule, that every man must follow his father's craft: If he possessed 100,000 bezants, he could still practice no other craft that his father had done before him. Not of course that he was obliged to labor at it with his own hands, but rather, as I have said above, to employ men to work at it. But this rule is by no means enforced by the Great Khan. Nowadays, if a craftsman has attained to such riches that he is able and desirous to abandon his craft, he is no longer constrained by anyone to practice it.'](#)" [Yet others apparently, may not enter this industry]

What's a king?

A king is an ak-ing, and acme-ing guy, the top pointing guy, the guy they all point to, the powerless figurehead, the sch-muck or n-a-ment that everyone thinks is really running the show.

Intersecting the meanings of SIRE

These are the same word. a SIRE is a king, knight or baron (bar-on = bro-big = big-brother). A SIRE is also the male parent of animals or sometimes of men, one of the highest quality. What an intersection of meanings. Clearly our leaders were

Arab harem bros, and clearly they were of this royal caste that was above the locals like the Bro-men Brahmin of India.

What an intersection of meanings. These Arab men, these SIREs living in our land were not only a caste above us, but they could have sex and SIRE children with our women. These were at first called best-ards, until that proved problematic and the name was changed to bastards.

In some times and places the Arab shape-shifters had the "Right of the First Night", where the local lord/SIRE had the right to take the virginity of all brides. Thus the Arab SIRE not only got to have sex with all the women of his land, but he was also the arbiter of virginity.

Christopher Marlowe, Edward the Second c. 1592 (1.1.125) "Come, let us leave the brain-sick king"

[The Brothers prefer to poison minds rather than killing people. It arouses little suspicion. It also leaves us weaker when our leaders are brain damaged. And if the king is mentally ill, his brotherly administrators have free reign to rule. Believe me, I experienced this first hand. They tried to do this to me. It was only through an extraordinary set of circumstances that my intellect survived.]

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 29.2

"[sovereign power is nothing if it doesn't care for society's welfare. It is the job of a good ruler to keep his power in check, to resist the passions of unbridled desire and implacable rage. He must realize that, as the dictator Caesar used to say, the recollection of past cruelty is a wretched provision for old age. If a ruler is going to pass judgement on the life and existence of a man... he ought to reflect long and seriously, and not be carried away by passion to commit an act that cannot be undone.](#)"

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 22.9

Julian was careful to steer a straight course as a sailor anxious to avoid running on a rock. He owed his success in this to the fact that [he was conscious of the excitability of his disposition and allowed his senior advisors freedom to curb his impetuosity by timely advice when it led him astray.](#) [Apparently the Arabs have favored Hitler types as front men for a long time.] [On many occasions he made it clear that he regretted his mistakes and that he was glad to be put right.](#) [The angry Hitler-type figurehead let his Arab assistants correct his mistakes when they wanted.] [When advocates for the defense praised him to the skies for his perfect uprightness... he...replied...'I would certainly be proud if I knew that this praise came from people who were also in a position to blame me for anything that I had said or done amiss.'](#) " [Nobody else but the emperor's/dictator's Arab assistants dared to suggest anything of the Emperor for fear of being thrown into a death camp.]

Procopius, Secret History, c.565 AD, 6.17

"[It was a long established custom that the Roman Emperor should sign all his decree documents. Emperor Justin, however, was incapable of either drafting his own laws, or taking an intelligent interest in the measures contemplated. The official whose luck it was to be his chief advisor - a man called Proclus \[pro-kal = pro-green\], who held the rank of 'Quaestor' \[The Quaestors were tax collectors.\] - used to decide all measures as he himself thought fit. Here would secure approval for these in the Emperor's own handwriting. The men responsible for this business went about it as follows: On a short strip of polished wood they cut a stencil in the](#)

shape of four letters [LEGI] spelling the Latin for I have read. Then they used to dip a pen in the special ink reserved for emperors and place it in the hands of Emperor Justin. Next they took the strip of wood described above and laid it on the document grasped by the Emperor's [illiterate] hand, and while he held the pen guided it along the pattern of the four letters, taking it [a]round all the bends cut in the wooden stencil. Then away they went, carrying the Emperor's directives, such as they were."

Machiavelli, The Prince, Ch. 7, 1513AD

"He was able if not to make whom he liked Pope, at least to prevent the election of any whom he disliked... as I have said already, though he could not secure the election he desired, he could have prevented any other." [The Arabs have totally corrupted both the papacy and the Catholic church.]

Denis Diderot

"Man will never be free until the last king is strangled with the entrails of the last priest."

Einhart, The Life of Charlemagne, c. 830AD, Book 1

"The Merovingian dynasty, from where the Franks chose their kings, is thought to have lasted down to King Childeric III, who was deposed on the order of Pope Stephen II. His hair was cut short and he was shut up in a monastery. Though this dynasty may seem to have come to an end with Childeric III, it really had lost all power years before and it no longer possessed anything at all of importance beyond the empty title of King. The wealth and the power of the kingdom were held tight in the hands of certain leading officials of the court, who were called the Mayors of the Palace, and on them supreme authority devolved. [These were Arabs, or their frontmen.] All that was left to the King was that, content with his royal title, he should sit on the throne, with his hair long and his beard flowing, and act the part of a ruler, giving audience to the ambassadors who arrived from foreign parts and then, when their time of departure came, charging them with answers which seemed to be of his own devising but in which he had in reality been coached or even directed. Beyond this empty title King, and a precarious living wage which the Mayor of the Palace allowed him at his own discretion, the King possessed nothing at all of his own, except a single estate with an extremely small revenue, in which he had his dwelling and from which came the servants, few enough in number, who ministered to his wants and did him honor. Whenever he needed to travel, he went in a cart which was drawn in country style by yoked oxen, with a cowherd to drive them. In this fashion he would go to the palace and to the general assembly of his people, which was held each year to settle the affairs of the kingdom, and in this fashion he would return home again.

[This was how the new Emperor of Europe got around with the Arabs firmly in control of the new Rome, 225 years after the fall of the old Rome. Behold the great Caesar of Rome getting around in an oxcart. Behold what the Arabs did to Europe once before.] It was the Mayor of the Palace who took responsibility for the administration of the realm and all matters which had to be done or planned at home or abroad.

2. At the time of Childeric III's deposition, Pepin the Short, the father of Charlemagne, was already performing this duty as if by hereditary right. Charles Martel, the father of Pepin the Short, had performed the same office with great success, inheriting it in his turn from his own father, Pepin of Herstal. It was Charles Martel who had crushed the despots who were claiming dominion for themselves throughout the whole land of

the Franks. It was he, too, [this puppet monarchy] who had conquered the Saracens/ Moors, when they were striving to occupy Gaul, in two battles, one in Aquitaine, near the city of Poitiers, and other by the River Berre, near Narbonne. In this way he compelled them to withdraw into Spain.[Apparently both sides were the Arabs.]

It was customary for this title of Mayor of the Palace to be granted by the people only to those who outshone all others by family distinction an the extent of their wealth." [because they were working for the haremi clan of Arabia.]

Xenophon, Persian Expedition 1.9

[Cyrus was sent to be governor] "...the first thing he did was to make it clear that in any treaty or agreement or undertaking that he made he attached the utmost importance to keeping his word. The cities which were in his command trusted him and so did the men. And the enemies he had were confident that once Cyrus had signed a treaty with them nothing would happen to them contrary to the terms of the treaty." [Remember, Cyrus is just a disposable figurehead.

When it is convenient to break the agreement, the Brothers will simply eliminate him, as an excuse to renegotiate. In fact the Persian Emperor did this in Ammianus Marcellinus.

One of the biggest reasons why the Arabs want lone figureheads is that two people are much harder to get rid of. If they both die, then even the fools can see that it was foul play.]

From Giovanni Botero 1589, The Reason of State (II:6):

"Make no sudden changes... When Charles Martel [Charlemagne's grandfather], who had been the king's chief of staff, aspired to the crown of France, he refused to assume the title of king immediately, but first had himself called prince of the French nobility. In this way his son Pepin easily took on both the name of king and the kingdom. [Pepin III was Charlemagne's father] The Caesars began as perpetual dictators, then acquired tribunitian [head of tribe] powers, then became princes and finally emperors and then absolute rulers." [Somebody out there is clearly thinking with a multi-generational time horizon about total domination of other nations. Who could that be but the harem breeders from the ancient land of no resources?]

The menacing powers of the English Queen

Does the English monarch currently have the legal right to take over the nation any time she wishes? Can she still declare war? Can the English monarch still sentence people to death at will? Can the English monarch simply seize any property at will? Is there still a death penalty on the books for speaking out against the queen or advocating her ouster?

You know, it is a lot easier to start enforcing a long forgotten law than to pass a new one and start enforcing it. Here we imagine that one day, some "King of England" real or usurper might try to use these powers to seize control of the nation. Wouldn't it be smart to end this dangerous, and malignant institution now, while we all can with ease and with no fear of bloodshed? Can you not see how the parasite is the force lionizing, humanizing and favoring your monarchy and keeping it alive? You know, your monarchy is huge part of the Arab jihad —For it could easily be the bud of that which will eventually enslave your people under a new line of dark and hairy kings with big noses and unflinching faith is Al•A.

James I, King of England 1609

"The state of monarchy is the supremest thing upon the earth, for kings are not only God's lieutenants [al•oo•tenants] upon earth, and sit upon God's throne, but even by God himself they are called Gods...

Kings are justly called Gods, for that they exercise a manner or resemblance of divine power upon earth. For if you will consider the attributes to God, you shall see how they agree in the person of a king. God hath power to create, or destroy, make or unmake at his pleasure, to give life or send death, to judge all, and to be judged ~~ner~~ [and] accountable to none. To raise low things, and to make high things low at his pleasure [The parasite's key pleasure]... And the like power have Kings: they make and unmake their subjects: they have power of raising and casting down: of life and death: judges over all their subjects, and in all causes, and yet accountable to none but God only. They have power to exalt low things, and abase high things, and make of their subjects like men at the chess. A pawn to take bishop or a knight, and to cry up or down any of their subjects..."

Did Elizabeth salute Hitler?

Is it true that the British aristocracy was pro-Nazi. Is there is in film showing them making the German salute.

Thomas Paine, Common sense p.6:

"The prejudice of Englishmen in favor of their own government by king, lords and commons, arises as much more from national pride than reason." [Restated for America today: The prejudice of Americans in favor of their own government by lone president, Senate, and House of Representatives, is more a matter of tradition than reason.]

All monarchy must be prohibited

There are a lot of people in this world that look up to the UK to show how things should be done. Clearly your show monarchy has had some faint part in legitimizing many other monarchies and dictatorships in this world. Do you, the British people really want to do this? Are you really monarchists in the least bit? Do you really want to go back to our parasite's omnipotent, monarch figureheads and their predatory and corrupt harem brother administrations?

Is your own national tradition of monarchy so compellingly great that you want to preserve monarchy the world over? For this is what you are doing now in Britain. This is the message many people take away from the continued existence of your monarchy. For your show monarchy is in faint measure part of the excuse for continued tyranny in many places. Your monarchy is serving as a backstop in tyranny's total defeat. And for this reason, you must get rid of it. You are simply not being a good example for other less democratic nations.

You are staunchly democratic and staunchly anti-fascist, I know that you are. And I now that you now understand how your monarchy harms other nations, so you will get rid of your monarchy entirely now. You will no longer help the cause of tyranny in any way. Tyranny is always unacceptable even if its powers have been put on hold or severely curtailed. And it is time for everyone to say this in the UK and in the Netherlands and in Sweden, Japan and Thailand, and any other culture with even the tiniest little bit of monarchy infection: virulent, benign, or carrier. All monarchy must be exterminated just like smallpox.

The UK's greatest embarrassment

What an embarrassment you are to democracy — that YOU allow something as eternally malignant as a figurehead monarchy to exist in your nation. What if it rises again? What if it serves as some faint justification for monarchy to remain existent in other nations? What if it helps just one dictator-monarch rise to power. All hereditary monarchs must go. You must end this last and critical vestige of narrow government in our world.

Regarding all monarchs, kings, presidents, and oligarchs

Everyone, please help me make this so. All the figurehead monarchs and oligarchs that do not immediately resign and go eternally mute in public should be held guilty of capital democide. What constitutes immediately should be established later on, and this includes all monarchs, especially Elizabeth and hers. Shame upon you. Resign now totally and unconditionally, all of you.

Hitler a puppet monarch?

Say the name of any monarch and I will say the words 'figurehead' and 'Baro•cracy'. Say Adolph Hitler and I will add "final solution for Arabia's #1 problem, its own disloyal genetic periphery.

Real kings don't need it

Let's say that a man above men comes along, a man who entirely reorganizes and changes all human reality. What do you do? Whatever you do, do not give this man any lasting power — except with regard to his own self protection and freedom from due to his fame.

After you accept his message, listen to him as you would a once brilliant advisor, but give him no ongoing or official power. Make him an advisor only. Make him an Ubiquitous. But never allow anyone to be an all-powerful monarch, president or oligarch or dictator ever again.

What is the opposite role to all powerful king?

Is it subject or slave? I say that it is slave, and that all kings are figureheads for a parasite that strives for total enslavement of its host.

Bartolome De Las Casas

Prologue to The Destruction of the Indies, 1542

"God's wisdom has decreed that the world be divided into kingdoms, so mankind can benefit from proper rule by kings and their governments. As Homer says, these men are fathers and shepherds to their people. They are therefore, the most superior and virtuous of beings. There is no doubt, nor could there be any doubt, that these kings decide nothing except that which is morally unimpeachable. It follows therefore that if the nation suffers from some defect or evil, the reason can only be that the ruler is unaware of it.

Once the matter is brought to his notice, he will work with the maximum diligence to set matters right and will not rest content until the evil has been eliminated. This would appear to be the meaning of Solomon's words in the Bible: 'A king that sits on the throne of judgement dissolves all evil with his eyes'. For granted the innate and natural virtue of the ruler, it follows that the simple knowledge that something is wrong in his kingdom is quite sufficient to ensure that he will see that it is corrected. For he will not tolerate any such evil for a moment longer than it takes him to correct it." [According to this writer, some 3 million people were murdered by "the Spanish" in the Caribbean, under the administration of a "king",

a man who is in every way identical to chancellors like Adolph Hitler and dictators like Pol Pot.]

Nathaniel Hawthorne House of Seven Gables, Ch. 4

[Next we here the Brothers describing one of their political figureheads] "No better model need be sought, nor could have been found, of a very high order of respectability, which, by some indescribable magic, not merely expressed itself in his looks and gestures, but even governed the fashion of his garments, and rendered them all proper and essential to the man. Without appearing to differ, in any tangible way, from other people's clothes, there was yet a wide and rich gravity about them that must have been a characteristic of the weather, since it could not be defined as pertaining either to the cut or the material [He looked and sounded completely respectable]. His gold-headed cane, too --- a serviceable staff [administration], of dark polished wood [from the Brother's tree] -- had similar traits, and, had it chosen to take a walk by itself, [it] would have been recognized anywhere as a tolerably adequate representative of its master. This character -- which showed itself so strikingly in everything about him, and the effect of which we seek to convey to the reader -- went no deeper than his station, habits of life, and external circumstances [he was a brainless figurehead]. One perceived him to be a personage of marked influence and authority; and, especially, you could feel just as certain that he was opulent as if he had exhibited his bank account, or as if you had seen him touching the twigs of the Pyncheon Elm, and Midas-like, transmuting them [through al-chemy] to gold."

Christopher Marlowe, Edward the Second c.1592, 5.4.46

"The prince I rule, the queen do I command
And with a lowly conge to the ground
[conge = an unceremonious dismissal or rejection of someone]
The proudest lords salute me as I pass;
I seal, I cancel [veto], I do what I will.
Feared am I more than loved: Let me be feared
And, when I frown, I make all the court look pale.
I view the prince with Arist·archus' eyes
[Aristo = best/Arab + archus=ruler]
Whose looks were as a breeching to a boy.
[like breach-loading rifles, and breached walls]
They thrust upon me the protectorship
[The person in charge when the king was absent, incapacitated or busy]
And sue to [formally appeal] me for what I desire
While at the council-table, grave enough
And not unlike a bashful puritan
First I complain of imbecility
Saying it is onus quam gravissimum; [a most heavy burden].
Till, being interrupted by my friends [brothers]
Suscepi that provinciam, as they term it;
[I accept the province, as they call it. Pro·vince = from·victory.]
And, to conclude, I am Protector now.
Now is all sure: The queen and Mortimer
Shall rule the realm, the king; and none rule us.
My enemies I will plague, my friends advance;
And what I list command who dare control?
Major sum quam cui possit fortuna nocere."

The greatest weakness of monarchy

One of the greatest strengths of broad democracy stems from how there is less reliance on leaders, and how monarchies and oligarchies are many thousands of times more vulnerable to assassination than broad democracies. Thus we recognize that

our democracy will prevail in a war of leadership assassination, and with much less carnage than in military war. Thus assassination is one of the easiest and most direct ways to end tyranny and war.

Get the tip first

Eliminate all the monarchies and presidencies in this world. This is a top priority. Make people afraid to be an Arab frontman so nobody will dare to do it. And this should include all the king's/president's appointee bar·ocracy, his top advisors and top administrators. Once you have made progress here, get rid of the top people in every money-grubbing religion. Go for the cardinals and bishops and other religious super "holy" men. Eliminating the parasite's leadership is a huge part of eliminating the parasite.

Montesquieu

The Persian Letters were published in 1721 (originally anonymously) and the Spirit of Laws in 1748. Montesquieu is said to have had a strong influence on the US constitution. Perhaps this was as a bad example.

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, 127

"If a king does some bad deed, it is almost always at someone else's instigation, so that the ambition of princes is never as dangerous as the ignoble souls of their advisors. A prince has emotions, and the minister inflames them. That is the principle which controls his policies. That is his only purpose, and he as no wish to know of any other. Courtiers seduce the king by flattery, the ministers flatter him in a more dangerous manner, by the advice he gives, the plans he suggests, and the precepts he puts forward."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, 104

"Not all the nations of Europe are equally submissive to their rulers. The English, for example, with their uncontrollable disposition, hardly give their king enough time to assert his authority. Meekness and compliance are the virtues on which they pride themselves least. They say the most extraordinary things on the subject. ...

But if a ruler, doesn't keep his subjects happy, [but instead] wants to tyrannize or destroy them, the basis of obedience is lost, and nothing then unites them. Nothing connects them to him; and they go back to their natural liberty. They maintain that unlimited authority can never be legitimate, because it can never have had a legitimate origin. For, they say, we cannot give someone else greater power over us than we have ourselves. We do not have limitless power over ourselves—for instance, we may not take our own lives; therefore, they conclude that nobody else has such a power."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, 139

"Here is a wonderful example of matrimonial love, and not in a mere ordinary woman, but in a queen. The Queen of Sweden wanted to bestow the crown on her husband the prince regardless of the cost. In order to eliminate every difficulty, she sent the States General [the legislature] a declaration saying that she would renounce the regency if he was elected.

Sixty years ago, another queen named Christina, abdicated in order to devote herself entirely to philosophy. I do not know which of these two examples is more remarkable.

I like a man to stay firmly where he has been placed by nature. [The Brothers are behind the caste system after all.] And I cannot approve of the weakness of those who find themselves inferior to their position and abandon it, which is a

kind of desertion. I am nevertheless impressed by the greatness of soul shown by these two queens: [Namely] that the mind of the one, and the emotions of the other, are superior to their destiny. Christina concentrated on knowledge at a time when others only wanted enjoyment, and the other wanted to enjoy the crown only so as to place her whole happiness in the hands of her illustrious husband."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, 107

"They say that it is impossible to tell the character of western kings until they have been subjected to two great ordeals, their mistress and their confessor. It will not be long before we see both of them hard at work to seize control of the king's mind. It will be a mighty struggle. For under a young prince, these two powers are always rivals, though they are reconciled and join forces under and old one.

Under a young prince, the dervish [monk, Brother] has a hard time maintaining his position; the king's strength [sexual appetite] is his weakness, while his adversary's triumphs come from his strength and his weakness as well.

When I arrived in France, I found the late king completely ruled by women, although at his age, I think he needed them less than any other king on earth. One day I heard a woman saying: 'Something must be done for this young colonel, I know what he is capable of. I will speak to the minister about it.' Another said: 'It is surprising that this young cleric should have been forgotten. He must be given a diocese. He is a man of good birth, and I can vouch for his morals.' However, you shouldn't imagine that the women who made these remarks were favorites of the prince. They might not have spoken to him more than twice in their lives, though that is easy enough with European princes.

[Perhaps the Brothers found some pretty girls to get what they want. The first time they spoke, the prince would say something like, 'You are the most beautiful woman here. I would like to talk to you in private. Meet me at the ____ room when ____ ends.' The second time they spoke, the prince, wanted to return the favor the pretty young lady gave him. He might have said something like, 'Is there anything I can do for you?' The reply might have been something like, 'well, there is my friend who wants to be a _____.'] And the Brothers would have found a girl who was just the Prince's type, and offered her a good chunk of money if she got what they wanted. ...and if she ever 'spoke a word, they would probably all die in the dungeons'.]

The thing is that for every man who has any post at court, in Paris, or in the country, there is a woman [Brother] through whose hands pass all the favors and sometimes the injustices that he does. These women are all in touch with one another, and compose a sort of commonwealth whose members are always busy giving each other mutual help and support. It is like another state within the state, and a man who watches the actions of ministers, officials and prelates [bishops] at court, in Paris, or in the country, without knowing the women, who rule them, is like a man who can see a machine in action but does not know what makes it work.

Would you say Ibben [ibn., like ibn Saud], that a woman sets out to become mistress of a minister in order to sleep with him? — what an idea! [the opposite is true, she sleeps with him to become his powerful mistress.] It is so as to present half a dozen requests to him every morning; and the natural goodness of women is shown by their eagerness to do good deeds for countless unhappy men who provide them with ten thousand pounds a year. [the women are very well paid prostitutes.] In Persia, we complain that the kingdom is

governed by two or three women [Brothers]. It is much worse in France, where women in general govern, not only taking over the authority wholesale, but even dividing it up piecemeal among themselves." 1717

Xenophon, Persian Expedition 1.9

"All the children of Persian nobles are brought up at the Court, and there a child can pick up many lessons in good behavior while having no chance of seeing or hearing anything bad.

[Rubbish, the reality is actually more like the street urchin's life from the Prince of Persia movie.] The boys see and hear some people being honoured by the King and others being dismissed in disgrace, and so from there childhood they learn how to command and how to obey. Here, at the Court, Cyrus was considered, first, to be the best-behaved of his contemporaries and the more willing even than his inferiors to listen to those older than himself; and then he was remarkable for his fondness for horses and being able to manage them extremely well. In the soldierly arts also of archery and javelin-throwing they judged him to be most eager to learn and most willing to practice them. When he got to the age for hunting, he was most enthusiastic about it, and only too ready to take risks in his encounters with wild animals." [Again, more rubbish. A Brotherly education mostly consists of reading these gazettes and learning to interpret them. The best of them come up with brand new, unheard-of interpretations and responses. Through these gazettes, they live the lives of many who have gone before them and the ones who can keep the most experiences straight become a sarafa (exalted) Sharif, a son of Sarah that gets to join his other Sharif Brothers on a Safari, bringing home the meat. The underlined is all Arab propaganda about what to encourage in Rumi leaders, it is the same force that has us wasting more than 1/6 of our school time, and more than 1/6 of our education budget on the oxymoron of physical education.]

Laws of Manu, 7.20

[According to the Apple dictionary, Manu was the archetypal first man of Hindu mythology, survivor of the great flood and father of the human race.

In the following ancient text, we see how the right to punish universally is the supreme right that the parasite seeks to have. For with the right to punish, the parasite can stop any economic activity that competes with its Mafia rackets.]

"If a king does not tirelessly dispense punishment [justice] on those who should be punished, the stronger will roast the weaker like fish on a spit. The crow would eat the sacrificial cakes and the dog would lick the oblation. There would be no ownership, and (everything) would be upside down [the parasite's inverted agenda would stop working]. The whole world is mastered [for Mideast inc.] by punishment, for a pure man is hard to find. Through fear or punishment, everything that moves [between people, i.e. all commerce] allows itself to be used. The gods [religion], the titans [companies], centaurs [sexual mores], ogres [criminals], birds [smart, big picture people] and even the snakes [cheaters] allow themselves to be used [by Mideast Inc.], but only when under threat of punishment. All classes [castes] would be corrupted [and un-sellable], and all [trade] barriers [walls] broken [this would result in a price collapse for the Mideast], all people would erupt in fury [at our Arab frontmen] as a result of a serious error in punishment.

Where the [punishment] Rod moves around, black [evil] with red eyes [blood to be seen], destroying evil, the subjects do not get confused [and disobedient], as long as the

[frontman] inflicter sees well. They say that [frontman] kings make a (proper) dispenser of punishment when he speaks the truth, acts after due consideration, is wise and is considers religion, profit and pleasure. [Translation: make sure your frontman does not appear to lie, or act without due consideration, or act foolishly. He must also consider religious norms, economic reality and finally the pursuit of happiness.] A king who inflicts punishment correctly thrives on the triple path, but if he is lustful, partial, and mean, he is destroyed by that very punishment. [Translation: The frontman king must never have a harem, he must not favor his friends too obviously, and he must not be a sadist — at least until the political intimidation as public spectacle stage is reached in the society.]

Punishment has a great brilliant [glorious] energy, but for those who are undisciplined, it is hard to hold on to. When a king swerves from justice, he [first] strikes men down, [then men] together with their families, and then their community, [then] their territory, and then the whole world, with all that moves and does not move [killing everything and scorching the earth]. He even oppresses the gods [stealing from their rich temples] and hermits [the dead] who have gone to the atmosphere [gone to heaven — by plundering their grave goods]

(Punishment) cannot be inflicted according to the right standards by anyone without assistants, by a fool [an obvious fool], by anyone who is greedy, or whose mind is undisciplined or who is attached to sensory pleasures. Punishment can [only] be inflicted properly [and over the long term] by someone who has good assistants [2nd mention of assistants for the frontman], who is wise and unpolluted, who keeps his promises and who acts in accordance with [established] teachings. [Translation: you have to follow the rules of the matrix]

He should uphold the right standards in his own realms and inflict severe punishment among his enemies, without bias towards his close friends and with patience towards [the brotherly] priests. If a king behaves like this, even though he makes his living by gleaning and gathering, his fame spreads throughout the world like a drop of oil on water. But the fame of a king who is the opposite of this, who has not conquered himself, congeals in the world like a drop of clarified butter in water. The king was created as the protector of the classes and the stages of life, that are appointed each to its own particular duty, in proper order.

I will [now] explain... the various things he and his retainers [staffers, administration] must do to protect his subjects."

The [frontman] king should rise early in the morning, attend respectfully to the learned [Arab] priests who have grown old in the study of triple learning, and abide by their advice. He should always serve the pure old [Brotherly] priests who know the Veda, for a man who serves old people is always revered, even by ogres. He should study humility [vinaya=good manners and discipline], from them even if he is always humble. For the king who is humble is never destroyed. Many kings have been destroyed, together with their [brotherly] entourages, [4th mention of the Arab administration] thought lack of humility — while even forest dwellers [barbarians] have won kingdoms through humility."

Penguin, Divine Right and Democracy, introduction

"If Parliament was weak, so was the civil service. Royal government still betrayed its origin as a system for the administration of the king's own household affairs. Offices in the royal administration were customarily bought and sold, being regarded as franchises for the extraction of fees from the

public. The government was too poor to pay proper salaries to its own officials: James I's annual ordinary revenue at the beginning of his reign was around £400,000, or less than 2 shillings per head of population, at a time when a laborer might expect to earn £9 per year. The state was obviously absorbing only a tiny portion of national income, and this was because the vast bulk of its revenue came not from taxes, but from customs dues, the income on royal estates, and feudal dues such as wardship and purveyance [the kings right to buy below market]. Charles I managed to raise royal income to £900,000 p.a. by the late 1630s. He did so not only by maximizing his income from feudal dues, and by raising customs dues... but also by pioneering a regular national tax, ship money — whose legality was upheld by the courts in 1637 — despite the fact that most Englishmen continued to believe that direct taxation should be levied only in emergencies, and never without parliamentary approval. Even so, his income was now only marginally better, in real terms, than the Crown's income in 1510: and in the meantime, the population of the nation had doubled.'

A government with so small a revenue [FENGLISH=foreigner English] could do little. Local administration was almost entirely in the hands of unpaid amateur officials, the justices of the peace. What influence Parliament did have derived in large part from the fact that members of the House of Commons were often also justices of the peace, and the king could not afford indefinitely to ignore the views of his own volunteer bureaucracy, particularly as he had only a limited capacity to compel obedience. He had no professional army to call upon, only a local militia organized by the same local gentry who became justices of the peace and Members of Parliament. Just as there was no army, there was scarcely a police force: constables were part-time officials elected by their parishes. It was to parish too, not the nation, which was increasingly taking on the task of relieving the poor and of ministering to those too old or sick to work. To most Englishmen and women, central [national] government must have seemed distant and irrelevant: they were more immediately aware of the manor court, which concerned itself with their rents and property transactions; the parish, which raised taxed to pay for poor relief; and the county, which organized the militia and provided the courts at which malefactors were brought to justice. All this might happen within the framework of the king's law, but the king and his government played little direct part in it.

If the early 17th century state was highly decentralized and underfunded, the result was not that citizens had more rights and freedoms. In criminal cases, trials were rarely allowed to run for more than a day. The accused had no automatic right to legal counsel: Sir John Davies thought the law could take pride in the fact that no lawyer would ever be called on to defend a rapist. He had no right to know the charge before the trial, and thus limited opportunity to organize a defense. Witnesses called on his behalf did not take the oath and their testimony was given less weight than that of witnesses for the prosecution. Punishments were normally corporal (only debtors were regularly imprisoned for long periods of time, and that at their own expense), and often capital: theft over 2 shillings was in principal punishable by death, although juries were often reluctant to convict... Nevertheless, there were 70 executions a year in London between 1607 and 1616, out of a population of some quarter of a million. There were no opportunities to appeal.

It would be possible to compile a long list of rights which we take for granted that were denied to people in the

early 17th century, rights, some of them, as important as the right to a fair trial. Traveling in search of work, for example, was illegal: vagabonds were to be whipped and sent back to their parish of origin, and lodgers could not be taken in without a license. Wages were fixed by law: Sir Edward Coke, as Attorney-General, upheld the view that combinations to obtain higher wages were treasonous. The same man, famous for his defenses of the liberties of Englishmen, employed a battering-ram to break down his daughter's door in order to take [drag] her to church to marry a man who was repugnant to her. Nor was there freedom to buy and sell: quite apart from government-granted monopolies in the production of goods like window glass and soap, monopolies whose legality was disputed, selling could take place only under carefully controlled conditions. Guilds exercised a monopoly control [foreigner English] over many trades. Grain was supposed to be brought to market and sold retail: forestalling (selling before market), engrossing (hoarding) and regrating (wholesaling) were all illegal. It need not surprise us that even the clothes one wore were in principle controlled by law: only Knights of the Garter could wear crimson [purple], for example. The law touched even the dead: from 1622, they were required to be dressed for burial in woolen cloth. Finally, attendance at church was, of course compulsory.

Nevertheless, the English were convinced they had rights, and important ones at that. When Sir Walter Raleigh contrasted the absolute monarchies of France and England with the tyranny of the Turks, he took it for granted that the English had 'fundamental laws, privileges and ancient rights': above all, the rights to have legislation and taxation approved by Parliament and to be tried by the common law and not imprisoned with out charge. In England suspected criminals could feel secure in the knowledge that they would not be tortured unless they were under investigation for crimes against the state; on the Continent, Roman legal traditions [under the code of Justinian] required the routine use of torture to establish the truth.

Aside from these rights, however, it was accepted that the king could lay claim to free hand [had a free hand with respect to]: the choice of councillors [advisors, secretaries], the command of the army [commander in chief], the marriages of the king and his family, foreign policy, coinage, and the pardoning of criminals were areas where royal prerogative was agreed to be unchecked. (Attempts to add religion to this list were bitterly disputed).

Yet in the early 17th century, the privileges of the English were coming to seem increasingly uncertain and the prerogatives of government increasingly burdensome. Royal proclamations threatened to supplant the statute law approved by Parliament."

Penguin, Divine Right and Democracy, introduction

"Second after the Bible in dominating men's thinking on political questions was the imagery of the Great Chain of Being. According to this theory, the universe consisted of a series of hierarchies. In heaven, there was God and below him a descending series of angelic beings. In the skies there was the sun, and below it a descending series of planets. In the animal kingdom, the king of the beasts, the lion, stood atop a descending series of beasts. In the political order, the king ruled over a descending series of authorities reaching down to village constables and churchwardens. In the microcosm of man's body, the head ruled over the hierarchy of organs. Everywhere, order was associated with hierarchy, and each ordered system was comparable so that a network of

correspondences could be drawn, establishing a more than metaphorical link between God, the sun, the king, the head, and the lion. ...

The conceptual framework of the Great Chain of Being was an ambiguous one. It gave the king and unquestioned position of superiority, but at the same time, it confirmed him within a framework which he must not seek to undermine and implied that his authority was limited by the obligation to preserve harmony. [according to ideology of the time] The sun might be the most important body in the heavens, but the planets all exercised an independent influence over men's lives. The head might be the organ of command in the body, but its power was sharply limited by the humors, which had to be maintained in a healthy balance, or reason would be swept away by passion."

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 22.1

[Julian was Roman emperor 360-363AD]

"While the wheel of fortune was bringing about events in another part of the world, [emperor] Julian, among his many-fold activities in Illyricum [Yugoslavia], busied himself with the inspection of the entrails of sacrifices and with observation of the flight of birds. He was eager to discover how things would end, but the answers were ambiguous and obscure and left him in doubt about the future. At last the Gallic orator Aprunculus [ab•our•uncles], a master of this branch of divination, who was later promoted to the government of Gaul Narbonense, announced that he had discovered what was to come by the inspection of a liver, which he had found covered with a double layer of skin..." [Not only was this emperor afraid to go out and detached from the real goings on of the empire—but he was busied doing inconsequential things. One of these inconsequential things was acting as top bridge (Pontiff Maximus) with the gods—something that was little doubt quite time consuming.

Thus the Arabs try to keep their kings/dictators/emperors/presidents double insulated from the place they rule over. On one hand they should live in a filter-bubble and never leave the 'forbidden city' to talk with their people. On the other hand they should be distracted doing inconsequential things like appeasing the gods, participating in ceremonies of state, going to parties (bar•ti), having sex, hunting, playing games, etc. In Rome, after the charm of these distractions wore off, that was when the emperor would get whacked.]

Christopher Marlowe, Edward the Second c. 1592, 1.1.51

"These are not men for me.

I must have wanton poets, pleasant wits

[lively storytellers, entertaining wits]

Musicians, that with touching of a string

May draw the pliant king which way I please:

Music and poetry is his [the King's] delight;

Therefore I'll have Italian masks by night

Sweet speeches, comedies, and pleasing shows;

And in the day, when he shall walk outside

Like sylvan nymphs, my pages shall be clad

[Nymphs were scantily clad beauties employed by the Arabs to seduce, lure, and distract victims. Sylvan=forest. Page is from Gr. Paid=boy. Pages were boys/girls that attended to the needs of people of 'rank'. A page was a Peh•G's who would do whatever their G-man masters told them to do.]

My people, like satyrs grazing on the lawns

[Satyrs were famous for their in•sat•iable lust.]

Shall with their goat-feet dance an antic hay"

[Much dancing, antics and rolls in the hay. All of this was very

distracting to the one man that was supposed to be ruling the nation.]

T.E. Lawrence, Seven Pillars of Wisdom, Ch. 9

[of Sherif Ali] "His manner was dignified and admirable, but direct; and he struck me as a pleasant gentleman, conscientious, without great force of character, nervous, and rather tired. His physical weakness (he was consumptive) [he had Tuberculosis] made him subject to quick fits of shaking passion, followed by long moods of infirm obstinacy. He was bookish, learned in law and religion, and pious almost to fanaticism. He was too conscious of his high heritage to be ambitious; and his nature was too clean to see or suspect interested motives in those about him. Consequently, he was much the prey of any constant companion, and too sensitive to advice for a great leader, though his purity of intention and conduct gained him the love of those who came into direct contact with him. If Feisal should turn out to be no prophet, the revolt would make shift [make do] well enough with Ali for its head." [Here we get a sense for how much the Arabs study their host leaders. We also see the Arab focus on manipulating leaders.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

" 'Great is Mr. Morgan's power, greater in some respects even than that of President of kings', wrote a seasoned British observer a quarter of a century ago which fact, patent [obvious] to even the casual onlooker, easily passed un-contradicted.

Could this Morgan be the same who started out by successfully palming off, upon the Government during the Civil War, 5,000 of its own condemned [rejected] rifles, and at extortionate prices? Was it possible that the man who profited from arming the nation's soldiers with self-slaughtering [sabotaged] guns could be the same Morgan whose power later was 'greater than of President of kings'? Was the great, sublime patriot of subsequent times, J. Pierpont Morgan, the same Morgan who came into collision with investigating committees during the Civil War, and who was practically denounced in the severest language? Verily [truthfully], he was the same man, the identical same. Behold him in the budding of his career, and observe how he began it. And behold him in after decades, glutted with wealth and power, covered with honors, august dispenser of benevolence, the incarnate source of all wisdom, financial and otherwise, the mighty man of commerce and of the arts, the idol of capitalist ideals.

Between the Civil War transaction and his later sway, necessarily there lay a long category of deeds. Undisputedly he began his career with proofs of exceptional brilliance. Had his first business achievement—that of the condemned rifles—been judged by the standards of the 'lower classes' [of the Rumi host society], he would have been thrown into prison, or had the soldiers who had to use the guns come within his proximity, the life, peradventure [by chance], might have been shot out of him then and there. But his own class [the Arabs], far from having a remote thought to abhorrence or ostracism, admired his business skill, mettle [strength] and audacity, and regarded him as an extraordinarily promising young man. Great things were predicted for so astute a novice [novice]; yet novice was not the word. The most experienced business man could hardly have done better than did Morgan in the famous rifle sale.

Moreover, Morgan had other advantages which assured a notable future. He had a millionaire father, which was a relationship to be treble prized at a time when millionaire

progenitors were not so very numerous. [He was the "native son" of a high-ranking brotherly immigrant.] The paternal advice and guidance, based upon a protracted career in the serpentine channels of wealth getting [Gr. kitting = whaling], could unfailingly be drawn upon. Additionally, J. Pierpont Morgan had the backing of the old man's millions and prestige, and—what was more important—would some day inherit those millions. All of these factors were infallibly the prelude to a glorious career" [as an Arab frontman].

Chaplin's Law = the more kooky and idiotic looking the Arab figurehead, the more dangerous he is, viz Hitler's buffoon mustache, and Kim Arab Mole's haircut.

3—BAROCRACY AND CORRUPTION

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

"Those North American colonists who came in direct contact with London were shocked at the notorious ways in which hundreds of thousands of pounds were being spent to buy elections." [Inflation adjusted, this sounds just like the US today.]

Percy Shelley

"The unacknowledged legislator of the world"

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #88

"Influence at court is the great French god. Its high priest is the chief minister, and many are the victims that he sacrifices to it."

Thomas Jefferson, 1809.03.31

"The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

Theodore Roosevelt

"Behind the ostensible government sits enthroned an invisible government owing no allegiance and acknowledging no responsibility to the people."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #19

"The Pashas, who obtain their posts only by paying for them are ruined by the time they take up their appointments, and plunder their provinces like a conquered country. ... Impunity is the rule under this harsh government... Possession of land cannot be guaranteed, and consequently any eagerness to develop it is reduced. No title-deed or rights of possession will stand up before the capriciousness of the authorities." [If the parasite could, it would rule the entire world this way forever.]

Here is how bad the parasite infection is

It took over 20 years for the Oakland Bay bridge to re-open after the 1989 earthquake. And the new Berlin airport is many years behind schedule.

Life of Vespasian 16

"[The Vespasian administration] openly sold government positions to people. He also sold acquittals to men facing prosecution, regardless of their guilt. Some believed he even deliberately promoted the most insatiable officials to higher positions. This way they were even richer when he later imprisoned them [thus confiscating the proceeds of their corruption]. Such men were commonly called his 'sponges', as

he let them soak up money, which he later squeezed out of them." [This is how the real Arab wise guys work. Here succinctly stated is their role in corruption and organized crime.]

Aeschines, Against Timarchus 119

"every year the [Athenian] Council sells off the prostitution tax, and that those who buy the right to exact the tax do not guess, but have precise knowledge of the people who engage in this trade."

Procopius, The Secret History, c.560-570 AD. 21.6

"Everywhere in the Roman Empire Justinian followed this method. He picked out the most degraded specimens of humanity he could lay his hands on and sold them the offices they were to corrupt, charging a very high price; for no one with any decency or any vestige of good sense would ever think of pouring out his own money for the pleasure of robbing inoffensive citizens. After collecting the cash from those with whom he was negotiating, he gave them permission to do anything they like to those under them. This enabled them to ruin all the districts allotted to them, inhabitants and all, and make enough money to keep them in luxury for the rest of their lives. To find money to pay for their cities, they obtained a loan from the bank [fronting for the parasite] at a very high rate of interest, handing over the money to the seller [of this license to steal. This Arab management technique is known as BARRA•TRY and it is still used widely around the world today; especially in countries regarded as "klepto•cratic". Basically, the corrupt officials have to rob from the public to pay for the interest on the loan they took out from the Brothers to buy their office from the Brothers. Here they generally find themselves subject to a loan that necessitates their becoming not only corrupt, but aggressively corrupt.

So whenever we see absurd and bottomless greed in government people, it is usually a figurehead fronting for "big mouth," or "deep throat," or "the bottomless pit," or "the money pit" or just the endless hunger of the world's parasite empire.

It might also be worth noting the way the blame is once again placed upon the superficial reality. Note how our parasite always has a superficial scapegoat for every bad thing it does. There is always a superficial scapegoat, usually our powerful, but dimwitted, leaders. Continuing...] then when they arrived in the cities, from then on they brought every variety of misery upon their subjects, having no other object in life than to make sure that they could satisfy their creditors [Again, their creditors were the Haremi Brothers. We can easily see the same process at work in the corruption endemic in many parts of the world today. The Brotherly governors sell government jobs which amount to a license to steel whatever they can grab. Do we all want this sort of world... a world ruled by people who seek to maximize scarcity?...] and themselves be included from then on amongst the richest in the land. The business did not lay them open to any risk or criticism. It brought them on the contrary a good deal of admiration [We made corruption normal and even admirable], which became greater and greater as they succeeded in the senseless killing and despoiling of more and more of their chance victims. For to call them murderers and despoilers was to give them credit for vigor and effectiveness. But the moment Justinian noticed that any office-holder had amassed a fortune, he found some excuse for netting him and dropping him and all he possessed into his fisherman's basket." [It appears the Brothers get the fish to eat each other and then they only net out the big ones.]

Marcus Cicero, Electoral Bribery in Rome, 54BC

"There has been an shocking outbreak of bribery. Never before was there anything like it. On 15 July the rate of interest rose from 4% to 8% owing to the agreement/bargain made by Memmius and the consul Domitius. I am not exaggerating. They are offering as much as 10 million sesterces in the Consul's [president's] election. The matter is a burning scandal. The candidates for the Tribuneship have also made a mutual compact, having deposited 500,000 each with Cato, they agree to conduct their elections according to his directions, with the understanding that any one offending against it will be condemned to forfeit by him. If this election then turns out uncontaminated, Cato will have more power than all the laws and jurors put together."

What is bureaucracy/ baro•cracy?

The Apple dictionary says: "1) a system of government in which most of the important decisions are made by state officials rather than by elected representatives." and 4) "excessively complicated administrative procedure, seen as characteristic of such a system: *the unnecessary bureaucracy in local government*."

[I would suggest again that local government offers a clear picture of how screwed-up our nation's government is. I would also suggest that they forgot to mention how baro•cracies are absurdly slow and clogged with costly regulations.]

BULLA•CRACY or BAR•ACRACY

The normally maligned word BUREAUCRACY has a suspicious 'official' etymology or origin. This dead ends in the 1600s, supposedly with the French word 'BAIZE', meaning a coarse felt (fabric/matrix) that people used to cover their writing desks. So officially, BUREAUCRACY means something like rule by people with felt covered desks. A more believable and simple origin is that the word started as BAR•OCRACY, or rule by Haremi Bros or Harem sons.

The Baro•cracy is often the highest hurdle

There are numerous governments around the world that are regarded as mostly corrupt. In these nations, the baro•cracy is the high hurdle, the important barrier, the powerful part to be gotten through. The genuine government in these nations is the low hurdle, the unimportant barrier, be it a show democracy, or figurehead tyrant.

Now in America today, it is worth suggesting that the baro•cracy is also be the highest hurdle. After all, our great and wonderful democracy was recently powerless to begin offshore oil drilling when a clear majority of people were in favor of it. Also, we were powerless to stop subprime from doing a pump and dump on the world economy in the last decade.

Arrabbian is an anagram of Barbarian

The great wall of baro•cracy

For the better part of 800 years, during Roman times, our parasite's European division re-invested a small share of its revenues in funding utterly shocking acts of Barbarian/ Arrabbian terrorism. These were the provocations that got Rome to station tens of thousands of men on the Rhine and Danube rivers, thus enforcing a great trade wall at great cost to Rome. Thus it was the regulated Roman empire that kept the northern Europeans, the unregulated "barbarians", from coming down and trading and competing with the people of

Rome and the Mediterranean, interfering with the highly profitable commodity (mostly grain) cartels the parasite lived on.

Anyway, once Rome was hooked on imported Mideast Grain (which actually came from Ukraine via the Black Sea), the parasite would constantly struggle to reduce output, so that it could sell its cartelized food for famine prices. To do this, it would constantly re-introduce crop pests that could not survive the cold season. It would also foment wars, commit arson, light forest fires, and engage in all sorts of sabre•tage. This would frequently lead to tremendous waves of demand and high prices for the foodstuffs the Mideast monopolized. And of course these were all known as famines (eff'em•ins) to the host civilization that suffered through them. These desperate people would trade everything for food to eat, thus squeezing the mare while she is milked (in the words of the Herodotus BBS or gazette).

A similar thing happened with China. Think about how our parasite got China to build its Great Wall at immense cost. It is just like how our parasite got Rome to enforce a great trade wall along the Rhine and Danube rivers at immense cost. All it took was a little shocking terrorism, and then that would be made the excuse for building and manned these insane barriers to our own free markets. Thus, we prevented our parasite's competitors from interfering with its highly profitable monopolies/ cartels. This enabled our parasite to throttle supply in must-have commodities like food, energy, and hero•in, and use waves of super-expensive pricing to suck the economic life blood out of its host societies, thus leaving them poor and economically enslaved.

Today, the "song remains the same" and all the world's coastal oil fields are off limits, walled off, as precious wetland habitat. Look at the lengthy approval process for drilling oil wells. Look at the insanely high fines and insane cleanup liability. Look at the way our parasite has us drilling in the arctic, in the deep ocean, and deep underground. See, our oil and mineral resources have been hidden behind Arab walls.

Look at the war on drugs. Aren't we building and enforcing a hugely expensive wall to keep our parasite's competitors under control? The process of the Brothers working together to build a barri•our stays the same, the only thing that changes is the nature of the barrier. Anyway, it is time for people to start asking what part of our government's bureaucracy, environmental regulations, multi-million dollar court awards, labor burdens etc. are all actually just walls that exist for the benefit of our parasite.

What if bureaucracy is not inevitable?

Bureaucracy seems to be widely regarded as something that is merely annoying and somewhat naturally occurring — like say silt in an irrigation channel. But I think that most baro•cracy or barak•cracy is fatal to a host society over the long run, like clogged arteries. I also think it is intentional, unnatural and man-made. I also think it is designed to slow down the host, so the parasite has an easier time sucking more blood from its host.

Building permits are emblematic

Building permits are a good indication of how government is working overall. Why does it take many months (or even years) to get permission from the government to do something as innocuous as build a home, an office building or a factory?

Gridlock as filter and veto

If our parasite controls the legislative gridlock, then the gridlock

can be used as a selective filter for our democracy's decisions. If we try to do something our parasite does not want, and it controls the gridlock, then our parasite has a veto over our decisions.

Three choke points where gridlock can work

Three potential choke points is better than one for our gridlock loving parasite. The US currently has three choke points where our parasite's gridlock can veto any potential new law of the land: 1) the House of Representatives, 2) the Senate, and 3) the non-elected administration of our lone presidential monarch.

The Apple dictionary definition of boondoggle

["work or activity that is wasteful or pointless but gives the appearance of having value: writing off the cold fusion phenomenon as a boondoggle best buried in literature. a public project of questionable merit that typically involves political patronage and graft: they each drew \\$600,000 in the final months of the great boondoggle."](#) [1] Apparently the parasite wants us to think of cold fusion as "a boondoggle best buried in literature". Sometimes a lie tells the truth with perfect clarity once you know it is a lie. 2) Apparently boondoggles are a great way for Brothers to draw lots of money in salary.]

Bending light with private polls

Strange how "our" news media runs private polls to tell us what our nation supposedly thinks. Perhaps these polls exist to extend the realm of the democratically plausible in the eyes of the public.

Study these polls to see where our parasite has been pushing hardest against a majority public opinion. If you see a poll that says that 75% of Americans favor offshore drilling, then you can be pretty sure that someone is trying to justify a ban when nearly all Americans support more drilling.

A thin veneer of democracy

The figureheads and Harem moles may come an go, but the baro•cracy is 'immortal' in that it regenerates itself. The bari•cracy brothers get in and take over the hiring process, and then frequently, the bureau•cracy acquires a life of its own that will survive for centuries. Just look at the Roman empire.

Reader: Can you now imagine that America's great democracy is run almost entirely by an immortal bureaucracy of non-elected appointees, people largely chosen by the Baro•cracy itself? And you Catholics, can you imagine that the same thing happened many centuries ago with your church?

Under America's democratic system, we have only the thinnest veneer of democracy over our nation's massive federal bureau•cracy: We have 536 elected people directing millions of people in our government. What immense power the Brotherly baro•cracy has over us. And so long as we stay within our current narrow form of democracy, about all we can hope for is a perpetual cat and mouse game to keep Brothers from being appointed.

However, under the broad democracy I propose, where all the top positions are staffed by elected officials, there is really no place for Brotherly appointees anywhere in our government. So, under a Broad democracy there will be no bar•ocracy, and little intentionally inflicted government inefficiency.

A di•lected administration

To eliminate the possibility of a bar•ocracy forming in our government, all the top administrative positions in government

should be closed to people who have not been di-elected and served in the Main-Senate.

Sequence the administrative positions in government according to the power they wield. In the second year of this constitution, the top 1,000 positions should have to be at least co-managed by a someone who has served in the Main-Senate. In the third year, this will apply to the top 5,000 positions. In the fourth year, it will apply to the top 10,000 positions.

We might also say that once our new government gets going, no single individual may manage more than 5,000 government employees, and no group of less than 7 may manage more than 50,000 government employees. Feel free to change the numbers, but make sure there is some rule in this respect. We might also put a lifetime limit of 3 to 9 annual appointments for this type of service.

Lee Iacocca

"One of the things that government can't do is run anything. The only things our government runs are the post office and the railroads, and both of them are bankrupt."

Efficient government

Today, all governments are widely regarded as inept, corrupt, or at least less efficient than corporations. We are told that this is due to lack of profit motive, or a diseconomy of scale, or that it is "poorly understood" like the way petroleum forms. But maybe, more than anything else, our group efforts go wrong because they are being sabotaged by a parasitic baro•cracy that naturally struggles against what we naturally struggle for.

Let's replace all the "baro•crats" in our government with elected officials. And once we do that, let's take another look at what government can do well. I wouldn't be surprised if they matched the efficiency of our largest and oldest money making enterprises.

In fact, if we have any faith in patriotism, duty and the desire of men to distinguish themselves through public service, government might run even better than the average large corporation. Imagine all the tax money we could save if our governments even approached the efficiency of the average corporation. Imagine all the wonderful things society could do.

Ancient corruption and father time

Gr. *kryptos* = secret, hidden, or perhaps covered up in our group efforts. The final vowel and consonant in this word (like much of ancient Greek) is silent. This word is pronounced exactly the same in ancient Greek as in English — *core•upt* — The core being the center of the earth, the navel of shipping, the freighter fraternity, the bro•thur•ali bro•cracy

Anyway, our parasite's baro•cracy is running its arch enemies America and Europe into the ground right now. And it is doing this not only on purpose, but according to a plan and little doubt a loose timetable. Here the Father Time of myth is the one speeding up and slowing down the timetable. I mean, what else could father time reasonably be about?

Intersect the meanings of APPROPRIATE and APPROPRIATIONS to see the parasite

- 1) Devote money for a specific purpose.
- 2) Take for one's own use, from L. *ad•propriare* = towards•making one's own.
- 3) Suitable or proper for the circumstances, so you won't get caught.

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"**Commonwealth**, n. An administrative entity operated by an incalculable multitude of political parasites, logically active but fortuitously efficient. ...[the poem below follows]

...

This commonwealth's capitol's corridors view,
So thronged with a hungry and indolent [lazy] crew
Of clerks, pages, porters and all attaches
Whom rascals appoint and the populace pays

That a cat cannot slip between the the thicket of shins
[The Brothers call Ashkenazi (ex•kin•usi) jews like me as cats.
And a shin is a sh•in, someone not 'in it'.]

Nor hear its own shriek for [over] the noise of their [wagging] chins.

On clerks and on [congressional] pages, and porters, and all,
Misfortune attend and disaster befall!

May life be to them a succession of hurts;

[Give them the disease and sell them the cure. More than anyone else in our society, our leaders have to have problems, big problems, so they desperately and constantly need money or favors from our parasite. This is a primary way the parasite corrupts the government, group effort and mind of the host society.]

May fleas by the bushel inhabit their shirts;
May aches and diseases encamp in their bones,
Their lungs full of tubercles, bladders of stones;
May microbes, bacilli, their tissues infest,
And tapeworms securely their bowels digest;
May corn-cobs by snared without hope in their hair,
And frequent impalement their pleasure impair.
Disturbed be their dreams by the awful discourse
Of audible sofas sepulchraly hoarse,
By chairs acrobatic and wavering floors—
The mattress that kicks and the pillow that snores!
Sons of cupidity [greed], cradled in sin!
Your criminal ranks may the death angel thin,
Avenging the friend whom I couldn't work in."

Laws of Manu, 7.54

[According to the Apple dictionary, Manu was the archetypal first man of Hindu mythology, survivor of the great flood and father of the human race.]

"He [the king] should appoint 7 or 8 [Arab moles as] advisers, hereditary advisers, men who know the teachings, who are brave and have distinguished themselves, who are well born and well tested.

There are many things that are hard for one man to do alone. It is much harder (for a king to rule) if he has no assistants, especially in a highly productive kingdom. He [the king] should constantly meet with these men [appointees] to consider the [kingdom's] condition, its wealth, its protection, its wars and its peace treaties, along with the consolidation of its gains [war conquests]. He should listen to their opinions both individually, and as a group [like a House of Lords]. Then he should make his decision for himself.

The king should allow himself to be advised about the most important concerns of the six-fold policy by an intelligent priest who is the most distinguished of them all. He [the king] should always be confident in him [the top Arab advisor mole] and entrust all his affairs in him. And when he [the king] has made his decision with him [the top Arab mole], he [the king] should then begin his action. He [the king] should also appoint other ministers, unpolluted [not scandalized by the Arab media], wise [a graduate of the top college Bar•bard], firm, who collect taxes fairly [The helpers collect the taxes and everyone

suffers equally] and have been well tested. He should appoint as many tireless skillful, clever men as are needed to accomplish the work to be done. In financial matters he should employ those who are skillful, well-born, and brave [not afraid of the people they are oppressing]. In mines and manufacturing, he should employ those who are unpolluted. In the palace interior, those who are timid and meek.

He [the king's administration] should appoint as an ambassador, a man who is well versed in all the teachings, who understands involuntary movements [body language, poker tells], facial expressions, and gestures, and who is unpolluted, skillful, and well-born. The man should be well liked, unpolluted [4th mention] and skillful. He should have a good memory and have a sense for (the proper) time and place. He should be good-looking, fearless, and eloquent, to be recommended as the king's ambassador.

The kingdom and treasury depend on the king. The military and disciplinary [purging] activity on the army depend on the minister (of defense). The peace and its opposite [war] depend on the ambassador. For it is the ambassador who unites and who divides those who are united. The ambassador does the deeds by which men are divided. Through secret involuntary movements and gestures, (the ambassador) should learn the facial expressions, involuntary movements, and gestures (of the other king concerned) in his affairs, and (he should learn) among his servants what he intends to do. And when he has found out accurately all that the other king intends to do, he should take pains to prevent any harm to himself." [All they had to day was "I heard from at least 3 different sources that they are planning to attack our nation. I could even tell from the king's body language that he was lying when he denied it. We must attack them first." Thus the Arabs were able to induce a highly profitable war for the host society.]

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #138

"Ministers here replace and cancel each other out like the seasons. In my three years, I have seen financial policy change four times. In Persia and Turkey taxes are raised by the same methods today as when these kingdoms were founded, which is far from being the case here. It is true that we are not as clever as the Westerners are. We believe that the difference between administering the incomes of a king and of a private individual is no more than the difference between counting 100,000 dinars and counting 100.

But here, things are a great deal more esoteric and expert. Great geniuses must work night and day, incessantly bringing forth new projects. This involves the great labor of listening to the opinions of an infinite number of people who do their work for them without being asked. These [great geniuses] retire to live in the depths of an office which is inaccessible to the aristocracy and sacred to [untouchable by?] the common people. These [great geniuses] always have to have their heads full of important secrets, miraculous schemes, and novel policies. [So they are often so] deep in thought that they lack not only the use of speech, but sometimes even good manners. [This is the second part of the Persian Letters that makes it seem as if there were Brothers that were unable to communicate very well working in the royal administration of France. This was published in 1721, some 68 years before the French Revolution.]

As soon as the late king's eyes were closed, thought was given to setting up a new form of administration. Things were felt to be bad, but nobody knew how to make them better. The unlimited authority of previous ministers had produced bad results. An effort was made to divide it up [the power]. To this

end, six or seven councils were created, and of all governments they were perhaps the one which has ruled France with the most sense; [even if] their duration was short, like the benefits they produced." [Here we are told that people knew that the unlimited authority of the un-elected ministers was a bad idea. They also knew that they wanted to have large councils to divide up the power. They also knew that this approach made the most sense. They even implemented this approach for a short time. They failed however to maintain resolve against the irresistible force that is the land of no resources and its desperate need to eat. Indeed few would have even suspected that the Mideast was propping up the monarchy of France to eternally parasitize their nation's economy through a variety of schemes and scams.

Anyway, once the councils had formed, the parasite threw all national resources into stopping them. All the Brothers started pulling strings. Some of them opposed the councils, while most struggled to infiltrate the councils and make them ineffective.

The most important thing was to make it look like nobody knew for sure how to make the government work better. This idea is very important to the parasite's strength and must always be resisted when it comes up. If we don't know what direction to go in, the parasite can frequently come in and steer our herd any way it wants within reason of for some vague reason like greenhouse gasses.]

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #107

"They say that it is impossible to tell the character of western kings until they have been subjected to two great ordeals, their mistress and their confessor. It will not be long before we see both of them hard at work to seize control of the king's mind. It will be a mighty struggle. For under a young prince, these two powers are always rivals, though they are reconciled and join forces under and old one.

Under a young prince [king], the dervish [an Arab monk, a Brotherly slave] has a hard time maintaining his position. The king's strength [sexual appetite] is his weakness, while his adversary's triumphs come from his strength and his weakness as well.

When I arrived in France, I found the late king completely ruled by women, although at his age, I think he needed them less than any other king on earth. One day I heard a woman saying: 'Something must be done for this young colonel, I know what he is capable of. I will speak to the minister about it.' Another said: 'It is surprising that this young cleric should have been forgotten. He must be given a diocese. He is a man of good birth, and I can vouch for his morals.' However, you shouldn't imagine that the women who made these remarks were favorites of the prince. They might not have spoken to him more than twice in their lives, though that is easy enough with European princes.

[Perhaps the Brothers found some pretty girls as ringers. The first time they spoke, the prince would say something like, 'You are the most beautiful woman here. I would like to talk to you in private. Come to my room when after the _____.'] The second time they spoke, the infinitely rich prince/king, probably did what was expected of a gentleman who has a dalliance with women, below his station, a woman he could never marry. But these women were all 'ladies' that the king had sex with, so the king could not give them money or he would be treating them as prostitutes. So the king instead did them a favor. The Brothers probably set all the girls up and offered them a good chunk of money to have sex with the prince. The story was something like they were scheming to get their cousin (see the

family resemblance?) into office and if she ever 'spoke a word, they will probably all die in the dungeons'.]

[Here and elsewhere, women/girls=brothers] The thing is that for every man who has any post at court, in Paris, or in the country, there is a woman [Brother] through whose hands pass all the favors and sometimes the injustices that he does. These women are all in touch with one another, and compose a sort of commonwealth whose members are always busy giving each other mutual help and support. It is like another state within the state, and a man who watches the actions of ministers, officials and prelates [bishops] at court, in Paris, or in the country, without knowing the women who rule them, is like a man who can see a machine in action but does not know what makes it work.

Would you say Ibben [ibn.,like ibn Saud], that a women sets out to become mistress of a minister in order to sleep with him? — what an idea! It is so as to present half a dozen requests to him every morning; and the natural goodness of women is shown by their eagerness to do good deeds for countless unhappy men who provide them with ten thousand pounds a year. In Persia, we complain that the kingdom is governed by two or three women [Brothers]. It is much worse in France, where women in general govern, not only taking over the authority wholesale, but even dividing it up piecemeal among themselves."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #124

"What motive can there be for the immense generosity which kings display towards their courtiers [and courtesans]? Do they want to win their allegiance? They are already as devoted as they can be. And besides, if they buy the devotion of a few of their subjects, by the very same act, they are losing a huge number of others that they make poor. When I think of the position that sovereigns are in, continually surrounded by greedy and insatiable men, I can do nothing but pity them. And I pity them even more when they lack the strength to resist requests, which are always a burden to those who are not asking for anything.

Whenever I hear about their generosity or about favors and pensions granted to them, I cannot help indulging in lengthy reflections. Ideas come crowding into my mind, and I imagine myself hearing a decree proclaimed:

Our royal magnificence having been harassed without respite by certain of our subjects asking us, with untiring courage, for pensions, we have finally yielded to the many requests which they have presented and to which the Crown had always given its most careful attention. They have asked us to consider that they have never failed, since our accession to the throne, to be present when we are getting up. That we have always been able to observe them as we passed, as motionless as milestones. And that they have climbed as high as they could, on the tallest shoulders, so as to see our Serene Majesty. ... Therefore, wishing to treat all our suppliants generously, and grant all their please, we have decreed as follows: 'That every peasant farmer having five children is to reduce their daily allowance of bread by 1/5. Heads of households are urged to be as precise as possible in reducing each child's share.

It is expressly forbidden to anyone who is occupied in cultivating land which he has inherited, or who has leased it for farming, to make any repairs of whatever sort.

It is decreed that all persons engaged in low menial employment, who have never been present while our Majesty gets up, shall from now on, stop buying clothes for themselves, their wives, and their children, more than once every four

years. Besides which they are mostly strictly forbidden the little celebrations which they have been accustomed to have in their homes on the big annual holidays.

And insofar as we are advised that the majority of the citizens of our loyal towns devote themselves entirely to making provision for the dowries of their daughters, who have distinguished themselves in the eyes of the State solely by their dull and tiresome propriety, they are commanded to defer their marriages until, having reached the age prescribed by law, marriages become compulsory. And also, our officers are forbidden to provide for the education of their children."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #140

"The Parliament of Paris has just been banished to a little town called Pontoise. The Council sent it, for registration or approval, a declaration which dishonors it, and it registered this declaration in a manner which dishonors the Council. [what was actually said here?] Some other Parliaments in the kingdom are threatened with similar treatment

These institutions invariably meet with odium. [widespread hatred thanks to the propaganda odes and Mecca•nations of the parasite.] They come into the presence of their king only in order to convey the unhappy truths to him, and while a crowd of courtiers are continually making out how happy his people are under his government, the Parliaments come and contradict the flatterers, bringing to the foot of the throne the tears and lamentations with which they have been charged.

The truth, my dear Usbek, is a heavy load to bring to monarchs! They must surely realize that those who decide to do such a thing are compelled to. And that they would never take it upon themselves to carry out an action which is so unwelcome and distressing for those who do it, if they were not forced by their duty, their respect, and indeed their love."

4— CHECKS AND BALANCES

Patrick Henry, 1788.06.05

"There will be no checks, no real balances, in this Government: What can avail [be of value to] your specious imaginary balances, your rope-dancing, chain rattling, ridiculous ideal checks and contrivances?"

[specious = superficially plausible, but actually wrong]

Melancton Smith, 1788.06.27

"The constitution appears to be a restraint, when in fact it is none at all. I presume, sir, there is not a government in the world in which there is greater scope for influence and corruption in the disposal of offices. Sir, I will not declaim, and say all men are dishonest; but I think that, in forming a constitution, if we presume this, we shall be on the safest side. The [this] extreme is certainly less dangerous than the other. It is wise to multiply checks to a greater degree than the present state of things requires." [declaim = speak in a rhetorical or impassioned style]

Polybius, d. 118BC, History 6.18

"Whenever any one of the three groups becomes self-important, and shows a tendency to be contentious and excessively encroaching, the mutual interdependence of the three, and the possibility that the resolutions of any one will be checked and balanced by the others, will easily check this tendency. And so the proper equilibrium is maintained when the impulsiveness of one part [of government] is checked by its

fear of the others..." [Thus native rule is checked and Arabian imperial power is more easily maintained]

Tullius Cicero/ Julius Caesar, De Republica 31

"I mean Governments where the people vote, elect legislators and administrators [law makers, a legislative branch], are polled for their votes, and have bills proposed to them. But these only really grant what they have to grant, even if they are unwilling to do so — and are asked to grant to others what they do not possess themselves. For they have no share in the governing [executive] power, or in the deliberations of the courts [the judicial] — Over which appointed decision-makers preside, whose privileges were granted on the basis of birth or wealth."

Thomas Paine, Common sense p.4

"To say that the constitution of England is a union of three powers reciprocally checking each other is farcical." [Apparently our parasite was using the checks and balances concept to describe the Britain's constitutional monarchy prior to the American Revolution. The concept was recycled and reused for America's lone presidency, a better disguised form of monarchy.]

How American style checks and balances really works

The will of 400 1-in-580,000 lawmakers is checked by the will of 100 1-in-2.5-million. Then that is triple checked by the unelected administration of our 4-year monarchs.

Washington D.C.

A jar of broad oligarchy, and periodic monarchy labeled as democracy

Democracy is already too slow

Simply getting a few thousand people to agree on something is a slow process. Do we really need to slow it down any further?

Bartolomeo Scala, d. 1497, Dialogue on Laws and Judgements

"I think we [in Florence] lost our reputation as sound judges the moment when formulas of civil-law litigation began to creep in... I always find it very upsetting that once passed, laws cannot be changed by so much as a syllable, for whatever reason or cause, however good or equitable. Thus we see so many things happening every day that one might rightly require less restricted powers, and greater freedom of judgement. For it is scarcely possible in nature that a legislator can mentally comprehend every single type of thing that can come under one law. If the law has faults, time will reveal them: which is why philosophers are accustomed to call it "most wise." For it uncovers and brings to light many things that without the help of time, no amount of skill, study, energy or application could [possibly] achieve. ... Just as we find any irregularity in buildings naturally displeasing, so our minds naturally despise cruel judgements. And whatever doesn't fit with reason and nature, which ought to rule our minds, is thought wicked and shameful. ... I do not entirely agree with the opinion that I think originated with you lawyers: That laws either should not be passed or, if they are [passed], they should surely be religiously obeyed and enforced. It would perhaps be wiser, if laws have to be passed, to obey them only in so far as they do not violate the laws of nature."

The people writing our laws should also manage their

execution

The way American-style democracy works today is that we have one group say what they want for the nation — a legislative branch. Then another another group — an executive branch— implements those wants. This is a dumb approach. In fact, the cost to benefit ratio for this approach is so lopsided and stupid that it has to be the parasite's doing.

If the 2nd group finds a problem, it can't simply have a meeting and change the law. Instead it must go back to the first group and describe the problem, and convince them of the problem — along with the changes they want to make. And of course this takes time and effort and tends not to get done. So our laws tend to stay sub-optimal and poorly written. Anyway, here is a partial list of the problems with this approach

- 1) The law writers are not "in the field" executing the laws so they tend to be more ignorant of field conditions and tend to make bad laws to begin with.
- 2) The law executors need to take time and prepare, meet and convince the law writers about changes.
- 3) The law writers need to take time to meet and listen to the law executors about changes.
- 4) These wasteful meetings may need multiple rounds.
- 5) These meetings take time and in the meantime the laws are sub-optimal.
- 6) Government change and dynamism is slowed.
- 7) It results in government is less fine tuned with regard to heading.

Wouldn't our legislators understand their decisions much better if they were also "in the field" executing and implementing them, gaining first hand experience. Then they would come up with more suitable and more cost efficient policy in the first place, something of primary, make-it or break-it value to a form of government.

What benefit do we the host society get from this separation of powers between legislative and executive? I can't think of anything at all.

On the other hand, cutting the decision makers off from the policy implementation surely must add great inefficiency. It is like a corporate board that never actually visits the company's operations and relies on outside consultants firms for reports.

So let's find another way to balance government power. Let's scrap the idea of a separating our legislative and executive functions.

How a lone presidency can be like a malevolent genie

We have all heard the Mideast legend of the genie in a bottle. You rub the bottle, and a genie comes out to grant your wishes. Well, in some of these legends, the genie is malevolent. It grants your wishes alright, but it interprets them in a way that is maximally opposed to your obvious intent. Anyway, this seems a pretty good characterization when the non-elected Bro•cracy administration of our lone presidents execute the wishes of the people's legislature no matter how carefully stated.

Our wonderful democracy

Do you know why our democracy is always malfunctioning? Do you know what it always seems to take the worst course that is believable? It is because our current democracy is an illusion. We are not living under a real democracy. We are living under the illusion of democracy — an illusion run by an unelected administration of Arabs and their pawns. From the end of WW2 until the Arab oil embargo, they benefited by leaving us along, but no longer. now they want to reduce us, take us down as fast as they possibly can.

The minority report of the Pennsylvania delegates to the US Constitutional Convention, 1787-12-18

"...this great power [over the democracy of the United States] may be exercised by the president and 10 senators (being 2/3 of 14, which is a quorum of that body). What an inducement would this offer to the ministers of foreign powers to compass [get around] by bribery such concessions as could not otherwise be obtained. ... The president-general [president-commander in chief] is dangerously connected with the senate; his coincidence with the views of the ruling junto in that body, is made essential to his weight and importance in the government, which will destroy all independency and purity in the executive department, and having the power of pardoning without the concurrence of a council [legislative body], he may screen from punishment the most treasonable attempts that may be made on the liberties of the people, when instigated by his coadjutors in the senate." [An adjutant is an assistant or deputy]

Gore Vidal

"The genius of our [Arab] ruling class is that it has kept a majority of the people from ever questioning the inequity of a system where most people drudge along, paying heavy taxes for which they get nothing in return."

Anti-Federalist papers, 1787.06.26

[Here Federalist James Madison argues for a system of checks and balances where the power of our "impetuous" legislatures is checked and controlled by a much narrower branch of government. This argument is of course inverted nonsense like having a distant capital to reduce corruption.]

"[Regarding] this institution...[legislatures, we should examine] the ends to be served by it. These were first to protect the people against their rulers. Secondly to protect the people against the transient impressions into which they themselves might be led... in a temperate [hot-tempered] moment... [Thirdly] those charged with the public happiness, might betray their trust. An obvious precaution against this danger would be to divide the trust between different bodies of men, who might watch and check each other. In this they would be governed by the same prudence which has prevailed in organizing the subordinate departments of Government, where all business liable to abuses is made to pass through separate hands, the one being a check on the other. [This is a fine system for assuring the fidelity of individual public workers. However, it offers no advantage for legislatures that are already broadly constituted.]

It would next occur to such a people, that they themselves were liable to temporary errors, through want [lack] of information as to their true interest, and that men chosen for a short term, and employed but a small portion of that in public affairs, might err from the same cause. This reflection would naturally suggest that the Government be so constituted, as that one of its branches might have an opportunity of acquiring a competent knowledge of the public interests. Another reflection equally becoming a people on such an occasion, would be that they themselves, as well as a numerous body of Representatives, were liable to err also, from fickleness and passion. A necessary fence against this danger would be to select a portion of enlightened citizens, whose limited number, and firmness might seasonably interpose against impetuous councils." [My translation of the 2nd paragraph: It is better to have a wise-guy oligarchy, whose small size and power might provide timely intervention against the naturally fickle decisions

of the people's legislature.

Madison's 'fickleness' was due to the poor design of the first US congress as a meta-democracy of 13 state democracies. Under this constitution, a majority in 7 of 13 states could be theoretically had with 26.9% of the popular vote. So this congress was constantly passing and repealing measures due to its poor voting design. Here is how the founding Brothers could reasonably call it fickle, because it was constantly changing its mind. In Brolingo fickle = eff•ik•al = shout•down•towards.]

We never had an effective democracy in the US

Under our first constitution, we had the broad legislature, but the design could not function due to the meta-democracy where 26.9% of the state senators could pass a measure. Then, in one stroke we eliminated the broad democracy and instituted a broad oligarchy checked and balanced by a rather powerful monarch. Never has the United States had a broad democracy with a sensible voting system. In fact, the world has yet to have this.

If it sticks

Things were always being settled and resettled by the congress of the 13 states under the first US constitution.

The fickleness was a big reason

The parasite made sure to make the first constitution was fickle. This after all was the biggest reason for instituting a 2nd constitution.

Thus the fickleness became the main reason for eliminating the broad and incorruptible legislatures that were such a huge threat to the parasite's continued existence. Here is how the parasite got rid of the representation problem that it inherited from the time of the states.

Anti-Federalist papers, 1787.07.21

[Here we read the great James Madison, the so-called "father of the US constitution". Here is the main designer of America's prototype democracy. Note his nonsense arguments for why our lone presidential monarch should appoint our supreme court justices.]

"Later that day, Mr. Madison proposed that the national judiciary be appointed by the executive [president] unless disagreed to by 2/3 of the Senate. ...his reasons for the motion. 1. that it secured the responsibility of the Executive who would in general be more capable and likely to select fit characters than the Legislature... The Executive Magistrate [president] would be considered as a national officer, acting for and equally sympathizing with every part of the United States. If the second branch alone should have this power the Judges might be appointed by a minority of the people, though by a majority of the States. [note the strained logic] ... Appointments by the Legislatures have generally resulted from cabal, from personal regard or some other consideration that a title derived form the proper qualifications. ...

It has been said [that] the Executive would be uninformed of characters. The reverse was the truth. The Senate will be so. They must take the character of candidates from the flattering pictures drawn by their friends. The Executive in the necessary intercourse with every part of the United States required by the nature of this administration, will or may have the best possible information."

Do we actually lack resolve or do we only think we lack resolve?

- I believe that America is being spoofed into thinking:
- A) That it lacks the resolve to make hard choices.
 - B) That its national character is weak.
 - C) That its own special interests run the nation politically.
 - D) That these special interests were behind the subprime crisis and more than 10 lost years.
 - E) That our narrow democracy is not completely corrupt.

It is rather like how we were spoofed into thinking that the Mideast has all the oil.

US-style democracy does one thing really well

It hands as much power as possible to our presidential monarch and his parasite friendly barocracy while preserving the illusion of democracy, autonomy, and checks and balances. It does just what it was created to do for its true masters.

Checks and balances on whose power?

Maybe our system of checks and balances is not a check on the power of our own elected officials at all. Maybe it is a sort of guard rail on our parasite's own immense powers. Maybe our parasite needs checks and balances on its own power to keep it from overstepping... so the grand illusion or matrix keeps working.

Legislative checks and the flocks short attention span

Forget about the propaganda in so many school textbooks about our "brilliant" system of checks and balances. Instead, go back and look at the many problems the inaction of our government has caused in the face of widespread criticism. The Subprime crisis was only a recent problem, and a large problem we are all still familiar with. Why couldn't we stop this crisis when the FBI warned about it in around 2002?

And look how often it is said that our society (and especially "our" news media) has a short attention span and loses interest after a short time. With this in mind, why do we have these checks on legislative power that slow our democracies down and help the people to forget? Clearly these checks diminish the power of our democracy to bring the true will of the people into reality. And clearly this has created many big problems, like sub-prime.

Surely we are not getting smarter taking weeks or months or years to come to a decision. Surely the opposite is happening. Our society moves on, loses interest, and become dumber and more tractable for our always-on, always paying-attention, always-focused parasite. Here it looks these slowing check on our government are not for our benefit at all, but for our parasites — so we lose interest and leave the parasite to run our show.

Slow it down with unneeded checks

Looking at everyone's experience with democracy — what is the greater problem — that it is too responsive, or too unresponsive? The problem is of course that our democracy is too unresponsive. I mean, aside from cops on a personal power-trip, have you ever in your entire life heard people complain about their democracy being too responsive, or too quick to act?

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.03.18, Federalist 71

"The republican principle demands that the deliberate sense of the community should govern the conduct of those who they intrust the management of their affairs. But it does not require an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion or to every transient impulse which the people may

receive from the arts of men who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests."

[To simplify:

Under Democracy, elected officials govern deliberately. They don't obey every transient impulse the people receive from the arts of men who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests.

Consider that last part about the arts of men who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests. Who could that be?]

James Madison, 1788.03.01, Federalist 63

"Such an institution may be sometimes necessary as a defense to the people against their own temporary errors and delusions."

Thomas Jefferson, 1815.03.04, to Francis C. Gray

"Although a republican government is slow to move...once in motion, its momentum becomes irresistible." [The force of a democracy is obviously not significantly increased by taking a long time to come to a decision.]

George Washington, 1796.05.01, to Edward Carrington

"It is on great occasions only, and after time has been given for cool deliberate reflection, that the real voice of the people can be known."

[1) Nonsense, there are obvious other times. 2) Do we really care about the voice of the people, or do we care about making good decisions that cannot be corrupted? 3) Other considerations like the representation ratio are surely more important than cool deliberation. 4) The great George Washington.]

Make your business less responsive?

Imagine if every decision Apple, Boeing, or GM made had a 90-day waiting period due to the nature of their decision-making processes. Would this help or harm the ability of these companies to work effectively and be profitable for their shareholders?

10,000 Senators don't need a check on their power

They check themselves by their sheer numbers.

Gary Oldman

"The building of America has had its fair share of mistakes, but it's a constitution that's the jewel of democracy, the envy of many, and it's the most generous nation in the world." [generous with money flows to the parasitic land of no resources that is.]

Constitutional amendments

Look at how insanely low the bar was set to create the 2nd US constitution of 1789. I mean only 39 men wrote the document, and the small number of delegates that ratified it. Now look at how insanely hard the thing is to modify. Look at how insanely difficult the constitutional amendment process is.

Apparently, once our parasite got American democracy the way it wanted, it made America's Constitution (the model of all modern democracies) as hard to change as it could get away with. Here is the real reason why America's constitution is so notoriously difficult to change. This way our parasite will hold as much backdoor power as possible, for as long as possible. This is the real reason why US constitutional amendments often take years to pass.

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #129

"They have often needlessly abolished the laws they found in force — throwing their nation into the confusion that accompanies change. Certainly, on rare occasions... it is sometimes necessary to change certain laws. But this situation is uncommon, and when it does occur they should be amended only in fear and trembling. There should be so much seriousness about it, and so many precautions should be taken, that the people should naturally conclude that laws are deeply sacred, since so many formalities are required in order to repeal them." [If the host society gives it self permission, it can change anything in 24 hours. Thus in a day it can undue what the Brotherly struggle took decades and centuries to accomplish. Here is why the parasite is the number one proponent of slow group decisions. This is because the longer we wait the weaker we get and the stronger it gets.]

Alexander Hamilton, The American Daily Advertiser, 1794.08.28

"What is the most sacred duty and the greatest source of our security in a Republic? The answer would be, an inviolable respect for the Constitution and laws... A sacred respect for the constitutional law is the vital principle, the sustaining energy of a free government."

George Washington, Farewell Address, 1796.09.19

"The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole People is sacredly obligatory upon all."

Plato, Republic, 426b

"Governments that run badly, but forbid any change in the constitution under pain of death."

Patrick Henry, 5 June 1788:

"They tell us that there is a plain easy way of getting amendments: When I come to contemplate this part, I suppose that [either] I am mad, or, that my countrymen are so: The way to amendment, is, in my conception, shut. Let us consider this plain easy way: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be ... ratified by ... three-fourths of the several States... ...

... 'That whenever any Government shall be found inadequate, or contrary to these purposes, a majority of the community had, an indubitable, inalienable, and indefeasible right to reform, alter, or abolish it, in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal [well-being].' This, Sir, is the language of democracy; that a majority of the community have a right to alter their Government when[ever it is] found to be oppressive: But how different is the [supposed] genius of your new Constitution from this? How different from the sentiments of freemen, that a contemptible minority can prevent the good of the majority? If then Gentlemen standing [with both feet] on the ground [have] come to that point, that they are willing to bind themselves and their posterity to be oppressed, I am amazed... If this [is] the opinion of the majority, I must [of course] submit [to it]. But to me, Sir, it appears perilous and destructive: I cannot help thinking so. ... If, Sir, amendments are left to the twentieth or the tenth part of the people of America, your liberty is gone forever. [He is

talking about how swaying just 5-10% of the vote is often enough to block a 2/3 majority.]

We have heard that there is a great deal of bribery practiced in the House of Commons in England. And that many of the members raised themselves to preferments [appointment to highly profitable positions in government], by selling the rights of the people. But, Sir, the tenth part of that body cannot continue oppressions on the rest of the people. English liberty is in this case, on a firmer foundation than American liberty. It will be easily contrived to procure the opposition of one tenth of the people to any alteration, however judicious.

Nor can we ever expect to get this government amended, since I have already shown, that a very small minority may prevent it; and that small minority interested in the continuance of the oppression: Will the oppressor let go the oppressed? Was there ever an instance [of this]? Can the annals of mankind exhibit one single example, where rulers overcharged with power, willingly let go [of] the oppressed, though solicited and requested most earnestly? The application for amendments will therefore be fruitless [unless our parasite gets behind them]."

Over-majorities are anti-democratic

In the section above Patrick Henry meant that extreme over-majorities are a bad idea because through them, extreme minorities can gain blocking power over a clear majority. Basically, when we require an over-majority, the flip side is that a minority is able to block the actions of the majority. This is almost as wrong as if we allow a minority to take action regardless of what the majority wants. In either case, we have something less than genuine democracy where a majority or slight overmajority rules.

Avoid extreme over-majorities

How much blocking power do you give to the minority? If you require unanimous vote, then the will of 1% minorities are valued equally with the greatest 99% majorities. If you require an 80% overmajority, then the 20% have blocking power over the other 80%. The more extreme the minority we allow-to-block, the more exaggerated the power of small minorities are in our decision making process. So except in cases where people might be profoundly harmed by a vote, we must be mindful of extreme over-majorities and the injustice they may cause.

The supposed tyranny of the majority

Our parasite always struggles to exaggerate the problems with anything it does not like in its hosts. And it is constantly doing this with democracy. One of its age-old favorites is the idiotic double-speak term, "the tyranny of the majority". In general, the tyranny of the majority is a minor problem, a problem that has caused thousands of times less waste and loss of life over the centuries as compared to our parasite's various tyrannies of tyrannies. In other words, the supposed tyranny of the majority is nothing in comparison to the tyranny of the parasite.

Checks and balances 1.0, the British royal caste system

Around the time of the American Revolution, the British House of Commons was technically elected by "the people" of Britain. However, this was only the land owning people of England, a small portion of the voting age men. The House of Lords on the other hand was made up of "hereditary peers", people who could be described as a caste of lower royalty, coming from

about 400 royal or "noble" Arab front families of utterly spectacular wealth. These were men who had frequently inherited their office from their father and grandfather, some peerage "dynasties" going back for many generations: Ergo the term caste.

It is worth noting that the aristocratic House of Lords not only constituted the dominant house of the British Parliament, but they were also automatically given the most important appointments in government, church and military. And there they stayed, so long as they kept doing as they were told.

Now remarkably, this system was characterized by our parasite's media monopoly as a "mixed government", or a "balanced government" — a mixture of monarchy, aristocracy and (narrow) land-owning democracy. And according to our parasite's ancient media, these were the 3 basic types of government. And of course, this frames public notions of government all at one end of the representation ratio continuum, our Arab parasite's end.

Now according to the political theorists of the day, (all of which were part of the parasite's matrix), all these systems of government would, no matter how benevolent in the beginning turn into their malevolent forms. Monarchy was destined to turn into tyranny, Aristocracy was destined to turn into warring factions and tyranny. And democracy was destined to turn into anarchy and later despots or warring factions. At the time, our parasite's media said that the only way to control each was to mix all together and have a "mixed" government, where each form of government would CHECK AND BALANCE the others. (also search Estate of the Realm)

John Adams

"Democracy... while it lasts is more bloody than either aristocracy or monarchy. Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There has never been a democracy that did not commit suicide." [This is John Adams, the 2nd president of the United States.]

A democracy is only as broad as its narrowest house #1

To the extent that there is a single presidential monarch with a veto over the rest of government, that government is a monarchy. This monarchy may only exist in the range between a simple majority and a 2:1 override and it may only exist as a 4-year periodic monarchy, but the president is sort of a constitutional king in that range.

A democracy is only as broad as its narrowest house #2

Which democracy is broader?

Democracy #1 with a primary house of 435 and a secondary house of 100 and a lone presidential monarch with a veto right that takes a 2:1 overmajority to override? or

Democracy #2 with a primary house of 100,000 and a secondary house of 10,000 and a lone presidential monarch with a veto right that takes a 2:1 overmajority to override?

This is a trick question because while democracy #2 will definitely be broader in a number of important ways, it will still in many ways be just as narrow and corruptible as a democracy #1 thanks to its lone presidential monarch.

A democracy is only as broad as its narrowest house #3

Which democracy is broader?

Democracy #1 with a primary house of 1,000,000 and a secondary house of 10,000 and an executive council of 30. or

Democracy #2 with a primary house of 10,000 and a

secondary house of 1,000 and an executive council of 30.

Again, both are just as broad because both suffer from the backdoor power that the council of 30 introduces to the design.

A democracy is only as broad as its narrowest house #4

Which democracy is broader?

Democracy #1 with a primary house of 1,000,000 and a secondary house of 100,000 and no other houses. or

Democracy #2 with a single house of 100,000 and no other houses.

Again, both are just as broad because both have no house narrower than 100,000.

Double check your lawmakers not their laws

If we double check the laws of our lawmakers it slows the decision process down and leads to a loss of resolve on the part of our society and our legislature. It also wastes legislative "metal" on duplicate houses for double checking. Finally, it tends to cause legislative narrowing — unless the two houses are the same size — which sort of makes them identically constituted and defeats the purpose of the double check.

In the new broad democracy proposed herein, we double check our lawmakers not their laws. We elect 1:250 to be our nation's Sub-Senators. Then we elect 1:10 from among these to be our nation's Main-Senators. These people then work in 10 specialized Sluices of 10,000. Then when one of these elects something, there is no double check.

Broadly legislatures are a check on power

It is after all much easier to corrupt a senate of 100 than one of 100,000.

No vetoes

Vetoes are not a check on power, they are a backdoor to it. A veto can be used to narrow the menu options. A veto can also be used to stop the repeal of a dumb Arab-sabotaged law as we have so many times. A great example of this is how the US government cannot repeal Obamacare after our Arab president pushed it through.

A little bit of everything when we need to make sure

For reasons already discussed, using large over-majorities creates big problems for our democracy. When we want to make sure we are making the right decision, a better approach is to use a combination of a smaller over-majority, waiting periods, and re-measure. This is in addition to our broad legislatures and multi-elected officials.

Be careful of quorums as backdoors

If we say that 51% of legislators is the quorum, for a vote that would pass with a simple majority, then a minority of 49% can block the passage of a bill by not showing up for the vote. If we allow say 25% of the legislators to serve as quorum, then measures may be sneaked through with only a small number of votes.

Cicero, A book about Constitutions, 3.3.6-9

[Here the changes that Julius Caesar instituted are being explained by Tullius Cicero. Caesar/Cicero (one in the same man) dissolved the Roman 'Republic' and instituted a 640-year dictatorship that culminated in the European dark ages and the great age of Islam. Here the parasite cryptically records how the former republic of Rome was turned into a military dictatorship by the Caesar/Cicero administration. Note how

quaestores are compared with military tribunes. Note how the army will run the government and control the economy. Here we see the parasite's agenda very clearly stated.]

"In the army, there will be military tribunes who will command over those whom they are placed. In the city, there will be officers [Quaestores] who will administer the public finances...

There will also be aediles who will oversee the city's markets, merchandise, and food supplies [thus holding the "staff of life" or "nightstick of life" over the people], and also the regularly held games [In these gladiatorial spectacles, political prisoners and disobedient slaves were painfully and publicly executed so as to serve as examples — so as to intimidate the rest into "submission". This was euphemistically called entertainment for the masses. The aediles also maintained and repaired public works.]...

The censors will record the ages, children, slaves, and property value of all citizens [so they can be taxed and drafted into the army to die in war]. They will administer construction of temples, roads, and aqueducts in the city. They will also audit the records of the public treasury. They will divide the citizen body into tribes. They will also make other divisions according to wealth, age, and class. They will draft young men into the military [to get rid of the potential trouble makers while they are young]. They will regulate the morals of the people and will allow no one guilty of shameless behavior to remain in the senate [So the censors could oust any senator they wanted]....

There will be a praetor, a judge/arbitrator of legal disputes, who will himself judge or will arrange to have judged [all] civil lawsuits. He will also be the administrator of the civil [criminal] law. And there will be as many praetors, all the same power, as the Senate shall decree or the 'people' order.

There will be two magistrates with royal power... who will be called consuls. They will have supreme authority in military matters, and everyone will obey them. Their most important duty will be the safety of the people...

There will be tribunes, ten officers, whom the plebs have elected to help protect them from violence. And whatever they veto, and whatever legislation has been passed by the Pleb's Council [Concilium Plebis] over which they preside, will be binding and inviolable. [The Roman people clearly demanded a democracy and a legislature like we do today, and the parasite responded with this compromise, this democracy in name alone, this democracy with numerous backdoors for eliminating anyone the parasite found troublesome and making a public example of them in the "games".]

Decision in Philadelphia, ch.19

"as the Convention was coming together in May of 1787, the doctrine of the separation of powers was not well understood by many of them and was even disliked by a few. (Although it was referred to directly in four state constitutions, it had not really been followed in practice subsequently.)

Roger Sherman in particular was convinced that all power ought to reside in a legislature, which, after all, represented the people. On June 1, only his third day at the Convention, he said that he considered "the executive magistracy as nothing more than an institution for carrying the will of the legislature into effect, that the person or persons ought to be appointed by and accountable to the legislature only, which was the depository of the supreme will of the society". Later the same day he again insisted, "An independence of the executive on the supreme legislative was in his opinion the very essence of tyranny." And the next day

he repeated his idea that "the national legislature should have the power to remove the executive at pleasure [will]." Sherman was clear and certain in his belief that government should be run by the representatives of the people, and that the executive, far from acting as a check on the legislature, should be its servant."

John Adams

"Democracy... while it lasts is more bloody than either aristocracy or monarchy. Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There has never been a democracy that did not commit suicide." [This is John Adams, the 2nd president of the United States. Of course this swarthy man was an Arab mole, just like Bar•ak Hussein Ob•ana.]

More power than they need

The parasite's power over America's government probably exceeds the realm of the believable. Their power over our democracy is probably only limited by what the public will swallow. That is how much influence I think they have.

Checks and balances and the matrix

Here is a far-out idea: That America's checks and balances are actually the checks our parasite needs on its power to stay within the bounds of the matrix and the grand illusion. See, under a "democracy," the Brothers must limit their actions to preserve the illusion of democracy. Here having a Congressional override on the baro•cratic powers of their lone executive forces them to stay within the bounds of the plausible. It also forces them to not rock the boat too much. In this zone, a presidential veto gives them a monarch's veto, but one that must stay within the range of public opinion. Now if they stray beyond this zone, the two-thirds majority to override protects them from making too egregious an expression of their power and destroying the illusion of democracy, freedom and autonomy.

Legislatures in parallel not in series

Legislative strength in the face of corruption is analogous to the strength of the links in a chain. Let's say we only have enough legislative metal for 3 links. The worst approach is to link the links in a series of three links. This is not only bad because it squanders most of our (legislative) metal, but it also makes the whole linkage as strong as the weakest/narrowest of the three links. On top of this, any imperfection in any of the three links causes the system to fail. Far stronger is if we use our (legislative) metal to create either: A) one big and strong link. or B) three small links that work in parallel.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"The word 'Trust' be it noted, as signifying a complete monopoly, had not then come into popular usage. [Pay attention. Here we see the true meaning of anti-trust laws. We also see the Arabs struggling to cover up the true meaning of that term.] Those virtuous outbursts in Congress against the monopolies, served the purpose well, but one overshadowing fact neither the middle class nor the working class seemed to note [notice], namely, that whatever might be said in Congress, nearly every bill apparently drawn to curtail the power of monopolies and wealth was so ingeniously drafted that its so-called vital provisions failed to stand the test of the courts. Yet the lawyers in Congress who drew these bills were ranked as the foremost 'Constitutional experts' in the land—a situation not

at all contradictory to those who understood the double-faced [two-faced] nature of the [theater] performances at [in] Washington."
[what a grand illusion.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.25

"In 1895 he [Elkins] was elected to the United States Senate by the West Virginia Legislature, after a campaign in which, it was freely charged, corruption money, in the form of campaign funds, was distributed throughout the entire State to insure the election of members favorable to his plans. In the United States Senate Elkins was one of the most adroit and useful law-drafters for the plutocracy. One of his notable acts was an amendment to the interstate commerce act expunging the clause providing imprisonment for violations of the anti-rebating law, and giving complete immunity to magnates who testify in such proceedings brought against them."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"The 'poor settler' catspaw was again made use of. ...the 'Stone and Timber Act' was passed in 1878 by Congress, An amendment passed in 1892 made frauds still easier. This measure was another of those benevolent-looking laws which, on its face, extended opportunities for the homesteader. No longer, it was plausibly set forth, could any man say that the Government denied him the right to get public land for a reasonable sum. Was ever a finer, a more glorious chance presented? Here was the way open for any individual homesteader to get 160 acres of timber land for the low price of \$2.50 an acre. Congress was overwhelmed with outbursts of panegyrics [speeches] for its wisdom and public spirit.

Soon however, a cry of rage went up from the duped public. And the cause? The law, like the Desert Land Law, it turned out, was filled with cunningly drawn clauses sanctioning the worst forms of spoliation. Entire trainloads of people, acting in collusion with the land grabbers, were transported by the lumber syndicates into the richest timber regions of the West, supplied with the funds to buy, and then each, after having paid \$2.50 per acre for 160 acres, immediately transferred his or her allotment to the lumber corporations. Thus for \$2.50 an acre, the lumber syndicates obtained vast tracts of the finest lands worth, at the least, according to Government agents, \$100 an acre, at a time, 35-years ago when lumber was not nearly so costly as now."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.8

"Legislative measures in New York and many other States were drafted with such skill that sly provisions allowing the greatest frauds were concealed in the enactments. And the first knowledge that the plundered public frequently had of them was after they had already been accomplished. These frauds comprised corrupt laws that gave, in circumstances of notorious scandal, tracts of land in the Adirondack Mountains to railroad companies included in the Vanderbilt system. They embraced laws, and still more laws exempting this or that stock or property from taxation, and laws making presents of valuable franchises and allowing further consolidations. Laws were enacted in New York State the effects of which were to destroy the Erie Canal (which has cost the people of New York State \$100-million) as a competitor of the New York Central Railroad."

Legislatures must write their own Laws

In America's Congress, anyone can introduce a bill. And outsiders normally write and introduce bills such as the Patriot Act (the help the Arabs find all the smart and dangerous patriots act). I mean, just look at how impossibly fast this immense act appeared after September 11.

Anyway, again, most of the power in a bicameral legislature is supposed to lie with the primary house, because it supposedly negotiates and writes the exact language of new laws. And the secondary house and president are supposedly much weaker because they only have the power to approve or disapprove.

But what if the primary house is not actually negotiating the exact language of our legislation? What if our primary house is acting like a secondary house and only making small changes to bills introduced by that great, 154-year-old Mideast puppet Exxon/Standard-Oil, or one of those many well-funded Mideast greenhouse gas charities? Doesn't the real power in America's democracy then rest with the people drafting the laws, whoever they may be?

Look: If there is one thing that democracies absolutely must keep as their own exclusive domain, it is writing their own laws, sentence by sentence. But if we are going to require that our primary house write its own laws this way, then our 1-in-1-million Congress is hopelessly understaffed. So here we see yet another reason why we need to broaden our democracies —So they can undertake the all important task of writing their own darn laws.

They struggled to make secondary houses look valuable

[From Ralph Ketcham, The Anti-Federalist Papers]

"Many states with two-house (bicameral) legislatures, and some with frankly aristocratic [Harem/Brotherly] upper houses, even found that prolonged deliberation and checks on popular will could result in more dispassionate and practical legislation." [This seems an admission of how the Brothers were not hindering, but helping the secondary houses to look like they were useful. In Ketcham's words, This way, the "new government to be fashioned in the United States might become a model for the world."]

Centinel, #1, 1787.10.05

"if imitating the constitution of Pennsylvania, you vest all the legislative power in one body of men (separating the executive and judicial) elected for a short period [one year], and necessarily excluded by rotation from permanency, and guarded from precipitancy [suddenness of action] and surprise by delays imposed on its proceedings, you will create the most perfect responsibility. For then, whenever the people feel a grievance they cannot mistake the authors, and will apply the remedy with certainty and effect, discarding them at the next election. This tie of responsibility will obviate all the dangers apprehended [perceived] from a single legislature, and will the best secure the rights of the people." [1) Pennsylvania was doing very well under its mono-cameral legislature. 2) It is important that we track who contributed what terms to what laws. This is so our legislators can be in some way accountable for introducing laws and clauses that later prove obviously favorable to corruption or Arab parasitism.]

Gridlock is a symptom of a parasite infection

Look at what the Harem bred race has historically done with the axis of evil running from Mecca to Mosque-o. It creates a dangerous and impassible situation a gridlock situation for all outsiders trying to trade Asian goods with European goods. It

uses this gridlock to stop anyone that is not authorized by Mideast Inc. and only allows trade through that it profits from. When we see or hear about gridlock in government, it is the same process at work.

Gridlock is a property of bicameral legislatures.

The following is a weak metaphor, but it is the best one I could think of. Imagine two dogs tied together with a 3-meter rope. Imagine them chasing say a wild pig through the woods. Now imagine how quickly the rope would get caught on a tree or bush.

This is how I see the problem of bicameral legislatures. And the more differently the houses are constituted, the more different their decisions will be, and the farther apart the two dogs will run. And then the more likely the pair of dogs will get caught on a tree and need someone to free them. We should get rid of the rope and use single legislatures.

A democracy designed to tie

A democracy with a presidential monarch as tie-breaker

Recall how the US presidential monarch breaks any vote between a 1:1 and 2:1. This I say is a democracy designed to produce tied votes for the presidential monarch to break. Here is yet another way our democracy was cleverly designed to maximize the power of its 4-year presidential monarch and his non-elected administration, his non-elected Bro•cracy.

5— CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND SCANDAL

Elections distract our leaders.

Under a one-in-a-million democracy, our elected officials tend to waste huge amounts of time and energy on the campaign trail reaching voters by the million. However, under a 1:250 democracy, campaigning is reduced until it becomes a matter of a couple local town-hall meetings with the entire constituency of 250.

Mark Twain

"We have the best government money can buy."

Politics in a narrow democracy is a huge and costly thing

What sort of personality is so driven to politics that he pours out huge sums of his own money to fight for the long-shot chance to become a one-in-a-million leader? Wouldn't we get better leaders if running for office was a smaller scale affair involving no outlay of money? If we did that, we might be able to stop calling our elected officials politicians, and start calling them leaders. Wouldn't that be refreshing, to be led by a legion of small-time leaders instead of a few big-time politicians and their invisible appointees and backers?

Theodore White

"The flood of money that gushes into politics today is a pollution of democracy."

Bill Moyers

"America's corporate and political elites now form a regime of their own and they're privatizing democracy. All the benefits - the tax cuts, policies and rewards flow in one direction: up."

Peter Singer

"I'm not overly alarmist about it, but I do think there are some

worrying signs, like the growing accumulation of wealth by a very small proportion of the population, plus elections in the US are much more dominated by money than anywhere else calling itself a democracy."

Like water and salt for plants

Campaign corruption is the water of the political plant, scandal the salt. If campaign finance corruption allows our parasite to select our leaders, then scandal allows them to de-select them.

Carrot and stick political influence

The political tool, the beast of burden is rewarded in two ways. He gets a few carrots if he is a good little mule (m•you•al = think•your•way). And if he gets head•strong, he gets the stick/ stigma, a little scandal perhaps. Or maybe he will blow up politically.

Also, is not just carrot politics (bribery) that gets much easier for the parasite when we have 50 vs. 100,000 Senators. The stick gets much more powerful too.

Vulnerable to foreign veto by scandal

The Apple dictionary says that Eng. SCANDAL comes from Gr. skandal = snare; a wire or fiber loop to trap animals. Here the important thing to realize is that snares/ scandals don't set themselves, they are always set by someone to catch an unsuspecting creature. Scandals are a common way for our parasite to snare and eliminate our elected officials when they are troublesome to the parasite.

About 28 years ago, just about all of America's best mayors were found to be potentially troublesome for our parasite. They were all placed under intense scrutiny and scandalized for no good reason really. Many were forced out of politics. This helped our parasite create the desired leadership vacuum in the United States. And this leadership vacuum is the reason why America currently lacks people on the national stage that are qualified to lead our pin-head narrow 1-in-a-million democracy.

Now, if we had 500 times as many people running our government (each decade), scandalizing the strongest X% would be at least 500 times as difficult. Also, each leader would not be as important, so our tolerance of human faults among our leaders would be more realistic. And finally there is probably an absolute number at which 'scandal fatigue' sets in among the public, so having 500 times as many scandals seems unlikely.

Anyway, here we see another vulnerability of one-in-a-million democracy; that our parasite can carefully scrutinize the few elected officials we have. Then it can use this knowledge to "veto" or fire our politicians when they step out of line.

Donald Trump

"One of the key problems today is that politics is such a disgrace, good people don't go into government."

Which democracy would you rather work in?

A) The one that "religiously" prohibits its Senators from having any affairs or saying anything inappropriate ever. or
B) The one where its Senators have the rights of normal employees — i.e. what they do on their own time is none of the employer's business.

Scandal: Pedophile priests under my thumb

Remember that Rolling Stones song 'under my thumb'? Scandal can also be used to keep our leaders under our

parasite's thumb. This is after-all why so many Catholic priests are pedophiles. All of these men will do as they are told because of their secret, their corpse in the basement.

Why is it so hard to believe that your priests are chosen because they have some secret to hide and they can be gotten rid of at a moment's notice if necessary. In times and places where everyone wants to be a priest, and the parasite can be picky, this is part of the job qualification for being a Priest.

Odious Rex — under my thumb

I wonder what George Bush did. I mean, remember George Bush's face when he was told about the September 11 attacks in that Michael Moor film. That was a real Oedipus moment there: A figurehead king's face captured on film forever. Here we see the moment that the Odious Rex realizes that he has committed the worst crimes imaginable in the eyes of his mother country. Remember how Odious Rex correctly answered the riddle of the Sphinx Mafia and then was made king? Remember how George Bush was improbably sitting under a poster that said "reading makes a country great." He was also flipping through a book about a goat (a scapegoat). What are the odds?

Also, funny how George was on camera when he was told about the September 11 attacks. Funny how they just let him sit there being filmed before they called him away. Funny how they did not stop the filming. Funny how Mike Moor got the film. Funny that goat book he was flipping through. Of course this all means that George was just a dumb scapegoat figurehead. It also means that the people running George's administration knew about the attacks beforehand.

The right to privacy

The idea of having your entire life dragged out in public if you run for office. That is a terrible discouragement for outies to enter public service — one that does not affect innies like Bar*ak Hussein Ob*ana.

Allegations they don't like, they get rid of, allegations they like, they let come through. We need to do something about this. We need to fix this.

In this new broad democracy, we have no place or role for the media in our election process. Besides, with 100,000 Main-Senators and 1,000,000 Sub-Senators, all of which are annually elected, scandalizing a few Senators will do little to shape their behavior.

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Oleaginous, adj. Oily, smooth, sleek [British Prime Minister Benjamin] Disraeli once described the manner of Bishop Wilberforce as 'unctuous, oleaginous, saponaceous.' [flattering, greasy soapy] And the good prelate was ever afterward known as Soapy Sam. For every man there is something in the vocabulary that would stick to him like a second skin. His enemies have only to find it." [The Apple dictionary says "from latin oleaginous 'of the olive tree'"]

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Rumor, n. A favorite weapon of the assassins of character. Sharp, irresistible by [chain] mail or shield, By guard un-parried as by flight unstayed, Oh serviceable Rumor, let me wield Against my enemy no other blade. His be the terror of a foe unseen. His the unused hand upon the sword's handle,

And mine the deadly tongue, long, slender, keen, Hinting a rumor of some ancient guilt. So shall I slay the wretch without a blow, Spare me to celebrate his overthrow, And nurse my valor for another foe."

[unseen is the way Arabs fight if they can. They hide bombs, or poison wells, or get people to live in tsunami funnels.]

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Kill, v.t. To create a vacancy without nominating a successor."

The stuff of leaders

You know, many of our important leaders, be they elected officials, appointed priests, teachers, judges, newspaper editors, news producers, movie makers, commodity company CEO's, whatever; they all tend to be either:

A) Brothers

B) People who always do what their trusted Brotherly advisors say.

C) People chosen because they have a rotting corpse in the basement. This is incidentally why there are so many Catholic Priests that are pedophiles. These men were chosen by the Bro*cracy and Brotherly administration of the Roman Catholic Church precisely because they were pedophiles that would do absolutely anything not to get caught.

Forrest Gump

In 1994 this film was awarded 6 Academy awards including "Best Picture" by the corrupt MPAA. It seems to have been a command broadcast not to assassinate Bill Clinton who was also inaugurated in 1993. In this film we see 8 political assassination or attempted assassinations, along with President Nixon's ousting. In fact, here we see an assassination/ouster centric view of recent US history. Any more and the people might become suspicious and the Brothers might 'shock the meme*key', a song flooding the airwaves at the same time.

[Of George Wallace] "A few years later, that angry little man at the school house door thought it would be a good idea and ran for president." [Image shows Wallace being gunned down by Arthur Bre*mer and laying on the ground while campaigning for the 1972 Democratic presidential nomination.] "But SOME ONE thought that it wasn't. But he didn't die." [he was paralyzed].

"Some time later, for no particular reason, somebody shot that nice young president [JFK] When he was riding in his car. And a few years after that, somebody shot his little brother [RFK] too, only he was in a hotel kitchen."

"For the 2nd time in 17 days President Ford escaped possible assignation"

[In the following imaginary scene we see the meaning of John Lennon's great song muddled and belittled by the Brothers who probably released the dog that assassinated him]

Dick Cavet: "Forrest Gump, John Lennon"

John Lennon: "Welcome home"

Dick Cavet: "Can you tell us what China was like?"

Forest Gump: "In the land of China, people hardly got nothing at all."

John Lennon: "No possessions?"

Forest Gump: "And in China, they never to to church."

John Lennon: "No religion too?"

Dick Cavet: "Hard to imagine."

John Lennon: "Well its easy if you try, Dick"

Forest Gump: "Some years later, that nice young man from Ang*land was on his way home to see his little boy and was

signing some autographs. For no particular reason somebody shot him."

[That no particular reason was that John Lennon offended the parasite with his great song Imagine — a song I am making into the anthem of the world government. Here the parasite simultaneously gloats over its assassination, and simultaneously tries to muddle the meaning of John Lennon's great song.]

Only the great die young

Isn't it remarkable how many of the greatest people die young. Steve Jobs was unquestionably the greatest technological innovator of my time. Funny how 3 films have recently been made that minimize his achievements and maximize his demanding personality. The way I see it, the Harem Bros somehow gave this great man cancer, and then they made these movies to begin the process of eliminating his greatness from history.

6—ISOLATED GOVERNMENT

Xenophon, The Constitution of the Athenians, 1.16

"There is a feeling that the Athenians are wrong to make their allies sail to Athens for legal proceedings. In reply, the Athenians enumerate the resulting benefits for the Athenian people. First the legal deposits finance state pay for the year. Second, they control the allied cities while staying at home without the necessity of going on voyages"

George Mason, 1788.06.14, Virginia Ratifying Convention

"Those gentlemen, who will be elected senators, will fix themselves in the federal town, and become citizens of that town more than of your state."

Thomas Jefferson, 1823.06.12, to William Johnson

"The states can best govern our home concerns and the general [national] government our foreign ones. I wish, therefore... never to see all offices transferred to Washington, where, further withdrawn from the eyes of the people, they may more secretly be bought and sold at market."

Ralph Ketcham, The Anti-Federalist Papers, introduction

"To the anti-federalists this meant retaining as much as possible the vitality of local government where rulers and ruled could see, know, and understand each other. Thus they cherished the Revolutionary emphasis on state and local councils and committees, and the Articles of Confederation where the central government rested entirely on the states. The idea of self-government was tied inextricably to something like a town [hall] meeting directness, or at least to a state legislature of many annually elected representatives, who would really know the people of their [tiny] districts. ...Only with such intimacy could the trust, good will, and deliberation essential to wise and virtuous public life be[come] a reality. Anything else [less], even though resting in some fashion on the consent of the people, would not really be self-government.

The intense anti-federalist suspicions of corruption, greed, and lust for power were directed generally at those who ruled from on high and without restraint. Corruption and tyranny would be rampant as they always had been when those who exercised power felt little connection with the people. This would be true, moreover, for elected representatives, as well as for kings and nobles and bishops, who lived in a distant capital milieu where power, intrigue, and

wealth exerted their baneful influence. The more remote and distantly powerful a government was, the more visions of imperial Rome or Versailles or London came to mind with all their venality, cynicism, corruption, and neglect of the people... Would some future capital of the United States be as filled with courtiers, courtesans, military heroes, and superfluous officeholders as London or Paris or St. Petersburg? The anti-federalists thought so under a constitution that consolidated power in a central government remote from the people."

Washington D.C., Bonn, Brasilia, Canberra, and Ottawa

Consider the big free nations of the world, the nations that might, any one of them, flood the world with commodities and ruin the Mideast's main way of feeding on the outside world. It is remarkable how most national (and state) capitals have been purposely isolated from their own domestic interests:

- 1) The US capitol is not in New York, but Washington D.C. pop 570,000.
- 2) Germany's capitol was Bonn pop 300,000,
- 3) The EU's capital is Brussels pop 950,000.
- 4) Canada's capitol is Ottawa pop 300,000,
- 5) Australia's capitol is not Sydney or Melbourne, but Canberra pop 300,000.
- 6) Brazil's capitol is not in Sao Paulo, or Rio, but Brasilia pop 2.4 million.
- 7) California's is Sacramento pop 470,000.
- 8) Massachusetts' is Springfield pop 150,000.
- 9) New York state's capitol is Albany pop 93,000.

Clearly a government of the people, by the people and for the people should not have an isolated capital. Clearly the people should be able to easily reach and communicate with their government as much as reasonable possible. And clearly our democracies don't benefit from this — they suffer from it.

Our parasite is the main beneficiary of our isolated capitals. These make it harder for our own citizens to interact with their government, and this results in less competition and "struggle" for our parasite.

Also, it is worth saying that the idea of keeping democracies free from the corrupting influence of their own people is based on the idea that foreign powers are not trying to influence our democracies. Once we admit this obvious fact, the idea of using these isolated capitals becomes not only idiotic, but evidence that a foreign power shaped the creation of all "democracies" in the world today.

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

"More than any other person, he [Washington] was responsible for backing Pierre L'Enfant in designing the magnificent federal city that was to bear his name."

[The tall and stately figurehead George Washington — and his "minder" Alexander Hamilton, were the men most responsible for moving America's capital far away from New York to Philadelphia first, and then to the District of Columbia (kal·umbi·A) where our parasite could be a bigger fish in a smaller pond.]

Summer of 1793: Yellow fever strikes Philadelphia

In 1793, there was a Yellow fever epidemic in Philadelphia that is recognized to have killed by about 10% of the city's population of 40,000. (Although here, we have reason to wonder about understated statistics.) This brought America's new, still nascent, national government to a standstill. It also may have served as a great cover for eliminating some of

America's best minds en mass.

Now the funny thing is that yellow fever is a tropical disease that is spread mostly by the *Aedes aegypti* (Egyptian) mosquito, an insect that can not survive cold conditions. So when yellow fever broke out in Philadelphia in 1793, it must have come by boat in the summer months from far away. The story is that there was a particularly deadly yellow fever epidemic raging in the Caribbean and lots of refugee ships descended on Philadelphia, skipping the other ports in between.

What a pity, they built Philadelphia here

Freneau's National Gazette (associated with Thomas Jefferson) was one of the main Anti-Federalist newspapers in the US in the late 1700s. It stood against Noah Webster's Minerva, the main Federalist newspaper. (here incidentally you see how the parasite runs all the dictionaries and encyclopedias and wikipedias)

Anyway, these newspapers like nearly all US newspapers of the late 1700s and early 1800s were owned and operated by the nation's two non-democratic political parties. So these two non-democratic parties not only established and debated the agenda of our democracy, they also defined in the news media, the ostensibly "free press", but in truth a sort of sham free press.

Here we see the command broadcast to blame the plague on the Philadelphia location for the US capital. Below is Philip Freneau (fri•new) on Philadelphia in 1793. (See also Robert Johnson's description):

"Dead men to the graveyards going
Constant hearses, funeral verses
Oh what plagues [the city] -- there is no knowing
Priests retreating from their pulpits
Some in hot, and some in cold fits
In bad temper, off they scamper
Leaving us -- unhappy culprits
[It seems that many priests were quite unhappy about their forced involvement in some criminal conspiracy]
Doctors raving and disputing [about the cause]
Death's pale army still recruiting
[the army of pale and infected are still infecting others]
What a pother [fuss], one with t'other
Some a-writing, some a-shooting
[purging the troublesome sheep]
Nature's poisons here collected
[many poisons were used]
Water, earth, and air infected
O, what a pity, Such a city
Was in such a place erected"

Washington D.C. began as a real estate scheme

Keep in mind that Washington D.C. was founded only 3 years before Yellow Fever made Philadelphia unsuitable as a national capital in 1793. See, first the Brothers moved the new nation's capital to Philadelphia (the city of brotherly love), outside of New York. And they probably made a good chunk of gold on that. That was the big step and the name probably helped a lot. Then, once they had done that, they made Philadelphia a city prone to plague (by causing at least one plague). Then they pushed for the new capital, a city designed from the beginning, from the bottom up, with proper drainage that would control the mosquito problem. But it was all just a real estate scheme of the parasite. In the end, the land of no resources had both a money-making real estate scheme and

a distant capital for its arch-enemy, the land of the free.

Here distance was vital to keeping the New Englanders away from the nation's capital where they would dilute our parasite's influence in the system. Here we realize that Washington D.C is more than twice as far from New York as Philadelphia.

Look what was changed in the US constitutions

Next we see the US constitution being changed into a document that supports the parasite's efforts to give our democracy a distant capitol. Here a sensible sounding rule for the nation's capitol was changed. Why did that happen?

US Articles of Confederation, §9, 1777-1789

"The congress of the United States shall have power to adjourn to any time within the year, and to any place within the United States, so that no period of adjournment be for a longer duration than the space of six months."

US Constitution Article 1, Section 5, 1789-present

"Neither house, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two houses shall be sitting."

John W. Gardner

"It is hard to feel individually responsible with respect to the invisible processes of a huge and distant government."

Gustav Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Corporations [fronting for the Arabs] always have their lobby members in and around the halls of legislation to watch and secure their interests. Not so with the people—they cannot act with the directness and system[atic approach] that a [large] corporations can. No individual will take it upon himself to go to the [proverbial distant] Capitol at his own expense, to watch the representatives of the people, and to lobby against the potent influence of the corporation. But corporations have the money, and it is to their interest to expend it to secure the passage of partial laws."

The distance rule

We can all agree that the democratic process is improved by participation. So let's have a common sense distance rule for all our democracies and sub-democracies. It is simply that all elections must be held in the most convenient location for the greatest number of voters. So, for example, if there is a condominium democracy, the vote MUST take place at the condominium property, unless this is impossible. If there is a county capital, ore regional voting center, it must be located in the most populous, or at least the most accessible city.

Where was Spain's capital moved between 1492 and 1561?

Search Valladolid and Morelia. Might this move have had something to do with the invincible Spanish Armada in 1588?

Isolation through etiquette

All the pomp of royalty is our parasite's idea. It loves to create artificial divides between our leadership and our people. The bigger the divide, the less our own people compete with their parasite in running the world. So let's have no special etiquette rules for our government leaders. And let's even go so far as to say, no suits, no polishable shoes, and no neckties.

Long terms isolate

Which elected official is closer to the people he represents, the one elected for a year or the one elected for ten years?

Linguistic isolation

The following long words make it harder for the host society to discuss and understand politics. They form another sort of barrier between the people and their government, one of communication and understanding:

LE•GI•SLA•TURE
CON•STI•TU•TION
PAR•LI•A•MENT
REP•RE•SEN•T•ATIVE
HOUSE OF REP•RE•SEN•T•ATIVES
SPEA•KER OF THE HOUSE
SEC•RE•TAR•Y OF STATE
SEC•RE•TAR•Y OF THE TREA•SUR•Y
RE•PUB•LI•CAN
DE•MO•CRA•CY
FE•DER•AL•IST
FI•LI•BUS•TER
CON•GRES•SION•AL
PRE•SI•DENT
PO•LI•TI•CIAN
AM•BAS•SA•DOR

Aeschylus, Suppliants, 664

"Let the seats of their senates

Be graced with venerable [white] beards"

[The parasite wants all our leaders to be old and detached]

Isolation through elderly leaders

Would you want your government run by 90-year olds? What about 80 year olds? What about having a minimum age of 70 or even 65?

While there are certainly exceptions, these people are too old, and too far from the reality of everyone else's existence. What about a government by 20-year olds? What about one of 30 year olds? In general, aren't these people too young, too inexperienced and too rash? Clearly we want a government somewhere in the middle.

Here I might suggest that we keep age charts for our Senates. How many Senators do we have of what age? What is the statistically modal age for our various Senates. Here the modal age of the Over-Senate will probably offer valuable insight about when people are at their peak with respect to public service.

I might add that we want the wisdom of old men balanced by the energy of younger ones. As well, there might be different modal ages in our three Senates. Also, it is worth repeating: the smartest broad legislatures probably will have a number of super-sharp teenagers and a number of very wise and visionary 80-year olds. Figure out the optimal age, but support age diversity.

Isolation through lack of seats

Contio, As the Romans did, p. 227

"As noted above, the function of the three assemblies was simply to vote on electoral or legislative matters, and no opportunity for discussion was provided. However, an informal public meeting in which discussion was allowed was often held a few days before a convocation of the assemblies. Such a meeting was called a contio. There was no division of those present into voting groups and, of course, no voting. And... [everyone could attend, even] slaves and foreigners could

attend a contio. The purpose of a contio was to acquaint people with the issues which would be voted on in the comitia [committees], or with the candidates who were up for election. Sometimes, however, a consul might summon a contio simply to inform people about matters of general interest and to let them know how he was handling each specific matter.

The people who attended the contiones were frequently quite vocal in their expressions of approval or disapproval. In the passage translated here, Cicero complains that the people are too vocal or rowdy. He seems to fear that issues were being decided, albeit unofficially, in the contiones, and that, as a result, the traditional [traditional normally means Arab supported] structure of voting according to voting groups in the comitia was being undermined. Senators and [Brotherly] conservatives such as Cicero felt threatened by these changes because, whereas they had manipulated the voting groups for many years, they had little control over the moods or whims of the often volatile contiones.

It is curious that Cicero blames these changes on Greek influences and particularly singles out the Greek practice of sitting at meetings. The Romans had in the past, always stood at their assemblies. For some reason, Cicero attributes disorderly conduct to sitting down." [People have trouble standing all day. They only do this when the matter is very important. Thus the government that provides no seats, or not enough seats, and no floor sitting, is the government that does not really want input from the public.]

Cicero, Speech in Defense of Flaccus, 15, 16

"If only we had preserved the outstanding system of citizen's assemblies which we inherited from our ancestors. But now it is somehow slipping away through our fingers. Our wise and revered ancestors did not want any power to reside in the contiones. So they instituted these regulations about what the plebs decreed or the populus ordered. Only after the contio had adjourned, after the voting citizens had been distributed into their proper tribes or centuries according to rank, class, and age. After the men who proposed the legislation had spoken, after the proposal had been published and understood well in advance, only then did our ancestors want the people to vote and thereby approve or reject a proposal. Among the Greeks however, all public business is conducted quite irresponsibly by a contio where people sit down... And ancient Greece, which once flourished with wealth, power, and glory, was ruined by this one evil: The excessive liberty and license at its contiones.

When men who were inexperienced, incompetent, and ignorant sat down in the theater, they would decide to embark on futile wars, they would choose lawless men as magistrates, and they would expel from the city the very citizens whom they should have thanked for good service." [In other words, the parasite wants to make it difficult for the people in a democracy to get involved.]

Our central banks are isolated capitals too

The FED chairman and the FED board of appointees are just more of our parasite's inverted logic and rationalization. It is the same sort of isolation nonsense that gave us isolated capitols in Washington D.C., Bonn, Brasilia, Canberra, Ottawa, Albany, Sacramento, etc. All these places (and the Fed) are the parasite's way of doing business in our democracy.

As the Arab story goes, the US central bank, like the national capital must be protected from the corrupting influence of the people. So this is similarly isolated from the people and their democracy by a 10-year ("ten-year", not exactly for life)

appointee, an appointed US money czar (caesar), a FED chairman. All this is to maximally cut our central bank off from our national interests, leaving the parasite relatively stronger.

We are a democracy — and as a democracy, we always trust large groups and elected people more than small groups and appointees. We trust large groups of elected people over small groups of appointees in every single government circumstance where it matters. And the more the decisions matter, the more we need lots of elected officials. So our critically important central banks must always be run by elected officials, and NEVER by appointees of the non-elected administration of our 4-presidential monarchs.

Name isolation

Things in government must be named accurately. The cryptically named FED is a great example of a name that isolates the people from their government.

From now on, we are all going to call all our government institutions by their function. We are going to stop using cryptic names that hide the true nature of the thing, names like the "Federal Reserve System". We are going to call the US central bank by the name US CENTRAL BANK.

Our central bank is very important to the parasite

Running our central bank democratically is one of the most important thing we can possibly do to harm our parasite's ability to feed on our nation. Firstly, our parasite needs to keep inflation under control or its OO (Gr. oo =egg, nest egg) stops growing and starts shrinking in real terms. When this happens, the value of our parasite's fraudulently-obtained debts decline in value. Another problem (for the parasite) is that without central bank control, international currency exchange rates begin to float freely, and it grows difficult to surf metaphorical WIFE NATIONS.

If it is isolated, it is probably important

Look for other things that are isolated from the people. Maybe they are hidden behind a confusing name, or maybe they are taking place in the wilds of Alaska, or maybe they are top secret. If it is isolated, it is important to the parasite that we not get involved.

Long terms of office are a form of isolation excessive incumbency is a form of isolation

Melancton Smith, 1788.06.27

[Term limits and ten-year]

"I have frequently observed a restraint upon the state governments, which Congress never can be under: construct that body as you please. It is a truth, capable of demonstration, that the nearer the representative is to his constituent, the more attached and dependent he will be -- In the states, the elections are frequent, and the representatives numerous: They transact business in the midst of their constituents, and every man may be called upon to account for his conduct [vote]. In this state the council of appointments are elected for one year. -- The proposed constitution establishes a council of appointment who will be perpetual [i.e. no term limits] -- Is there any comparison between the two governments in point of security?"

Melancton Smith, 1788.06.25

"As the clause now stands, there is no doubt that the senators will hold their office perpetually [i.e. no term limits]; and in this situation, they must of necessity lose their dependence and

attachment to the people. It is certainly inconsistent with the established principles of republicanism, that the senate should be a fixed and unchangeable body of men. There should be some constitutional provision against this evil. A rotation I consider as the best possible mode of affecting a remedy. The amendment will not only have a tendency to defeat any plots, which may be formed against the liberty and authority of the state governments, but will be the best means to extinguish the factions [political parties] which often prevail, and which are sometimes so fatal in legislative bodies. This appears to me an important consideration. We have generally found, that perpetual bodies have either combined in some scheme of usurpation, or have been torn and distracted with cabals [secret political factions]. Both have been the source of misfortunes to the state. Most people acquainted with history will acknowledge these facts. Our Congress would have been a fine field for party spirit to act in -- That body would undoubtedly have suffered all the evils of faction, had it not been secured by the rotation established by the Articles of the Confederation. I think a rotation in the government is a very important and truly republican institution."

Strom Thurmon = Storm Thur·man = Storm Sacrifice·man

This man with a brologo matrix name served a 49-year tenure in the US Senate. What an isolated government we have.

Decentralize

Our nations should try to do what so many businesses do: Push as much management as is practical down to their subsidiaries — in other words, local government.

Decentralized democracy

We don't want our democracy isolated in a corrupt specialist town like Washington D.C. We also don't want to move it to our biggest and most expensive city either. In fact, given the state of communications today, and the security imperatives of a nuclear world, we probably don't even want a single national capital.

But we still need to have our Senators voting in person in groups, to make sure their votes are anonymous and cannot be sold. So in America, let's start with 45 Regional Voting Centers or RVC's, for each of our 10 Main-Senate sluices. They will be the following cities unless you elect otherwise

Seattle, Portland, Oakland, Sacramento, Fresno, Glendale, Riverside, Oceanside, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Denver, Albuquerque, Minneapolis, Des Moines, Kansas City, Madison, Chicago, St. Louis, Lansing, Indianapolis, Columbus, Lexington, Oklahoma City, Dallas, San Antonio, Houston, Little Rock, Baton Rouge, Jackson, Nashville, Birmingham, Atlanta, Jacksonville, Orlando, Miami, Columbia, Raleigh, Lowell (Boston), Albany, Newark, Long Island, Philadelphia, Washington City, Richmond, and Pittsburg

With all these centers, most of our elected officials will not have to move house. Most can remain with their families and commute to the weekly or bi-weekly voting sessions. Only Senators living too far away from these centers (in say Hawaii, Alaska and Montana) will not be able to commute.

Quorum for a RVC should be say 100 Main-Senators in each sluice head. This implies 1,000 Main-Senators in all 10 sluice-heads and a local electorate of around 2.5-million people. Because of quorum, it is impossible for the people of Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, and other remote parts of the nation to have RVCs given their low population. These Main-Senators (around 2,000 to 5,000 of them) will have to journey to vote, or

remain near the RVC. Every Senator living more than say a 4 hour bus ride away from their home should be provided a free 55m apartment "on campus" at the RVC. This should be fully furnished to the extent of the Cape House service apartments on Soi Langsuan in Bangkok. These apartments should all be within walking distance of the RVC — like student dorms but in the next building.

We will Establish standards for the provision of apartments. How many hours is too much for a Senator to commute to vote? It is probably a longer commute in the first years and less in later years.

Once America installs ordinary high speed wide-gauge rail infrastructure (not the boondoggle of maglev), its Senators, will have a much easier time with their regional commutes.

In more compact nations where there already exists proper national rail infrastructure, the regional voting centers will be much more convenient. Also, it would probably be wise to forever abandon Washington D.C, Ottawa, Canberra, Brasilia, etc. as a seats of government.

Units of 100 for RVC sluice heads

They need to be in units of 100. So they need to be balanced, and some people from the countryside will have to go a more distant RVC to keep the numbers balanced.

Mandatory Senate vote attendance

You will be excused if your relative or daily associate dies within 24 hours, but not otherwise. No leave shall be granted to attend a childbirth, wedding, or funeral.

Overlarge nations, the flip-side of Monarchy

I forget the exact percentage, but in Indonesia, something like 1/3 of the tax money paid to Jakarta (the nation's capital) never returns to its colonies. This is a big part of the reason why most of Indonesia remains desperately poor. It also shows what a severe parasite infection looks like. This is a nation being bled for everything that can be sucked out.

One of the things that makes Indonesia much more vulnerable to corruption is the immense size and absurd centralization of the nation's government. And here Indonesia is much like America, China, India, Pakistan, Brazil as well as the recently formed EU government. All these giant nations are helped by our parasite to be oversized and over-centralized, to maximize the proportional narrowness of the government running the nation. This serves to maximize power and income for our parasite.

Break it up

Indonesia could profit from breaking itself up into 10 or more Financially Independent Provinces (FIPs): North Sumatra, South Sumatra, West Java, Central Java, East Java, Borneo, Sulawesi, etc. Having 10 times as many state divisions will make each act of corruption 10 times less profitable. As well, the stolen money will tend to stay closer to home — instead of being shipped off somewhere far away, like to Jakarta or Arabia.

And let's not stop with Indonesia. Famously corrupt India would benefit from becoming 29 FIPs. I mean, it is pretty easy to imagine that similar incredible waste ratios exist for many overlarge and over-centralized nations. All the big countries, especially the more corrupt ones, would probably benefit a great deal from decentralizing their government operations into a number of Financially Independent Provinces. They would also be much harder to herd into war than one big

government.

All the time people say that this company or that one is just too big. What about your nation? Doesn't your nation have this insanely massive organization that should be a bunch of smaller organizations?

Break America up into 70 or 90 counties and put as much as you can under the supervision of the local county governments. Only the stuff that has to be done by as one unified effort should remain under the national government. Follow this in America and China and India and Mexico and everywhere else in the world where you have this massive "mono-lithic" parasite-friendly government.

Nation and county jurisdictions

The jurisdictions between nation and county duties shall be clearly defined and shall only be allowed to change for good reason and upon election. If we fail to do this, our government may be driven towards centralization.

With respect to national defense from foreigners, we shall be one nation. With respect to industry standards, we shall be one nation. With respect to sharing markets, industry, workers, knowledge, commerce and transportation, we shall be one nation. All national businesses shall pay a 2% national sales tax. For reasons of national competitiveness, and for long-term competitiveness, when a 50% majority of an industry or industry segment happens one city, all trade from that city, in that segment shall pay an extra 3% sales tax.

Deal with sub governments later

We will leave our state and local governments intact while we solve our national problems. Once we have settled our national problems, we can elect some of our many Sub-Senators to staff our state and local governments.

The biggest cities will have larger RVCs

This is intentional.

More Main-Senators?

If there are not enough Main-Senators, you can always expand. And it is worth repeating, don't ever let anyone tell you a 1,000 Main-Senate is too broad.

To widen the Main-Senate, we might hold the ranking vote twice a teneth, and have each Centi-Nome elevate the same number of Senators with each vote. This will double the population of the Main-Senate, and give it a 1:1,250 representation ratio.

With this number of Main-Senators you might have to 20 or perhaps 30 sluices. However, if you have too many sluices and 20 regional voting centers, there may not be enough people at some RVCs. Also if you have too many sluices, the Main-Senate might become too powerful in comparison.

Widen the role of the Sub-Senate

Try to widen the duties of the Sub-Senate, so it spends/ allocates more of the government's budget and runs more of the government.

7—POLITICAL PARTIES

Gore Vidal

"Democracy is supposed to give you the feeling of choice, like painkiller X and painkiller Y. But they are both just aspirin."

The quintessential Arab political party

Look at how the will to close your nation to foreign (Mideast) immigration is linked with genocidal types.

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

"The parties that emerged in the 1790s, the Federalists and the Republicans, were not modern parties, and... no one thought that the emergence of the parties was a good thing; indeed, far from building a party system in the 1790s, the nation's leaders struggled to prevent one from developing. The Federalists under the leadership of Washington, Adams, and Hamilton never saw themselves as a party but as the beleaguered legitimate government beset by people allied with revolutionary France out to destroy the Union. [1] Note how Washington is a Federalist. 2) The absurd propaganda of the day in America was that France, in the midst of a democratic revolution, was going to build a fleet, sail across the Atlantic and attack the US.] Although the Republicans under the leadership of Jefferson and Madison did reluctantly describe themselves as a party, they believed they were only a temporary one, designed to prevent the United States from becoming a Federalist-led British-backed monarchy." [Looking at Madison's role in the "1787 Constitutional Convention" he was with the Federalists. And apparently, the Arabs needed Jefferson for believability. Here we note how the parasite was running/influencing both puppet parties from the beginning.]

Plutarch, d. 120AD, Crassus, 7

"When all of Rome was divided between three powerful parties, Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus, it was the sober and conservative element in the city which followed Pompey, and the violent and easily unsettled types who hung on the hopes and ambition of Caesar, while Crassus took up a position between the two and made use of each." [Today the parasite has much the same position between the two political parties of the US.]

William H. (Alaska) Seward, d. 1872

[This is about the Southern "Slave Power" that was supposedly pushing America towards its civil war.]

"A [political] party is in one sense a joint stock association, in which those who contribute [the] most [money] direct the action and management of the concern. The slaveholders contributing [are] in an over-whelming proportion to the capital strength of the Democratic party, they necessarily dictate and prescribe its policy... The slaveholding class has [thus] become the governing power in each of the slaveholding states, and it practically chooses 30 of the 62 members of the Senate, 90 of the 233 members of the House of Representatives, and 105 of the 295 electors of the President"

The Slave Power and Islam's Umma

Prior to the American Civil War there was much newspaper coverage about a "Slave Power," or a "Slave Power Conspiracy." This Slave Power was supposedly set on spreading the institution of slavery, eroding the rights of free men, and dominating America's national political agenda. Here we should note the striking similarity between this so-called Slave Power in pre-Civil War America and the Mideast's power at the United Nations. It would appear that this same foreign power was working behind America's Slave Power, pushing America towards its Civil War, the deadliest war ever in terms of American lives lost.

Political parties help corrupt a democracy.

What is a political party? Is it not people with shared interests banding together to synergistically increase their power within a democracy? But do we want to allow this? I mean, does this help a democracy to more accurately measure the will of the people — or does it corrupt and subvert the measurement process for the benefit of the people who band together into political parties? And what of the non-elected party leadership? (non-elected by an official election of the people that is.) Don't we give this non-elected leadership a great deal of backdoor power within our democracies?

Today, in the United States, our political parties are able to collect immense amounts of our parasite's "soft money" and then use that money to fund campaigns and buy political influence in our democracy. In fact, this political party influence is so strong in the US that many legislators fear the financial consequences of not obeying the party line of their non-elected party leaders. Clearly this benefits the parasite and not the host.

A special sort of back door to democracy

It appears that American-style democracy was defective from the start. It was created with a special sort of back door, one that does not work for ordinary Americans, or individual American corporations. America is only truly and completely corrupt for an empire specialized and dedicated to swaying the entire special interest community. And then this can only be done profitably and continuously if the corrupting nation is also acting as an economic parasite.

We have all heard about the huge sway of foreign influences and special interest groups in Washington, and how America's corrupt campaign finance system is a back door to influencing America's Congress. And we all mostly sense that there is something wrong with America's government. Maybe we should take the final step and all admit that our American version of democracy is intensely corrupt; corrupt in that we allow money to sway our decisions at all.

Perhaps all our nation's many recent problems stem from one root problem: That America's democracy is in fact a bad democratic design and corrupt. Perhaps Washington really is run by special interest groups that are run by the land of no resources. Perhaps the oil embargo people, now immensely wealthy, have much more power to corrupt our democracy than we ever thought.

Two party politics in a nutshell

The oldest party is the right hand of the parasite, the next oldest party is the left hand of the parasite, and the third party is the party of the outsider host.

Please, everyone despise political parties

Whenever we hear the term political party, we should understand it as a tool for corruption and a backdoor to our democracy. We should all despise political parties and all those who affiliate themselves with them. They are infections and malignancies in our democracy.

My design is acceptable as a starting point

It is time for a new and better version of democracy, an initial framework that is fine as a starting point. It may not be perfect, but it is clearly better than our current democratic design.

The obvious weakness of US Vice Presidential running mates

To see our parasite's immense power over our political parties,

simply look at the selection of recent US vice presidential running mates: Dan Quayle, Al Gore, Sarah Palin, Fritz Mondale, and George Bush Sr.. All are all fine enough as administrators, but they are all definitely and obviously not acceptable as the leader of the free world.

Surely, these are not the strongest leaders our nation has to offer. Could our political parties have possibly thought that these people would help win the election? Did our political parties really think that these people would become their strongest presidential candidate in 4 years, or 8 years when they "short-listed" them as vice-presidential candidates?

Look, these Vice Presidential running mates are all remarkable for one thing: their weakness as potential president of the United States, and "leader of the free world". They are our parasite's "soft-money" vote, to keep the United States from having good leadership. These candidates all show our parasite's power over America's political parties. Our parasite is so powerful it can get us to pick weak people as vice presidential candidates. And then, if the parasite can maintain a leadership vacuum, these weak leaders will go on to be the next president, the next 4-year US figurehead monarch for their bar-ocracy.

The power of our parasite's soft money

The immense sway of "soft money" in America's political parties is felt in numerous other ways. Here are three examples:

- a) Establishment of national political agendas
- b) Selection of absurdly extremist Supreme Court justices.
- c) Many of our one-in-a million elected officials simply don't have time to review the information they are voting on; so they often just vote with their party, a party line that was often purchased with our parasite's soft money contributions.

Nathaniel Hawthorne, House of Seven Gables, 1851, Ch.1

"These gentlemen -- need you be told it? -- have assembled, not without purpose, from every quarter of the State. They are practiced politicians, every man of them, and skilled to adjust those preliminary measures which steal from the people, without its knowledge, the power of choosing its own rulers. The popular voice, at the next gubernatorial election, though loud as thunder, will be really but an echo of what these gentlemen shall speak, under their breath, at your friend's festive board. They meet to decide upon their candidate. This little knot of subtle schemers will control the convention, and, through it, dictate to the party."

Hawthorne, House of Seven Gables, 1851, Ch. 18

"These gentlemen -- need you be told it? -- have assembled, not without purpose, from every quarter of the State. They are practiced politicians, every man of them, and skilled to adjust those preliminary measures which steal from the people, without its knowledge, the power of choosing its own rulers. The popular voice, at the next gubernatorial election, though loud as thunder, will be really but an echo of what these gentlemen shall speak, under their breath, at your friend's festive board. They meet to decide upon their candidate. This little knot of subtle schemers will control the convention, and, through it, dictate to the party."

[And the parties will dictate to the nation.

- 1) Read this last underlined sentence a couple times. Here the Brothers are describing how they secretly manipulate our parties: from there it is not much of a leap to manipulating our nations into war.
- 2) Note how the Arabs focus on preliminary measures which

steal from the people, without its knowledge, the power of choosing.

3) Note who is deciding on the candidates.

4) This looks like something a well educated foreigner wrote about our political system.]

House of Seven Gables, Ch.1

"The Judge is a patriot; the fate of the country is staked on the November election; and besides, as will be shadowed forth in another paragraph, he has no trifling stake of his own in the same great game. He will do what the [party] committee asks; nay, he will be liberal [spend money] beyond their expectations; they shall have a check for five hundred dollars, and more anon, if it be needed."

America's secret ruling party

Don't think that just because our parasite can't get America's government to do just what it wants, right when it wants, that it is not exerting a great influence over our government. Most ruling parties can't do exactly what they want, when they want to.

Woodrow Wilson, US President, 1913-21

"The government, which was designed for the people, has got into the hands of the bosses and their employers, the special interests. An invisible empire has been set up above the forms of democracy."

PARTI not PARTY

Strange how our political parties are spelled with a Y when PARTI would much better describe their factional nature and help us understand the true role of our political parti-tions and political parti-als. Strange how party is synonymous with a fun get-together. Do we want this mental association? Let's instead start calling them POLITICAL PARTITIONS or better yet POLITICAL DIVISIONS instead of political parties. The term political division is intended to remind people of the fact that divided and factionalized we are weaker and our parasite stronger.

Divisive

Decisive

Deceive

Settle divisive issues first

To strengthen our nation, one of the most important things we can do is to settle divisive issues and move on with total unity. When we fail to do this, we weaken our government a great deal. The parasite struggles for the opposite, struggling to undermine our ability to move on with unity wherever it can. It wants every decision of our democracies to be appealable. It lead the charge to challenge the Brexit vote.

What happened to campaign finance reform?

A few years ago, it was widely said that campaign finance reform benefitted the Democratic Party (the party of the people ±), while harming the influence of Republican Party (the party of "our" corporations and "our" religions, "our" fictional citizens ±). Well, from 2008 to 2010, the Democratic Party had a majority in both houses of Congress, and it also had the Presidency. Shouldn't the Democratic Party have at least tried to institute some form of campaign finance reform? Shouldn't they have tried to institute even one public TV channel for communication between the candidates and the citizens? Why didn't they hold onto a tiny sliver of the digital TV spectrum

given away for free at the very same time? Any one of these measures would have shifted the entire US political continuum away from the influences of the money that is supposedly the basis of the Republican Party. This would have made America much more aligned with the objectives of the Democratic Party.

What happened to campaign finance reform? Why was there no talk of this reform? Why didn't Barack Hussein Obama, a Democrat talk about such things? Maybe it is the same reason he opposes the development of oil sands. Maybe Barack Ghassn Abana's campaign stickers should have read ARAB or MOLE instead of HOPE.

Maybe America's largest and most powerful constituency is the parasite civilization from the land of no resources. And they need to keep the backdoor open. In fact, the first priority of the people using the back door to America's Congress is to make sure that the backdoor stays open, whatever the cost.

Herman Melville, *Moby Dick*, 1851, Ch. 73

[This is not about whales, but democracies. Here we note that Martin Van Buren, US president 1837-41, was instrumental in developing America's two party system. Here we see an Arab gazette about how to use that system. And this gazette was published 10 -years after Van Buren left office.] Now, from this peculiar sideway position of the whale's eyes, it is plain that he can never see an object which is exactly ahead, no more than he can one exactly astern. ... and you may fancy... If your bitterest foe were walking straight towards you, with dagger uplifted in broad day[light], you would not be able to see him, any more than if he were stealing upon you from behind. In a word, you would have two backs, so to speak... The whale, therefore, must see one distinct picture on this side [of the political continuum], and another distinct picture on that side [of the political continuum]; while all between must be profound darkness and nothingness to him. [two political parties, each an eye.]

Man [individuals] may, in effect, be said to look out on the world from a sentry-box with two joined sashes for his window. But with the whale [government], these two sashes are separately inserted, making two distinct windows, but sadly impairing the view. This peculiarity of the whale's eyes is a thing always to be borne in mind in the fishery [when you are trying to harpoon or barb a nation with a giant nation-scale whaling scam.]; and to be remembered by the reader in some subsequent scenes.

A curious and most puzzling question might be started concerning this visual matter as touching [in relation to?] the Leviathan. But I must be content with a hint. So long as a[n individual] man's eyes are open in the light, the act of seeing is involuntary; that is, he cannot then help mechanically seeing whatever objects are before him. Nevertheless, any one's experience will teach him, that though he can take in an indiscriminating sweep of things at one glance, it is quite impossible for him, attentively, and completely, to examine any two things -- however large or however small -- at one and the same time; never mind if they lie side by side and touch each other. But if you now come to separate these two objects, and surround each by a circle of profound darkness; then, in order to see one of them, in such a manner as to bring your mind to bear on it, the other will be utterly excluded from your contemporary consciousness. How is it, then, with the whale [government]? True, both his eyes, in themselves, must simultaneously act; but is his brain so much more comprehensive, combining, and subtle than man's, that he [the government] can at the same moment of time attentively

examine two distinct prospects, one on one side of him, and the other in an exactly opposite direction? If he can, then is it as marvelous a thing in him, as if a man were able simultaneously to go through the demonstrations of two distinct problems in Euclid. ...

... it has always seemed to me, that the extraordinary vacillations of movement [Gr. Exantidromia, Gr. klonos = turmoil] displayed by some whales when beset by three or four boats [As you may recall, America was beset by more than a half a dozen distraction boats when the Arab oil embargo hoax was started. To name some, there was the Vietnam War, drugs, new sexual freedoms, Watergate, race troubles, Communism, and a great Recession.]; the timidity and liability to queer frights, so common to such whales; I think that all this indirectly proceeds from the helpless perplexity of volition, in which there divided and diametrically opposite powers of vision must involve them."

Ambrose Bierce, *Devil's Dictionary*

"Opposition, n. In politics, the party that prevents the Government from running amuck by hamstringing it.

The King of Ghargaroo, who had been abroad to study the science of government, appointed one hundred of his fattest subjects as members of a parliament to make laws for the collection of revenue. 40 of these he named the Party of Opposition and had his Prime Minister carefully instructed them in their duty of opposing every royal measure. Nevertheless, the first one that was submitted passed unanimously.

Greatly displeased, the King vetoed it, informing the Opposition that if they did that again they would pay for their obstinacy with their heads. The entire forty promptly disemboweled themselves.

"What shall we do now?" the King asked. "Liberal institutions cannot be maintained without a party of Opposition."

"Splendor of the universe," replied the Prime Minister, "it is true these dogs of darkness have no longer their credentials, but all is not lost. Leave the matter to this worm of the dust."

So the Minister had the bodies of his Majesty's Opposition embalmed and stuffed with straw, put back into the seats of power and nailed there. 40 votes were recorded against every bill and the nation prospered. But one day a bill imposing a tax on warts was defeated—the members of the Government party had not been nailed to their seats! This so enraged the King that the Prime Minister was put to death, the parliament was dissolved with a battery of artillery, and government of the people, by the people, [and] for the people perished from Ghargaroo." [G•our•g•our•oo]

An example of why we don't want political parties

In September of 2015, we saw a 'crisis' where waves of Arab refugees are trying to be considered refugees and enter the EU. The response is one of parties. Do you support the "center" party (which favors being nice to "refugees" that are 90% fighting age men), or do you support the right wing quasi-fascist parties with their dangerous racist lunatic fringe, and their Hitler skinhead types?

Look at how today in Europe, the positioning of the political parties is maximize for non-response to the immigration issue. That is not an accident. It shouts-out that the parasite controls the political spectrum, and the political dialogue of our lame 1776-era democracies. It is time for a real democracy — one without non-elected, extra-democratic,

indeed anti-democratic political parties.

Conservative and liberal

On one hand we have the Republican/ Conservative party of religions, corporations, money and the the parasite's front men establishment. On the other hand we have the Democrat/ Liberals that are a bit more the party of the host people — not much, just a little bit more the party of the host people. They are both run by the parasite, but the party of the fictional citizens and the rich is more the party of the parasite.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"both of the powerful political parties were under the domination of wealth [the wealth of the people fronting for the Arabs]. Not, to be sure, openly so, but insidiously. Differences of issue there assuredly were, but these issues did not in any way affect the basic structure of society, or threaten the overflow of any of the fundamental privileges held by the rich. The political campaigns, except that later contest which decided the eventual fate of chattel slavery, were, in actuality, sham battles..."

Both parties received the greater part of their campaign funds from the men of large property and from the vested corporations or other similar interests. Astor, for example, was always a liberal contributor, now to the Whig party and again to the Democratic. In return, the politicians elected by those parties to the legislature, the courts or to administrative offices usually considered themselves under obligations to that element which finance their campaigns and which had the power of defeating their reelection by the refusal of funds or by supporting the opposite party. The masses of the people were simply pawns in these political contests. Yet few of them understood that all the excitement, partisan activity and enthusiasm into which they threw themselves, generally had no other significance than to enchain them still faster to a system whose beneficiaries were continuously getting more and more rights and privileges for themselves at the expense of the people, and whose wealth was consequently increasing by precipitate bounds [sudden leaps]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"even bribery, like industry, became systematized and modernized. In the process, delicate externals were preserved. To ledger bribery funds as corruption money was a gross shock to fastidious taste, and was inexcusably un-businesslike. Hence, so the committee reported, bribery expenditures were classified as 'legal expenses'. The committee described them as extraordinarily large. The Mutual [an insurance company], in 1904, disbursed \$364,255; the Equitable [insurance company] \$172,698, and the New York, with Morgan's partner, Perkins, practically in command, \$204,019. This, according to the simple rules of arithmetic, made a total of more than \$750,000 spent in one year, in the corrupting of legislatures, administrative officials and certain newspaper writers. These 'legal expenses', the committee redundantly wrote, were 'far in excess of the amounts required for legitimate purposes'."

For what were these corruption funds employed? To get laws under which great [Arab] frauds could be carried on, and to prevent the passage of laws interfering with the [Arab] graft. And who were the immediate distributors of the funds? Trained, circumspect lobbyists, thoroughly experienced in the business of knowing who, when and where to bribe. They were

never stinted for money...

But the corruption neither began nor ended with the buying of legislative votes or of administrative connivance. Over and above the politicians in office were the bosses in control of the machinery of both the Republican and the Democratic parties. Those party machines could command the votes; and the orders of the men at the head called for submission [submission] by the underling politicians. Refusal brought discipline and retirement. By controlling the secret workings of the party organizations, the magnates virtually controlled the platforms of those parties, their nominees, and the general course of the men elected to office.

For one more proof of this, another dip into the report of that celebrated insurance investigating committee of 1905 will suffice. 'The insurance companies, it reported, 'regularly contributed large sums to the campaign funds of both the Republican and the Democratic parties'. [the right hand and the left hand of the Arabs.] This was no exceptional act, however [in fact]; it was the conventional order of the day; all of the great corporations did likewise. Had not Jay Gould, thirty-odd years before, explained the method? And had not other capitalists long antecedent to Jay Gould shown how efficacious it was? A present of nearly \$50,000 was contributed in 1894 by the New York Life Insurance Company to the campaign fund of the Republican National Committee, and similar amounts in 1896 and in 1900 for the same purpose. All of the large insurance companies gave contributions, not only for national political campaigns, but also for those in the States. It was found impossible to trace all of the directions of this continuous corruption. 'Enormous sums', the committee stated, 'have been expended in a surreptitious manner'.

The immense sums thus spent in political corruption were taken from the proceeds of the policy holders. With this money, mounting into millions of dollars, the magnates [fronting for the Arabs] bought their way into every State legislature in the Union. They purchased a way for themselves or for their allies into the United States Senate. And they carried their demands into both the Republican and the Democratic parties. An arraignment [arrangement] more destructive to the existing arrangement of society could not be found than was contained in the facts (and they were by no means, all of the facts) reported by that committee. The substantial conclusion was, although not set forth in so many plain words, that the administrative officials, the legislatures, Congress, the courts and the old political parties were controlled and dominated by groups of unparalleled frauds and pirates. For the sums diverted to insure this political control were only a tithe of the aggregate stupendous thefts."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"The directors or swayers of those insurance companies comprised some of the most super-eminent magnates and exalted philanthropists in the United States....

Throughout the United States the insurance disclosures... the vast, long-continuing corruptions and frauds — had called for a frenzied demand at first that the guilty be rushed to trial and imprisoned.

But that demand, if carried out, would have entailed a unique and unprecedented situation. Should all of the guilty be jailed, or even a number of them, the nation would have been deprived of many of its foremost magnates, its greatest philanthropists, its most exemplary patriots. How could society have survived such a loss? According to orthodox teachings, these men were imperative to the proper administration, and

the well being, of the whole social and industrial system. Incarcerate the great magnates, philanthropists and patriots, even though they were also the greatest plunderers? The though was impossible.

No fear of prison, however, need have been entertained by the implicated. Had not many an investigation been held before, decade after decade, almost year after year, sometimes several investigations in a single year? Had any of the rich culprits disclosed in those investigations ever gone to prison? What ground was there for supposing that this investigation would result any differently? In a society ruled by monarchy, what were courts for but to be used as a minatory instrument for enforcing the law, made by the rich, against the propertyless? What were judges for except to construe that law as the magnates who put them on the bench demanded that it be construed?"

8— CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1789

George Washington, 1776.05.31, to John Augustine Washington

"To form a new government requires infinite care and unbounded attention; for if the foundation is badly laid, the superstructure must be bad."

James Madison, 1834.03.10, to William Cogswell

"You give me a credit to which I have no claim, in calling me 'the writer of the Constitution of the United States'. This was not, like the fabled Goddess of Wisdom, the offspring of a single brain. It ought to be regarded as the work of many heads and many hands."

[Thus it appears that the current US constitution was not 'hammered out' and assembled by the men at the convention. It appears to have been written beforehand by Arabs and introduced by Madison largely in its current form.]

How was the US constitution produced?

Few Americans have a clear idea how their constitution came to be or the implications of the choices made by 38 men over the summer of 1787. Why is this subject not covered at all in US high schools?

An evolutionary ecosystem of governments

In 1787, Thomas Jefferson noted that in the 11 years since 1776, the 13 independent American colonies with their differing constitutions and legislatures had total democratic experience exceeding 143 years. What a fertile proving ground for new democratic ideas this was. New approaches were being tried at a pace that was 13 times the rate that any single democracy could achieve.

Basically under the first US constitution, the Articles of Confederation, our parasite was confronted with an impossible form of government to parasitize — at least at the state level. It also found itself with a fast evolving community of 13 democracies, represented by hard to corrupt, 1:1,200 law makers.

Decision in Philadelphia, CH.19, ISBN 978-0-345-49840-3

"The country was beset by laws that conflicted from state to state, by endless cross-claims to huge tracts of land, by complex cases involving shipping, and by the rapidly pyramiding structure of debt and credit that, after the break with England, floated over a commerce unsupported by sound currency. Americans were constantly racing into court over

their claims and counterclaims: It is safe to say that nowhere in the world were ordinary people so at home before judge and jury. Invariably, the importance of the legal profession grew, until by the time of the Revolution, lawyers were a major — perhaps the major— component of the American establishment, both in an official capacity as office-holders, and unofficially as shapers of law in the give and take of the courts. 31 of the 55 men at the [constitutional] Convention had been trained in the law. It is a commonplace among historians that the American Revolution was a "revolution of lawyers," who built their demands for freedom on legal theorizing." [I wonder what percentage of the 38 who stayed until the end and signed the constitution were professional lawyers/liars — same word you know, lawyer and liar.]

Why not have the convention in New York?

Congress met in New York until 1791, but the convention was held in Philadelphia, then a great distance away from the national capital. This prevented many of the acting Congressmen from becoming involved with the convention.

The name Philadelphia

Both the US declaration of Independence, and the 1789 US constitution were signed in Philadelphia. The old name of Amman Jordan is Philadelphia (phil•A De•al•fee•A). Also, there were 3 other ancient towns named Philadelphia. One was in Egypt between the Fayum and Nile, and two were in the south half of Turkey.

Perhaps Independence Hall is doublespeak, just like our cracked Liberty Bell that can't ring true

The devil's democracy

It is worth suggesting that American style democracy is the worst form of democracy the parasite could come up with. We follow a democracy designed to maximize the power of the non-elected administration of our presidential monarch. Look at the representation ratio pyramid. We have: A 1-in-580,000 house of representatives, vetoed by a 1-in-2.5 million senate, vetoed by the appointees of our lone president And unless the first two houses both vote 2-to-1, the presidential monarch can stop the whole system. Basically, president runs the show in America unless the congressmen in both houses oppose him by a 2-to-1 margin.

Grossly over-represented southern states

Voting at the convention was by state, so any three states had 3/13 of the vote, or 23%. The three southern states with around 4-5% of the non-slave US population had 23% of the vote at the convention. So too did the three populous states of Pennsylvania Virginia and Massachusetts, with 45% of the US population.

The over-representation of the southern states was nowhere so extreme as with Georgia 19-fold over-representation. This state had a total population of around 25,000 with around 50% being non-slave and free. Basically, Georgia had a free population that was around 0.4% of the US free population, but it had 7.7% of the convention's vote.

The big-state/ small-state ruse

Under its 1st constitution, the United States were not a nation per se, they were a confederation of 13 financially independent states. This lead to a number of inter-state problems, the most important of which was probably the problem of duties and port

fees. Here the smaller states found themselves at a disadvantage because they didn't have major international trading ports like the "big" states of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Virginia (with some 45% of the US population at the time).

The problem was that the states with ports were charging duties and port fees on all trade that cleared their ports, and this included the imports and exports from the other, "small" states. Thus the smaller states were paying taxes to the big states, and they were getting nothing in return for their money. It was for the small states a variant on colonialism with the big port states assuming the role of the British, imposing taxation without giving anything in return.

Anyway, this is why the small states (Delaware, Rhode Island, Vermont and New Hampshire) tended to favor the consolidated government of the parasite. And then once the national government started collecting all the duties and port fees and using this money for the good of all states, the idea of small states needing protection from big states stopped being a real issue and was forgotten.

It is also worth mentioning that the small-state/ big-state ruse was the main reason/excuse for having a bicameral legislature. Aside from the power issues created by small autonomous states there really is no reason for us to have a secondary house and the gridlock it induces.

Many great men of the day did not participate

Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, Samuel Adams, John Adams, John Jay, George Clinton and George Mason did not attend the Philadelphia convention that was later dubbed the constitutional convention.

Did we get democracy 100% right on the 2nd try?

You know, in 1789, America was trying something that had not been attempted for over 2000 years. On top of this, all the information we had about democracy from 2,000 years before was heavily censored by the Arabs that "luckily" preserved the writings of ancient Greece and Rome. (Recall how people often say that knowledge is power: And realize that our parasite only shares this knowledge/power for good reason.)

Strange how people think that a bunch of American bumpkins in the 1790s got their democratic design so right so fast. Strange how we all think that our democratic architecture is so great and perfect when we have clear evidence that our narrow democracy is completely corrupt. Besides, how likely is it that the ancient land of no resources was not in Philadelphia and helping to shape the new prototypical democracy in 1787?

L. **SERVIS** = slave and

Eng. **CON-SER-ATIVE** = with-slaves

L. **LIBER** = free man,

Eng. **LIBER-AL** = free-towards = the free people's way

Conservative and liberal

The very words themselves, conservative and liberal describe the relationship of parasite and host. The conservative party is the party of the parasite and its institutions, its religions, and its corporations (core-bar-ations). The liberal party is the part of the free people.

Now we all see how the so-called business and financial interests so easily fall in bed with our religions and news media? All the money here comes not from real people in our society, but from the establishment (or east-able-i-sh-mn't). It is our parasite operating through countless fictional citizens, or entities. It is Mr. P pretending to

be part of our society through so many thousands of In-core-br-ati'ns with millions of economic dependencies upon them. All of these inherently corrupt non-democratic institutions are a back door to power in our democracy, thanks to how our democracy was designed to work on campaign contributions.

How conservative is your society?

A great way to measure the Mideast parasite's influence is simply to gauge how conservative the nation is.

Everything has already been tried before

In Ralph Ketcham's introduction to the Anti-Federalist Papers, we read: "By 1787, not only had the theory of self-government been widely debated, but virtually every conceivable device for implementing it had been suggested, if not tried." Now when I read that, I thought about Al Gore insistence about how it was time to close the debate on climate science. Both are the same process of PRE-CONCLUSION by our parasite.

Now the process by which our parasite blocks all proposals until its one lame and self-serving proposal is introduced: Let's call that ANSWER DAMMING

Alexander Hamilton, The farmer refuted:

"The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for, among old parchments, or musty records [translation: there's no need to study history]. They are written, as with a sun beam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of the divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power." [These rights are not at all obvious, and they can easily be obscured.]

Was the first US Constitution of 1777 designed to fail?

- 1) It was a meta-democracy, and a majority in 7 of 13 states could be had with only 26.9% of the popular vote.
- 2) It had no way to enforce the decisions of this under-majority on the individual states.
- 3) It required unanimous approval from all states for amendment.
- 4) Its name sounds like a temporary measure: "the Articles of Confederation."
- 5) Its hard to use name seems optimized for being forgotten.

The Amazing Roger Sherman

He and George Read wanted to abolish state governments entirely. He pushed for bicameral government and proposed this as early as 1776. Sherman also came up with the Connecticut compromise, where we had one house by state, one popular house. Sherman is the man to sign all the important revolutionary documents:

Declaration of Resolves (1774), where the colonies said they would resist British power.

The Association (1774), a boycott of British goods.

Declaration of Independence (1776). He also participated in writing this document.

Articles of Confederation (1777) the 1st US Constitution.

Treaty of Paris (1783) The peace treaty with Britain calling for repayment for "British" interests lost in the war.

The 2nd US Constitution (1787)

Sherman also served in the 1st and 2nd Continental Congress sessions, (where 13 states voted), The US House of Representatives, and The US Senate. Sherman in fact, served more time in the 1st Congress of 13 states than any other delegate. At the Constitutional convention, he spoke more than anyone else, except James Madison and perhaps

Alexander Hamilton. This man was instrumental in the hijacking of US democracy.

Drafted by "your Founding Fathers"

Arch Federalist James Madison recorded the events of what would later be labeled the Constitutional Convention. In his records, George Washington spoke only once, and Benjamin Franklin (then age 81) said little. The discussion as recorded by James Madison was dominated by Federalists [Alexander Hamilton](#), [James Madison](#), [James Wilson](#), and [Gouverneur Morris](#).

39 men stayed to the end of the drafting of the current 2.0 US constitution. George Washington did not sign the constitution. Thus, there are 38 signatures on the document.

They stuffed the jury

As follows is an inventory of the 38 men who "hammered out" or "forged" the current US constitution that James Madison had largely pre-prepared. Note how there were:

17 Federalists

9 Southerners bent on saving slavery at any cost
and only 12 others

It is also remarkable how little the non-federalists are recorded as saying at the convention. Either these people were poorly represented, or they were poorly recorded, or both. For example, look at how the topic of the representation-ratio came up a couple times in the "Anti-Federalist" Papers and it was so quickly glossed over. Is this believable given the public furor the new constitution caused over the issue of the representation ratio?

F = people who leaned towards Federalism or concentrations of power, or did something that was unconscionable that signed the constitution.

S = people from slave states that signed the constitution.

N = others that signed the constitution

New Hampshire

F1) John Langdon strongly in favor of national government and wanted to end paper money

N1) Nicholas Gilman

New York

F2) Alexander Hamilton "One Gentleman alone, (Colonel Hamilton) ... boldly and decisively contended for an abolition of the State Governments. Mr. Wilson and the gentlemen from Virginia... wished to leave the States in possession of a considerable, though a subordinate jurisdiction." 1787.06.21

Robert Yates - Resigned in protest on 1789.07.05

John Lansing - Resigned in protest on 1789.07.05

Hamilton's other two New York delegates Yates and Lansing were anti-Federalists who resigned in protest in mid July. Hamilton was not authorized to vote alone. Yates published notes on the convention. However, these notes stop on July 5 when he left the convention

Massachusetts

F3) Rufus King: Spoke about the "The phantom of State sovereignty" but was for "preserving the States in a subordinate degree"

F4) Nathaniel Gorham seemed overly agreeable and easy going. A committee made up of Gorham, King, Randolph, Rutledge and Morris proposed that the 3 "wealthy" slave-owning states (they were wealthy because of their black slaves) with only around 7% of the nation's free population get

25 of the nation's 64 representatives. This is 39% of the nation's vote in the hands of 7% of its population.

Rhode Island

No delegates sent

Connecticut

F5) William Samuel Johnson He asked if the states "should retain some portion of sovereignty at least" William Samuel Johnson's father was a leading figure in the Anglican Church in America, the Church of England in America. In 1766, he was sent to England to Represent Connecticut. He was neutral during the war. He was also a get along type

F6) Roger Sherman: He and George Read wanted to abolish state governments all together.

Pennsylvania

N2) Benjamin Franklin

F7) Thomas Mifflin

F8) Robert Morris

F9) George Clymer

F10) Thomas Fitzsimons

F11) Jarred Ingersoll

F12) Gouverneur Morris was one of the richest men in America at the time, he found the financiers for the Revolutionary war: Apparently the same people profiting from it on the British side. He is quoted as saying that "the public liberty was in greater danger from legislative usurpations than from any other source", and this is of course Arab propaganda.

He proposed representation by wealth, on the notion that men of wealth ought to have a larger say in how their money was spent. He wanted aristocratic senate, a mono-elected president, not a prime minister.

He proposed that the wealth of each state, as well as population be used to determine the number of representatives. This proposal was made despite the fact that it would make his own state Pennsylvania less powerful. Also the committee of Gorham, King, Randolph, Rutledge and Morris proposed (during the constitutional convention) that the 3 "wealthy" slave-owning states (they were wealthy because of their black slaves) with only around 7% of the nation's free population get 25 of the nation's representatives as opposed to the 39 that the remainder of the nation would get. Basically with 7% of the population, the slave states were supposed to get 39% of the nation's lower legislature.

F13) James Wilson The federalist James Wilson was one of the more vocal participants at the convention. He was said to have been, "the preeminent legal scholar of his generation". He sat on the US Supreme Court and might have been the nation's first chief justice had he not borrowed a huge sum of money from Robert Morris to speculate on land. Wilson at one time owned more than 4 million acres of land, or 6,250 square miles (an area 62.5 x100 miles), and he was quite behold to his creditor Robert Morris. He said that he "[preferred a single magistrate, as giving most energy dispatch and responsibility to the office.](#)"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.4

["Many of the members of the Continental Congress were ship merchants, or inherited their fortunes from rich shippers, as, for instance Samuel Adams, Robert Morris, Henry Laurens of Charleston, S.C., John Hancock, whose fortune of \\$350,000 came from his uncle Thomas Francis Lewis of New York and Joseph Hewes of North Carolina."](#) [Many of these men were

either bros or their pawns.]

James Wilson, 1791, Lectures on Law

[the President] "is the dignified, but accountable magistrate of a free and great people. The tenure of his office, it is true, is not hereditary; nor it is for life. But still it is a tenure of the noblest kind. By being the man of the people, he is invested. By continuing to be the man of the people, his investiture will be voluntarily, and cheerfully, and honorably renewed."

The minority report of the Pennsylvania delegates to the US Constitutional Convention, 1787.12.18

"The delegates from Pennsylvania were, six of them, uniform and decided opponents to the constitution of this commonwealth".

New Jersey

N3) William Livingston

N4) David Brearley

N5) Jonathan Dayton

F14) William Paterson His legal practice made him rich. He prosecuted many people for fornication and took a very hard stance with people who participated in the Whisky Rebellion of 1794. He generally showed a strong tendency towards creditors over debtors. And like so many of the delegates that wrote our constitution, Patterson was not a traitor, but just a man with a set of ideas our parasite liked. This is shown in how on 1787.06.16 he motioned that the convention go back to the states and ask for more powers.

1777, The year of the hangman, John S. Pancake 111, Ch. 7

"in New Jersey... the state's executive body, the state Council of Safety was given virtually complete control of detecting and punishing disloyalty. It energetic attorney general, William Patterson, soon had the council traveling throughout the state, conducting its own prosecutions and rendering judgements." [This is the strangest book, for it mentions hangings almost not at all. It is as if this was the title of book that has been suppressed and replaced with another book about Revolutionary war battle history.]

Delaware

N6) Richard Bassett

N7) Jacob Broom

N8) Gunning Bedford

F15) George Read He and Roger Sherman wanted to abolish state governments all together.

N9) John Dickinson one of the nation's best known lawyers, anti slave, perhaps somewhat detached from reality judging from his statements.

1777, The year of the hangman, John S. Pancake

"Whig loyalists like John Dickinson, James Duane, and Robert Morris could not easily bring themselves to renounce loyalty to Britain."

Maryland

N10) James McHenry

N11) Daniel Carroll

F16) Dan of St. Thomas Jenifer came to the convention favoring a strong national government.

Virginia

N12) John Blair

F17) James Madison Argued for a check on "impetuous"

legislatures. He also proposed that the judiciary be appointed by the lone executive.

George Washington "I have scarcely ventured as yet to form my own opinion either of the manner in which the [the presidency] ought to be constituted, or of the authorities with which it ought to be clothed." **Did not sign constitution**

Edmund Randolph said of the first congress "they are a mere diplomatic body, and are always obsequious to the views of the states, who are always encroaching on the authority of the United States." **Did not sign constitution**

North Carolina

All Southern states would agree to anything to preserve slavery in the land of the free.

S1) Richard Dobbs Spaight

S2) William Blount The first man to be impeached in the US.

S3) Hu Williamson Suggested a small number of senators

South Carolina

All Southern states would agree to anything to preserve slavery in the land of the free.

S4) Pierce Butler not a federalist, concerned with the representation ratio, argued against a presidential veto.

S5) Charles Pickney

S6) Charles Cotesworth Pickney advocated narrow democracy, lifetime appointment, and all appointments in the hands of the lone executive. He was also pro slavery.

S7) John Rutledge He owned 26 slaves and was a business lawyer that wrote the South Carolina constitution. John Adams said of him, that he, "maintains that air of reserve, design and cunning." Rutledge is quoted as saying, "Care not who reigns, think only who rules", an incriminating remark.

Georgia

All Southern states would agree to anything to preserve slavery in the land of the free.

S8) William Few

S9) Abraham Baldwin was both a chaplain and a lawyer. He moved from Connecticut to Georgia in 1784 at age 30.

Confusing titles for vitally important things

The writing of the 2nd US constitution of 1787 was by far the most important political event of the century. It is nothing short of remarkable the way that the chronicle of this event is confusingly titled the "Anti-Federalist Papers", while the discussion of democracy leading up to this event is called the "Federalist Papers". These names have almost no memetic resonance at all. The titles look insignificant and they connect to little and infer almost nothing. These are names designed to hide and bury events of vital importance to the American people.

New names

The US Constitutional Convention Record of 1787

The Official Democracy Forum Record of the US Revolution

The Unofficial Democracy Forum Record of the US Revolution

Top secret

When the 74 men were called to product the 2nd US constitution

1) The organizers didn't say what they were doing.

2) They didn't say that a draft constitution had already been prepared.

3) They met behind closed doors

4) Despite meeting behind closed doors the Anti-Federalists

were taunted.

5) Half of the people called to attend either did not show up or walked out.

6) Most of the great names of the day did not attend.

7) The people working on the new constitution were mostly Federalists.

George Washington quoted by William Pierce in Farrand's Records of the Federal Convention of 1787

"Gentlemen, I am sorry that some one member of this body has been so neglectful of the secrets of the convention as to drop in the State House a copy of their proceedings, which by accident was picked up and delivered to me this morning. I must entreat, gentlemen, to be more careful, lest our transactions get into the news papers and disturb the public repose by premature speculations."

Delaware

Geo Read
Gunning Bedford
John Dickinson
Richard Bassett
Jacob Broom

Maryland

James McHenry
Dan of St. Thos. Jenner
Danl. Carrol

Virginia

John Blair
James Madison

North Carolina

Wm. Blout
Richd. Dobbs Spaight
Hu Williamson

South Carolina

J. Rutledge
Charles Cotesworth Pinckney
Charles Pinckney
Pierce Butler

Georgia

William Few
Abr. Baldwin

New Hampshire

John Langdon
Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts

Nathaniel Gorham
Rufus king

Connecticut

Wm. Saml. Johnson
Roger Sherman

New York

Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey

Wil. Livingston

David Brearley
Wm. Paterson
Jona. Dayton

Pennsylvania

B Franklin
Thomas Mifflin
Robt. Morris
George Clymer
Thos Fitzsimons
Jared Ingersol
James Wilson
Gouv Morris

9—FEDERALISTS AND HAMILTON

James Madison, Federalist #48, 1788.02.01

"The legislative department is everywhere extending the sphere of its activity and drawing all power into its imperious vortex."

James Madison, Federalist #45, 1788.01.26

"The powers delegated by the proposed constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the state governments are numerous and indefinite."

James Madison, Federalist #48, 1788.02.01

"173 despots would surely be as oppressive as one."

James Madison, Federalist #55, 1788.02.15

"Had every Athenian citizen been a Socrates, every Athenian assembly would still have been a mob."

James Madison, 1787.11.30, Federalist #14

"Is it not the glory of the people of America, that, while they have paid a decent regard to the opinions of former times and other nations, they have not suffered a blind veneration of antiquity, for custom, or for names, to overrule the suggestion of their own good sense, the knowledge of their own situation, and the lessons of their own experience.

[To simplify the intentionally prolix:

Americans will consider traditional ways and famous names — but they won't them overrule their own eyes, or their own common sense.]

John Adams, 1798.05.07, To the young men of Philadelphia

"Without wishing to damp[en] the ardor of curiosity or influence the freedom of inquiry, I will hazard a prediction. That after the most industrious and impartial researchers, the longest liver of you all will find no principles, institution or systems of education more fit in general to be transmitted to your posterity than those you have received from your ancestors."

[To simplify the intentionally prolix:

Not to discourage curiosity or innovation, here is a prediction. No matter how long you live, or how hard you work, you will not better ways to learn than those passed down to you. Clearly, this is the Arab agenda, and clearly it is disguised, intentionally disguised. Clearly John Adams was a mole. Adams was the first US vice president, and 2nd US president.]

John Adams, Federalist, 2nd US president

"Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy

yet that did not commit suicide." [Here we see who John Adams really is — for he sings the parasite's ancient propaganda "song" about democracy. The reason for this is of course that the Arabs are struggling with all their power against our democracy — the main thing protecting us from being enslaved by them.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.06.20, New York ratifying convention

"The state governments possess inherent advantages, which will ever [always] give them an influence and ascendancy over the National Government, and will for ever preclude the possibility of federal encroachments. That their liberties, indeed, can be subverted by the federal head, is repugnant to every rule of political calculation."

Alexander Hamilton, The farmer refuted

"The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for, among old parchments, or musty records [translation: there's no need to study history]. They are written, as with a sun beam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of the divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power." [These rights are not at all obvious, and they can easily be obscured by a poor democratic design, viz. the 2nd US constitution.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.06.21, New York ratifying convention

"This balance between the National and State governments ought to be dwelt on with particular attention, as it is of the utmost importance. It forms a double security to the people. If one encroaches on their rights, they will find a powerful protection in the other. Indeed, they will both be prevented from overpassing their constitutional limits by a certain rival-ship, which will ever subsist [always exist] between them."

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.06.24, New York ratifying convention

"While the constitution continues to be read, and its principals known, the states must, by every rational man, be considered as essential component parts of the union. And therefore the idea of sacrificing the former to the latter is totally inadmissible." [We all know how the states in our union have rather limited powers. They don't even have to power to fully legalize marijuana.]

The Federalists: Our parasite's party

We Americans all learned about the Harem brother faction in America's early government. We learned about them in high school where they were called Federalists. These were the advocates of centralized power that supposedly sought to bring many aspects of monarchy to American style democracy. I submit that every single thing they advocated was a corruption of our democracy.

Alexander Hamilton, Federalist

"It's not tyranny we desire; it's a just, limited, federal government." [Apparently people at the time were accusing Hamilton of trying to institute a tyranny.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.03.14, Federalist 69

"Energy in the executive [president or elected monarch] is a leading character in the definition of good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attacks. It is not less essential to the steady administration of

the laws; to the protection of property against those irregular and high-handed combinations which sometimes interrupt the ordinary course of justice; to the security of liberty against the enterprises and assaults of ambition, of faction, and of anarchy."

Alexander Hamilton

"Why has government been instituted at all? Because the passions of man will not conform to the dictates of reason and justice without constraint." [This is simply not true because most people will obey the laws of common sense without government. This is the parasite speaking. It needs to impose its inverted will over its secret subjects. It needs us to be constrained by its debt laws, and its runaway slave laws, and its laws of slander. It needs us to respect for its reprehensible monarch front men. And most of all it needs to hold weapons over its subjects so they obey its inverted and destructive will.]

Alexander Hamilton, arch Federalist

The Federalists were lead by Alexander Hamilton (c.1756-1804), a frizzy haired man that John Adams called "a creole bastard." As the story goes, Hamilton was an orphan from the St. Croix in the West Indies: So we imagine that Hamilton probably had an unusual accent like so many harem brothers.

This story is that a rich benefactor had noticed Hamilton as a young man and sponsored the 16-year-old's college degree at Columbia University. At age 19, Hamilton wrote a series of influential political papers. When the war came he studied up on artillery and at around age 21, he found himself serving under the George Washington then age 44.

Hamilton also worked closely with Gouverneur Robert Morris the richest man in America at the time, and the main financier or financial conduit of the Revolution. Morris was one of the 37 men who participated in writing the new 2.0 constitution of 1787, the current US Constitution. During the convention, Morris proposed that the wealth of each state, as well as population be used to determine the number of representatives. Also the committee of Gorham, King, Randolph, Rutledge and Morris proposed that the 3 "wealthy" slave-owning states (they were wealthy because of their black slaves) with only around 7% of the nation's free population get 25 of the nation's representatives as opposed to the 39 that the remainder of the nation would get. Basically with 7% of the population, the slave states were supposed to get 39% of the nation's primary house.

Hamilton was a major force, an apparently relentless force in shaping the prototypical democracy for the modern world. He pushed over and over again, often times absurdly, for a narrower, more centralized and easier to parasitize form of democracy. Hamilton was 32 at the time of the convention. After the war, Hamilton also lead an unsuccessful drive to make George Washington the king of the United States, this despite that practically nobody in America was royalist at the time.

Hamilton incidentally did not look like the man on the new \$10 bill. He was darker and far more Middle Eastern looking. Anyway, in your own pocket, you can see the Mideast ministry of truth at work — endlessly modifying the truth, here trying making Hamilton more European looking. This is remarkable in light of the great desire of many Americans in recent years to find more pigmented American heroes.

Alexander Hamilton, the real force behind American

democracy?

Was the famously reticent George Washington another A•lex•ander = no•word•man fronting for Hamilton? Clearly Hamilton was George Washington's right hand man during the Revolutionary War and then afterwards, he became Washington's leading cabinet minister, his Secretary of the Treasury. In fact, Hamilton wielded so much power in the Washington administration, that Thomas Jefferson (then the secretary of state) resigned in protest in 1794 over Hamilton's foreign policy maneuvering.

Now again, Hamilton was always trying to make our democracy narrower and more plutocratic, the objective of the Brothers. In fact, Hamilton's vision of a regulated economy is remarkable for its early proffering of modern bureaucracy. We can learn much about our parasite's objectives by looking at Hamilton's proposals, and what he stood for; and we should in general strive to go in the exact opposite direction.

George Will

"If you seek Hamilton's monument, look around. You are living in it. We honor Jefferson, but live in Hamilton's country, a mighty industrial nation with a strong central government."

Alexander Hamilton, federalist

"It is not [true] tyranny we desire;
it is a just, limited, federal government."
[a gentle form of tyranny]

Alexander Hamilton, 1787.06.26

"Real liberty is neither found in despotism or the extremes of democracy, but in moderate governments [tyrannies carefully disguised as democracies] -- if we incline too much to democracy, we shall soon shoot into a monarchy."

Thomas Jefferson, non-federalist

"A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government..."

Thomas Jefferson, non-federalist

"Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves are its only safe depositories."

Thomas Jefferson, non-federalist

"A Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government, and what no just government should refuse or rest on inference."

Thomas Jefferson, non-federalist

"The republican is the only form of government which is not eternally at open or secret war with the rights of mankind."

James Madison, federalist

"War should only be declared by the authority of the people, whose toils and treasures support its burdens, instead of the government which is to reap its fruits."

Anti-Federalist Papers, 21 June 1787

"The great objection made against an abolition of the state governments was that the general [national] government could not extend its care to all the minute objects which fall under the

cognizance of the local jurisdictions."

James Madison, 1788.01.25, Federalist 44

"What is to be the consequence, in case the Congress shall misconstrue this part [the necessary and proper clause] of the Constitution and exercise powers not warranted by its true meaning? I answer the same as if they should misconstrue or enlarge any other power vested in them... the success of the usurpation will depend on the executive and judiciary departments, which are to expound and give effect to the legislative acts; and in the last resort a remedy must be obtained from the people, who can by the election of more faithful representatives, annul the acts of the usurpers.

[1] The necessary and proper clause is a total back door to the constitution for it allows the US government to do anything it deems necessary or proper.

2) My constitution does not have necessary and proper clause.

3) Note how ridiculous Madison's logic is.

4) Why argue in favor of a necessary and proper clause unless you are trying to install a back door?

5) If congress votes to halt elections, there is no way to oust our government at the next election. So the final argument is nonsense.

6) Making disgraceful lawyer-ish arguments like this should make a person incredible and unbelievable for a long time, especially if they are a professional arguer, salesman, or speaker.]

James Madison, Federalist

Much of modern democracy is credited as flowing from James Madison:

1) Madison wrote a systematic study of governments through the ages, a study that explained which systems had worked, and which had failed and why.

2) Madison wrote the definitive diagnosis of the first US constitution, a document called "The Vices of the Political System of the United States," confusingly nicknamed "Madison's Vices". The dominant theme of Madison's Vices is not so much the defects of the first US constitution, but oddly the problems or grievances people had with the various state governments. Top among these were laws "oppressing" the creditor minority fronting for our parasite.

3) Madison wrote the definitive chronicle of the closed-door, pledged-to secrecy, Philadelphia convention: A convention that would after the fact be named the US Constitutional Convention of 1787.

4) Madison is also widely regarded as the father of the US constitution, having prepared much of this document prior to the "Constitutional Convention."

It is certainly worth asking if Madison did what so many congressmen do today — introduce someone else's draft bill as his own. Only in this case, we are not talking about merely a bill, but a whole new constitution.

Here we must note that Madison was only 24 in 1776 and only 35 in 1787. He was very shy and very softly spoken in person. In fact, history records a number of his contemporaries remarking about on how Madison's real life character was so very different from what his character seemed in his writing. Here we must ask if Madison and D'ali M•adi•s•on were a front men like Edward Gibbon. (See also Madison's 'Ancient and modern confederacies'.)

James Madison, 1788.02.01, Federalist 48

"The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judicial, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many,

and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

(1) Surely power is more accumulated in the hands of one man than 500, or 50,000.

2) Which leader accumulates more power, the hereditary monarch serving for 3 lifetimes, the man who serves for life, the man who serves for 8 years, or the man who serves for one year.

3) Where is power more concentrated: Under the Mafia appointee, or under the guy who won an election?]

Confusing titles for vitally important things

The writing of the 2nd US constitution of 1787 was by far the most important political event of the century. It is nothing short of remarkable the way that the chronicle of this event is confusingly titled the "Anti-Federalist Papers", while the discussion of democracy leading up to this event is called the "Federalist Papers". These names have almost no memetic resonance at all. The titles look insignificant and they connect to little and infer almost nothing. These are names designed to hide and bury events of vital importance to the American people

New titles for historical documents

The US Constitutional Convention Record of 1787

The Official Democracy Forum Record of the US Revolution

The Unofficial Democracy Forum Record of the US Revolution

Top secret

When 74 men were called to product the 2nd US constitution

1) The organizers didn't say what they were doing.

2) They didn't say that a draft constitution had already been prepared.

3) They met behind closed doors

4) Despite meeting behind closed doors the Anti-Federalists were taunted.

5) Half of the people called either did not show up or walked out

6) Most of the great names of the day did not attend

7) The people working on the new constitution were mostly Federalists.

Federalist mole John Jay

The swarthy looking John Jay was also a "Founding Brother" like Alexander Hamilton. Look at his 1794 treaty with the English where he offered that the US government cover all losses to the "British" interests. This included the British trade monopolist, the East India Company (really our parasite in disguise). Here it is worth noting that Jay is responsible for the treaty clause that paid the East India Company back for the tea dumped into Boston harbor during the Boston Tea Party.

Also look at the Jay Gardoqui Treaty where Jay absurdly agreed to suspend all US shipping on the Mississippi river for 25 years. Jay incidentally was the first US Supreme Court chief justice from 1789 - 95, indicating how this institution (with its 9 lifetime appointees) has been corrupt, like our monarchic presidency, from the very beginning. Also see John Adams and his stuff-the-federal-courts "midnight judges"; and how he called Thomas Paine's ideas a "star of disaster".

John Jay, Federalist, 1785.03.24

"I wish to see all unjust and unnecessary discriminations everywhere abolished, and that the time may come when all our inhabitants of every color and discrimination shall be free and equal partakers of our political liberties." [From this quote

we see that John Jay, John Adams and Alexander Hamilton all probably suffered racial discrimination and were not treated equally. If they were from European stock they would not have suffered this discrimination. And if they were from African or indigenous American stock, they would probably not have been allowed to participate in government. These were all men from another category, men from somewhere else that still suffered some discrimination.]

Ralph Ketcham

"Madison favored executive appointment, fixed salaries, and life tenure to shield judges from legislative intrigue and popular sentiment."

Anti-Federalist Papers, 1787.06.08

"Mr Madison... could not but regard an indefinite power to negate [veto] legislative acts of the States as absolutely necessary to a perfect system. Experience had evinced [shown] a constant tendency in the States to encroach on the federal authority; to violate national Treaties; to infringe on the rights and interests of each other"

Ralph Ketcham

"The Revolutionary struggle against the government of George III left even constitutional monarchy in ill-repute in America. (Many leaders, however, including at times John Adams and Alexander Hamilton, continued to think it [monarchy] theoretically the form most likely to insure freedom and good government.) Equally discredited was 'mere democracy' which still meant, as Aristotle had taught, rule by the passionate, ignorant, demagogue-dominated "voice of the people." This was sure to produce first injustice, then anarchy, and finally tyranny."

Anti-Federalist papers, June 7, 1787

[Here are the supposed anti-federalists, the people who are supposed to be against the centralization of power. Here they are discussing how to select a secondary house for the new paradigm of modern democracy. Apparently there was one puppet master for both sides]

"Mr. Williamson preferred a small number of senators, but wished that each State should have at least one. He suggested 25 as a convenient number. The different modes of representation in the different branches, will serve as a mutual check.

Mr. Butler was anxious to know the ratio of representation before he gave any opinion.

Mr. Wilson: If we are to establish a national Government, that Government ought to flow from the people at large. If one branch of it should be chosen by Legislatures, and the other by the people, the two branches will rest on different foundations, and dissensions [gridlock] will naturally arise between them. ...

Mr. Read proposed that the Senate should be appointed by the Executive Magistrate [the president, or rather his bar*ocracy] out of a proper number of persons to be nominated by the individual legislatures." He said he thought it his duty, to speak his mind frankly. Gentlemen he hoped would not be alarmed at the idea. Nothing short of this approach towards a proper model of Government would answer the purpose, and he thought it best to come directly to the point at once. ...

Mr. Madison: If the motion should be agreed to, we must either depart from the doctrine of proportional representation; or admit into the Senate a very large number of

members. The first is inadmissible, being evidently unjust. The second is inexpedient. The use of the Senate is to consist in its proceeding with more coolness, with more system, and with more wisdom, than the popular branch. Enlarge their number and you communicate to [give] them the vices which they are meant to correct. He differed from Mr. Dickinson, who thought that the additional number would give additional weight to the body. On the contrary it appeared to him that their weight would be in an inverse ratio to their number. The example of Roman Tribunes was applicable They lost their influence and power, in proportion as their number was augmented. The reason seemed to be obvious: They were appointed to take care of the popular interests and pretensions at Rome, because the people by reason of their numbers could not act in concert; were liable to fall into faction among themselves, and to become a prey [foreigner english] to their aristocratic adversaries. The more the representatives of the people therefore were multiplied, the more they partook of the infirmities [weaknesses] of their constituents, the more liable they became to be divided among themselves either from their own indiscretions or the artifices of the opposite faction, and of course the less capable of fulfilling their trust.

When the weight of a set of men depends merely on their personal characters; the greater the number the greater the weight. When it depends on the degree of political authority lodged in them the smaller the number the greater the weight. [Rubbish] ...

Mr. Wilson: The subject... is surrounded with doubts and difficulties. But we must surmount [overcome] them. The British government cannot be our model. Our manners, our laws, the abolition of entails [hereditary estates] and of primogeniture [eldest son gets everything], the whole genius of the people, are opposed to it. We have no materials for a similar one [democratic government]. He did not see the danger of the States being devoured by the national government. On the contrary, he wished to keep them from devouring the national government ... He could not comprehend in what manner the landed interests would be rendered less predominant in the [nation's] Senate, by an election [a second double-checking election] through the medium of the [state] Legislatures than [directly, in one huge step] by the people themselves. ... He was for an election by the people in large districts which would be most likely to obtain men of intelligence and uprightness; subdividing the districts only for the accommodation of the voters."

FEDERALISTS = eff•ed•our•al•ist = shout•educate•our•towards

The great Federalist name switcheroo

Another kooky thing about the drafting of the U.S. constitution is in the way that the Federalist political-party name was redefined by 180° — redefined into its exact opposite in around 1787. Prior to this time, the FEDERALISTS pushed for a more decentralized constitution where more power rested with the states and less with the nation's capital. Prior to this time, the NATIONALISTS pushed for more centralized power and less state power. However, after 1787, the Nationalists in a most confusing way (typical of our parasite) started calling themselves by the name of their opposition, the FEDERALISTS, the party advocating less centralization of power. And it under this hugely confusing state of affairs that the America's Constitutional Congress sat down to write the U.S. constitution.

This switcheroo was necessary because, our young

nation had just revolted against the centralized "British" authority fronting for Mideast Inc. And at the time, most Americans had seen little if any benefit and much tax cost from the great centralized British power they had just overthrown. As a consequence, most Americans of the 1780s did not want a strong national government. In fact, they wanted barely more than anarchy for their raw and self-reliant frontier nation.

For these "British" taxes, direct and indirect see the Navigation Acts, the Sugar Act, the Stamp Act, the Stamp Act Congress of 1765 in New York, Townshend Duties, and the Tea Act that lead to the Boston Tea Rebellion. Also see the Declaratory Act of 1776.

All should note that the tea dumped into Boston Harbor was not being sold by the British government but by the world's great infiltrative parasite which had bought the monopoly from the corrupt British government, complete with military protection. Here see clearly what the American revolution was in terms of the two great, eternal and "immortal" group spirits of mankind. On one hand we had this ancient empire from the land of no resources quietly, secretly infiltrating governments and cultivating empires (here Britain) to conquer or destroy the new anarchic rebel bases (to borrow a term from Star Wars mythology) that pop up every few centuries.

Anyway, the Brothers, the founding Brothers desperately needed a way to sneak a more centralized constitution through in a land that was dead set against centralization. What better way than to relabel the centralization party as the decentralization party and then move quickly before too many of the electorate realized what had happened.

How the Federalists were perceived

People of the day said that the new 1787 Constitution was the product of lawyers working for the rich aristocratic/royal interests that America had just rebelled against. And these were of course free to have their say in the land where freedom of speech reigned. But few if any American bumpkins of the day realized that the Arabian harem brothers from the land of no resources were standing behind these aristocratic/royal interests.

And little doubt, few realized that their government's Federalist leadership (Hamilton, Adams, Jay, Burr) were actually harem brothers.

And few realized that these harem brothers had used techniques perfected over thousands of years to quietly eliminate all opposition in the decades leading up to the revolution.

And few realized that the home team were carefully chosen ornaments — men like Madison, Washington, Franklin and Jefferson.

And few realized that the entire American enterprise began under the behind the scenes top-level management of the parasite.

A fake political spectrum

Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Adams, John Jay and the other Federalists offer a vivid lesson about fake political spectrums. And there is much history about all the figures. It will serve well as a prototype by which you may recognize other fake spectrums of the parasite.

And would we have tolerated these Federalists running the assembly of American democracy if not for the existence of:

- 1) The great general above all others George Washington,
- 2) The great inventor above all others Benjamin Franklin,

- 3) The great explainer of common sense, Thomas Paine,
- 4) The great defender of our liberties Patrick Henry,
- 5) And most of all, the one great opponent of the Federalists Thomas Jefferson.

The Arabs needed to keep these 5 disunited men for credibility, and so they could eliminate all the other smart people who came along and offered any potential threat.

From Ralph Ketcham, *The Anti-Federalist Papers*, introduction

[The following is a wink-wink how-to guide about the switcheroo.]

"The ratification struggle began with a clever move by the proponents of the new constitution: Since sentiment in the country was hostile to the idea of a national government and preferred a confederation [of independent states], or federation (the words were synonymous in the 1700s), the proponents called themselves 'federalists', even though the new document was not, strictly speaking, a federation [of states], a league of [independent] governments, as the old Articles [of Confederation] were. In fact the new constitution, as Madison explained carefully in Federalist No. 39, was a 'composite' ... [However] By taking the popular word 'federal' to denote the new constitution, its backers gained an important 'image' victory for themselves. The word 'federal' came eventually to mean the form of government embodied in the new Constitution just as 'confederation' came to mean the more strictly, 'league of states' idea of the Articles of Confederation and eventually the 'Confederacy of 1861-1865. The foes of ratification, moreover, were left with the negative designation, 'anti-federalists.' (The term 'federalist' here, uncapitalized, refers to the proponents of the new constitution, 1787-1789, and is a different group from the political party formed in the 1790s, called 'Federalist,' usually capitalized.)

Important backers of the new constitution, most notably Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, returned to New York (where the [13-member] Articles of Confederation Congress was in session) to organize their campaign for ratification. With Hamilton taking the initiative, he, Madison, and John Jay agreed to write a series of essays for New York newspapers explaining and defending the new Constitution. They used the pseudonym 'Publius,' the legendary law-giver of the Roman republic extolled by Plutarch, in addressing 'the People of the State of New York.' ... At the time, however, readers did not know who 'Publius' was, and [unfortunately for their cause] saw the Federalist as a comprehensive, single-minded advocacy of the [new] Constitution. At the same time, [a big propaganda campaign of] other federalist essays and speeches appeared in the newspapers. And the major antifederalist series of essays, 'Centinel,' 'Cato,' Brutus,' and 'The Federal Farmer,' came out initially in Philadelphia and New York newspapers, and were soon reprinted throughout the country." [Here our parasite engaged in two propaganda campaign. On one hand it skillfully argued for a single national government that was easy for it to manage: On the other hand it ineptly argued against that government.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.03.07, *Federalist #65*

"If mankind were to resolve to agree in no institution of government, until every part of it had been adjusted to the most exact standards of perfection, society would soon become a general scene of anarchy, and the world a desert." [Here we recall Al-Core saying:

'It...is...time...to...close...the...debate...on...climate...change.' Same process at work, same bunch of government infiltrating

moles.

- 1) The Arabs pretend to be one side of a debate in our nation.
- 2) They silence all credible opposition.
- 3) They close the debate.
- 4) They win by nobody else presenting an alternative.]

James Madison, 1833, letter to unidentified correspondent

"It has been said that all Government is an evil. It would be more proper to say that the necessity of any Government is a misfortune. This necessity however exists; and the problem to be solved is not what form of government is perfect, but which of the forms is least imperfect."

Thomas Paine, Letter #2 to the Citizens of the United States, 1802

[Paine was born in England and this was not written by a native English speaker]

"Are those men federalized to support the liberties of their country or to overturn them? To add to its fair fame or riot on its spoils? The name [Federalist] contains no defined idea. ... In the history of [political] parties and the names they assume, it often happens that they finish by the direct contrary principles with which they profess to begin [they professed at their beginning] and thus it has happened with Federalism.

During the time of the old Congress, and prior to the establishment of the [US] federal government, the continental belt was too loosely buckled. The several states were united in name but not in fact, and that nominal union had neither centre nor circle [periphery]. The laws of one state frequently interfered with, and sometimes opposed, those of another. Commerce between state and state was without protection, and [without] confidence without a point [of law] to rest on. The condition the country was then in, was aptly described by Pelatiah Webster, when he said, "thirteen staves and ne'er [without] a hoop will not make a barrel."...

As many thousands who were minors are grown up to manhood since the name of Federalist began, it became necessary (for their information) to go back and show the origin of the name [Federalist], which is now no longer what it originally was. ... To them it served as a cloak for treason, a mask for tyranny. Scarcely were they placed in the seat of power and office, than Federalism was to be destroyed, and the representative system of government, the pride and glory of America, and the palladium of her liberties, was to be overthrown and abolished. The next generation was not to be free. ... Among the men of this apostate description, is to be ranked the ex-president John Adams. ... I have had doubts of John Adams ever since the year 1776. In a conversation with me at the time, concerning the pamphlet Common Sense, he censured it because it attacked the English form of government. John was for independence because he expected to be made great by it; but... his head was as full of kings, queens, and knaves, as a pack [deck] of cards. ...

When a man has a concealed project in his brain that he wants to bring forward, and fears will not succeed, he begins with it as physicians do by suspected poison. Try it first on an animal. If it agree[s] with the stomach of the animal, he makes further experiments, and this was the way John took. His brain was teeming with projects to overturn the liberties of America, and the representative system of government, and he began by hinting it in little companies [to small groups of people]. The secretary of John Jay, and excellent painter and a poor politician, told me.... that... John Adams talked of making the government hereditary, and that as Mr. Washington had not children, it should be made hereditary in the family of Lund

Washington..." [The Brothers can say anything at all about a "dead" Brother. In fact this is often a good idea because it helps hide how he was part of an harem brother conspiracy to parasitize the world — the one great secret that must never be said.]

Thomas Paine, Letter #4 to the Citizens of the United States, 1802

"The Spanish proverb says, "there never was a cover large enough to hide itself"; and the proverb applies to the case of those [Federalist] papers and the shattered remnant of the faction that supports them. The falsehoods they fabricate, and the abuse they circulate, is a cover to hid something from being seen, but it is not large enough to hide itself. It is a tub thrown out to the whale to prevent its attacking and sinking the vessel. The want to draw the attention of the public from thinking about, or inquiring into, the measures of the late administration, and the reason why so much public money was raised and expended; and so far as a lie today, and a new one tomorrow, will answer this purpose, it is answers theirs. ...

He that picks your pocket always tries to make you look another way. ... Now the man that has his hand in your pocket, does not care a farthing whether you believe what he says or not. All his aim is to prevent your looking at him; and this is the case with the remnant of the Federal[ist] faction. ..." [Again, we see blame storming and escape-goating that hides the the parasite.]

Star Trek, 1968, The squire of Gothos

"A matched set [of flintlock pistols] just like the pair that slew your heroic Alexander Hamilton." [Someone apparently want this event to seem real to the American people.]

Alexander Hamilton's duel with Vice President Aaron Burr

In the book Founding Brothers, Alexander Hamilton's dueling death was presented with extremely vivid imagery. It was also placed right in the beginning of the book where it would be the only part of the book read by most people. Now it is just a hunch, but this account seems like propaganda. Also of note is how Hamilton's son also died in duel shortly before him. We have to wonder if their deaths were faked and they went back to the Arabian harems to live out their days.

Andrew Hamilton, 1735, The cause of liberty

[Hamilton, age 79 traveled from Philadelphia to New York to speak for John Zenger who was charged with seditious libel when his paper the New York Weekly Journal printed something critical of government.]

"I labor under the weight of many years, and am borne down with great infirmities of body. Yet old and weak as I am, I should think it my duty, if required, to go to the utmost [farthest] part of the land, where my service could be of any use in assisting to quench the flame of prosecutions upon informations [— These] set on foot by the [British] government to deprive a [the] people of the right of remonstrating [protesting], and complaining too, of the arbitrary attempts of men in power. [These are] Men who injure and oppress the people under their administration [and] provoke them to cry out and complain. And then [they] make that very complaint the foundation for new oppressions and prosecutions. I wish I could say there were no instance of this kind. But, to conclude, the question before the court, and you gentlemen of the jury, is not of small nor private concern. It is not the cause of a poor printer, nor of New York alone, which you are now trying. No. It may in its consequence, affect every free man that lives

under British government on the main continent of America. It is the best cause. It is the cause of liberty. And I make [have] no doubt but your upright conduct [on] this day, will not only entitle you to the love and esteem of your fellow citizens, but every man who prefers freedom to a life of slavery. [These] will bless and honor you as men who have baffled the attempts of tyranny. And, by an [your] impartial and uncorrupt verdict, [you will] have laid a noble foundation for securing to ourselves, our posterity, and our neighbors that to which nature and the laws of our country have given us a right — the liberty of both exposing and opposing arbitrary power (in these parts of the world at least) by speaking and writing truth.

[Andrew Hamilton was a big name in the cause of American independence when he died in 1741. The Harem bro Alexander Hamilton (born c.1755), little doubt got a political leg up when he adopted his surname in the mid 1770s.]

Optional -- may be skipped

Thomas Paine, Letter #5 to the Citizens of the United States, 1803

"Religion and war is the cry of the Federalists: Morality and Peace the voice of the Republicans. The union of Morality and Peace is congenial; but that of Religion and War is a paradox, and the solution of it is hypocrisy. [This was the old Republican party of the early 1800s]

The leaders of the Federalists have no judgement; their plans no consistency of parts; and want of consistency is the natural consequence of want of principle.

The exhibit to the world the curious spectacle of an Opposition without a cause, and conduct without a system.

The late attempts of the Federal leaders in Congress... to plunge the country into War [which would be profitable to the Arabs], merits not only reproach but indignation. It was madness, conceived in ignorance and acted in wickedness.

A neglect of punctuality in the performance of a treaty is made a cause of war by the Barbary [anagram of Arrabby or Arabi] powers, and of remonstrance [strong objection] and explanation by civilized powers. The Mahometans [Mohammed'uns, Muslims] of Barbary negotiate by the sword — they seize first, and expostulate [talk] afterwards. And the federal[ist] leaders have been laboring to barbarize the United States by adopting the practice of the Barbary States, and this they call honour. ... The world would be in continual quarrels and war, and commerce [would] be annihilated, if Algerian policy was the law of nations. ...

The conduct of the Barbary powers, though unjust in principle, is suited to their prejudices, situation, and circumstances. The crusades of the church to exterminate them fixed in their minds, the un-obliterated belief that every Christian power was their mortal enemy.

...Why was it, that America, formed for happiness, and remote by situation and circumstance from the troubles and tumults of the European world, became plunged into its vortex and contaminated with its crimes? The answer is easy...

The country, during the time of the former Administration [of John Adams], was kept in continual agitation and alarm. And that no investigation might be made into its conduct, [because] it entrenched itself within a magic circle of terror, and called it a SEDITION LAW. Violent and mysterious in its measures and arrogant in its manners, it affected to disdain information, and insulted the principles that raised it from obscurity...

The country was put to great expense. Loans, taxes, and standing armies became the standing order of the day.

The militia, said Secretary Pickering, are not to be depended upon, and 50,000 men must be raised. For what? No cause to justify such measures has yet appeared. No discovery of such a cause has yet been made. The pretended Sedition Law shut up the sources of investigation...

...The military measures that were proposed and carrying on during the former administration, could not have been for their object that defense of the country against invasion. This is a case that decides itself; for it is self evident, that while the war raged in Europe, neither France nor England could spare a man to send to America. The object, therefore, must be something at home, and that something was the overthrow of the representative system of government, for it could be nothing else. ...

If the former administration can justify its conduct, give it the opportunity. The manner in which [US President] John Adams disappeared from the government renders and inquiry the more necessary. He gave some account of himself, lame and confused as it was, to certain eastern wise men who came to pay homage to him on his birthday. But if he thought it necessary to do this, ought he not to have rendered and account to the public? They had a right to expect it of him. In that *tete-a-tete* account, he says, "Some measures were the effect of imperious necessity, much against my inclination". What measures does Mr. Adams mean, and what is the imperious necessity to which he alludes?

The suspicion against the late Administration is, that it was plotting to overturn the representative system of government, and that it spread alarms of invasions that had no foundation, as a pretense for raising and establishing a military force as the means of accomplishing that object.

The law, called the Sedition Law, enacted, that if any person should write, or publish, or cause to be written or published, and libel (without defining what a libel is) against the Government of the United States, or either house of congress, or against the President, he should be punished by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars, and by imprisonment not exceeding two years.

But it is a much greater crime for a president to plot against a Constitution and the liberties of the people, than for an individual to plot against a President"

Optional -- may be skipped

Thomas Paine, Letter #3 to the Citizens of the United States, 1802

"Had America been cursed with John Adam's hereditary Monarchy, or Alexander Hamilton's Senate for life, she must have sought, in the doubtful contest of civil war, what she now obtains by the expression of public will. And appeal to elections decides better than an appeal to the sword.

The Reign of Terror that raged in America during the later end of the Washington administration [1789-1797], and the whole of that of Adams [1797-1801], is enveloped in mystery to me. That there are men in the government hostile to the representative system, was once their boast, though it is now their overthrow [Hamilton and his son both "died in duels" not two years later.] and therefore, the fact is established against them. But that so large a mass of the people should become the dupes of those who were loading them with taxes in order to load them with [Arab enslavement] chains, and deprive them of the right of election, can be ascribed only to that species of wildfire rage, lightened up by falsehood, that not only acts without reflection, but is too impetuous to make any.

There is a general and striking difference between the genuine effects of truth itself, and the effects of falsehood

believed to be truth. Truth is naturally benign; but falsehood believed to be truth is always furious. The former delights in serenity, is mild and persuasive and seeks not the auxiliary aid of intervention. The latter sticks at nothing. It has naturally no morals. Every lie is welcome that suits its purpose. ...

What has become of the mighty clamor of French invasion, and the cry that our country is in danger, and taxes and armies must be raised to defend it? The danger is fled with the faction that created it, and what is worst of all, the money is fled too. ..."

Optional -- may be skipped

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

Hamilton and the making of a fiscal-military state

"Despite periodic biographies and occasional op-ed tributes in the Wall Street Journal, it seems unlikely that Hamilton can ever acquire a warm place in the hearts of most Americans. [His actions were far too reprehensible] Wall Street might erect a statue in his honor, but it is doubtful that an elaborate Hamilton Memorial will ever arise in the District of Columbia. ...

Many present-day liberal Democrats might find Hamilton's vision of a positive Leviathan state very appealing, but they would surely be turned off by his *realpolitik* view of the world, his desire to maintain a large standing army and build a strong military state, and his doubts about democracy.

('Democracy,' Hamilton said in 1804, was 'our real Disease,' one that was poisoning the American 'Empire.') Most present-day Republicans, for all their enthusiasm for Hamilton's vision of a powerful military machine, do not want a Leviathan state that manages the economy and taxes people. So for the foreseeable future, Hamilton seems to have few friends among those who would use the founders to further their particular causes. Perhaps he was right when he lamented a few years before his death at the hands of Aaron Burr [1st mention] 'that this American world was not made for me.'...

Hamilton was born in Nevis in the British West Indies in 1755 (though Hamilton thought he had been born in 1757). Because his father, James Hamilton, the younger son of a Scottish laird [lord] who had come to the Caribbean to make his fortune as a merchant, and his mother, Rachel Lavien [L'avian, a lofty-minded harem daughter], were not legally married, Hamilton's birth was illegitimate, a blemish that his later enemies never let him forget. John Adam's sneering comment that Hamilton was the 'bastard brat of a Scotch pedlar' [a scotch is a wheel stop] was only one of the more colorful reminders of his disreputable origins. After his father abandoned the family in 1765 and his mother died in 1768, the fourteen-year-old Hamilton ended up keeping the books for a merchant in St. Croix, yearning all the while for a war [struggle, jihad] in order to escape from what he called his 'groveling condition of a clerk ... to which my fortune, etc, condemns me.' This passion for war, jarring as it may be to us in the 21st century, is an important clue to Hamilton's temperament and to the aristocratic world in which he lived.

It was not a war, however, but the support of patrons that rescued him from the West Indies. Like many of the founders, he first attracted attention by something he had written, in his case a colorful description of a hurricane published in the local newspaper in 1772. A Presbyterian clergyman and other West Indian friends decided to send the promising young man to New York for an education. By the next year, Hamilton was on his way to America. he never looked back.

Although he preferred Princeton to King's College

(later Columbia) because it was 'more republican,' President John Witherspoon of Princeton would not let him take the accelerated program that he wanted, so Hamilton entered King's College as a special student in the fall of 1773. Still a teenager, he began contributing pieces on the patriot side of the deepening crisis with Great Britain, including in 1774 and 1775 two long, impressive pamphlets. With the outbreak of hostilities between Britain and the colonies in 1775, Hamilton at last had the war that he had longed for. By early 1776 he had become a captain of a New York artillery company.

After serving with distinction as an artillery officer with the Continental army and impressing his superiors, he was promoted in March 1777 at the age of 22 to lieutenant colonel and appointed to the staff of the commander in chief, General George Washington, as an aide de-camp. Washington took to the young man at once and developed a fatherly affection toward him. Yet the relationship had to have had its moments of tension, for Hamilton was too touchy about his honor for it to remain harmonious. [2nd mention of dueling] Early in 1781 Washington expressed some anger at Hamilton's 10-minute delay in presenting himself, saying, 'I must tell you sir that you treat me with disrespect.' Hamilton declared that he was not conscious of any disrespect, but exhibiting his hair-trigger temper, he resigned on the spot as Washington's aide. An hour later a remorseful Washington tried to patch things up, but the proud 26-year old Hamilton would have none of it. [This meant that Hamilton controlled the relationship.]

Hamilton stayed on Washington's staff until a replacement aide could be found, all the while pleading with the commander in chief to give him a field command. When he threatened to resign his commission, Washington finally relented and at the end of July 1781 gave Hamilton the command of a New York light infantry battalion — just in time of the young commander to participate in the siege of Yorktown [where the British surrendered and the war ended, thus Hamilton never really saw much battle.] So eager was Hamilton to show his scorn for death and earn military honor at Yorktown that he openly paraded his battalion in front of the enemy lines, leading one of his subordinate officers later to complain that Hamilton was an officer who 'wantonly exposed the lives of his men.' Finally, after more pleading, he had his opportunity for glory, and on October 14, 1781, Hamilton led a successful bayonet night attack on a British redoubt; naturally [‘history’ records that] he was first over the enemy parapet, shouting for his men to follow. [This is because history of the day written mostly by harem brothers.]

Because he was raised in the West Indies and came to the North American continent as a teenager, Hamilton had little of the emotional attachment to a particular colony or state that the other founders had (when Jefferson talked about 'my country', he meant Virginia). Hamilton was primed to think nationally, and from the outset of the Revolution he focused his attention on the government of the United States. [Why talk about this idea except as justification propaganda? Apparently people ask why Hamilton did all the things he did. Some lies speak the truth with perfect clarity — like when the crook somehow knows what the police are looking for] As early as 1779, even before the war was over, Hamilton was writing long, thoughtful letters to prominent Americans about the defects of the Confederation and that ways for reforming it. Not only, he said, did the Congress need the power to tax, but the government required 'a proper executive' [monarch]. Congress itself could never exert 'energy', a word that he and Washington both came to value. 'It is impossible such a body, numerous as it is [with a broad representation ratio] constantly

fluctuating [with its annual terms that defy infiltration] can ever act with sufficient decision or with system. Two thirds of the members, one half the time, cannot know what had gone before. These calls for a stronger central government were soon expanded and published in a series of impressive essays entitled 'The continentalist' in a New York newspaper.

In 1782 the New York Assembly elected Hamilton, at age 27, one of its representatives to the Confederation Congress. There he met [one of the other frontmen of his cause. The Arabs love to have blue-eyed friends in high places] James Madison of Virginia, and a fruitful collaboration for the strengthening of the national government was born. This partnership led from the stymied efforts to add to the powers of the Confederation in the early 1780s to the Annapolis Convention in 1786, then to the Philadelphia Convention in 1787, and finally to the production of The Federalist, the 85 essays written in New York in 1787 and 1788 in support of the Constitution that have become a classic of American political thought. [The so-called Anti-Federalist papers are many times longer, and more "organic" and of the people, written by dozens of regular citizens like Patrick Henry.] It was Hamilton who conceived of The Federalist and talked to Madison and John Jay into helping him. Because of illness, Jay wrote only 5 papers. Of the remainder, Madison wrote 29 and Hamilton 51. [Hamilton perhaps wrote the entire thing judging from the following comment.]

Although the hand of each author can often be uncovered by the pseudonym Publius, it is remarkable how much the essays assume a consistent tone. [Why bother to say this if not to hide something?] The authors were not political theorists but working politicians. They were trying to express not what they truly believed about the Constitution, but what would best counter the Anti-Federalist arguments against it. During the Philadelphia Convention Hamilton had proposed a president and a senate elected for life and had declared that the British government was 'the best in the world' and that 'he doubted much whether any thing short of it would do in America'. But in the ratification of debates in 1787 and 1788 he hid whatever doubts he had about the proposed Constitution and made the strongest case he could for it. In his respect he was no different from his collaborator Madison, the so-called father of the Constitution, who believed at the end of the convention that the final document differed so much from his original plan that it would inevitably fail. [1] Hamilton probably wrote the constitution. [2] They seem to have introduced a complete version at the start of the convention. [3] This probably did not change very much. and [4] All of this is probably claimed or inferred somewhere in the historical record.]

By 1789, at age 34, Hamilton was on the verge of his greatest accomplishments. He had risen fast and married well, to Elizabeth Schuyler, daughter of one of the most important families of New York. He impressed everyone he met. Although he was short — about five feet seven — and slight in build, his excitable nature commanded attention, and men and women were readily attracted to him. To Catherine Schuyler, the youngest of the Schuyler sisters, he 'exhibited a natural, yet unassuming superiority'. With a 'high expansive forehead, a nose of the Grecian mold, a dark bright eye, [one eye] and the lines of a mouth expressing decision and courage', he had 'a face never to be forgotten'. But it was his ready grasp of statecraft that really impressed. The worldly French politician and diplomat Talleyrand [the Harem brother behind Napoleon, just as Hamilton was behind Washington], who knew kings and emperors and spent some time in the United States in the

mid-1790s as a refugee from the French Revolution, actually ranked Hamilton over [the Brotherly fronts] Napoleon and William Pitt as the as the greatest statesman of the age.

In September 1789 President Washington appointed Hamilton secretary of the treasury. It was almost a preordained choice. Washington's confidants like Robert Morris, the financier of the Revolution, knew that Hamilton was the best man for the job, but it was Washington who most wanted him as secretary of the treasury. Like many revolutionary army officers, Washington and Hamilton had experienced the war from the center and had developed a continental perspective and passion for the union that neither ever lost. Although the two men had similar realistic assumptions about human nature [This implies that Washington was a Harem Bro] and shared a common outlook on the future of the United States, it was actually Washington's sensitive appreciation of his surrogate son's brilliance together with his careful handling of Hamilton's extremely high-strung and arrogant nature that ultimately made their very successful collaboration possible.

As secretary of the treasury Hamilton was the most important minister in the new administration. In emulation of Britain's first lord of the treasury, Hamilton saw himself as a kind of prime minister to Washington's monarch-like presidency. He sometimes even talked about 'my administration'. Because he believed that 'most of the important measures of every government are connected with the treasury', he felt justified in meddling in the affairs of the other departments and in taking the lead in organizing and administering the government.

Unlike Jefferson as head of the State Department and Henry Knox as head of the War Department, Hamilton as secretary of the treasury had an extraordinary degree of authority and independence. President Washington treated Jefferson and Knox as only advisers and often immediately involved himself in the conduct of foreign affairs and military matters. He treated Hamilton very differently partly because he knew little about public finance but also because he believed the Treasury Department was constitutionally different from the other departments. When Congress created the departments of State and War in 1789, it simply declared that the secretaries were to perform such duties as the president required. When it created the Treasury Department, however, it made no mention of the president and instead required the secretary to report directly to the Congress. Unwilling to encroach on the authority of Congress, Washington thus gave Hamilton a much freer hand in running the Treasury than he gave the other secretaries.

Emboldened in this way, Hamilton began interfering in the legislative business of Congress. Indeed, one of the reasons the House of Representatives in the early Congress dispensed with standing committees was that it soon came to rely on the heads of the executive departments, in particular, the secretary of the treasury, to draft most of its bills. [So it was Hamilton that was writing and introducing laws on behalf of Washington.] At the end of July 1789 the House of Representatives set up a Committee of Ways and Means to advise it on financial matters, but on September 2, 1789, the Treasury Department was created. On September 11 Alexander Hamilton was appointed secretary of the treasury, and six days later the House discharged its Committee of Ways and Means, stating that it would rely on Hamilton instead for its financial knowledge. Not until 1795, after Hamilton's resignation from the Treasury Department, did the House reestablish its Ways and Means Committee.

Hamilton set out to do for America what early 18th-century English governments had done in establishing Great Britain as the greatest [front-man] power in the world. Hamilton greatly admired the English constitution, the English constitution as it was — unreformed. Jefferson recalled a dinner party in 1791 in which he, Hamilton, and John Adams were present. In the course of the conversation someone mentioned the English constitution, at which Adams observed, 'Purge that constitution of its corruption, and give to it's popular branch equality of representation, and it would be the most perfect government ever devised by the wit of man'. At that point, said Jefferson, 'Hamilton paused and said, 'purge it of it's corruption, and give to it's popular branch equality of representation, and it would become an impracticable government: as it stands at present, with all it's supposed defects, it is the most perfect government which ever existed. With such a startling statement, surely designed to provoke both Adams and Jefferson, Hamilton was only echoing the realistic observation of David Hume. For Hume the Crown's minister's use of money and patronage to influence members of Parliament, whether or not called 'by the invidious appellations of corruption or dependence', was simply a necessity if the Crown were to carry out its responsibility for government the realm, [that particular realm of Mideast Inc.]

Hamilton was nothing if not a hardheaded realist, and in the 1790s he set out to do what the successful 18th-century British ministers had done, in effect, to 'corrupt' the society for the sake of stable government. He sought to use monarchical-like government influence both to tie the leading commercial interests to the government and to create new hierarchies of interest and dependency that would substituted for what he believed was the lack of virtue [parasite virtues] in America.

Hamilton knew there were many men in America — merchants, speculators, stockjobbers [Arab innies] and others — who were eager only to make money off the government. Even though these moneyed men may have been selfish schemers, the new government, he believed, needed their support, in deed needed the support of all the influential people at the top of society, whatever their character or level of virtue and disinterestedness. In traditional 1700s fashion, Hamilton saw these few at the top extending their influence and patronage down through the various levels and degrees of the society. Hamilton, like most Federalists, assumed that politics was largely a matter of securing the support of these influential gentry patrons at the top. Capture these few, he thought, and a statesman inevitably captures the whole society.

The way to do so was to appeal to the interest of these few influentials. Interest—there was no better or firmer tie between people. He had known that from his earliest years at King's College and had repeated it ever since. 'Men will pursue their interest,' he said in 1788. 'It is as easy to change human nature, as to oppose the strong current of the selfish passions. A wise legislator will gently divert the channel, and direct it, if possible to the public good'. This realistic view of human nature was one of the ties he had with Washington. Although Hamilton assumed that nearly everyone else was self-interested (Washington was an exception), he himself always remained extraordinarily scrupulous in maintaining his personal disinterestedness and freedom from corruption. Let others, including congressmen, become 'speculators' and peculators', [peculate= to embezzle or steal public funds, from L. Peculium=the slave's private property.] he said, but not he; he would be, as he put it in one of his mocking moods, one of those 'public fools who sacrifice private to public interest at the certainty of ingratitude and obloquy'. [ob=against + loqui =

speak] He would stand above all the interested men and harness and use them [to appear totally virtuous while doing the work of the people from the land of no resources].

Although he later and rather defensively denied that he had ever made interest 'the weightiest motive' behind his various programs, there is no doubt that he meant to strengthen central authority and the Union 'by increasing the number of ligaments between the Government and the interests of Individuals'. Hamilton's financial program, like all his measures, was designed not to make money for any particular group [except the invisible parasite] but to create a great and powerful nation-state [a Rome-like heavy to front for the parasite]. Like all the great European state builders before him, he aimed to use the powerful tool of patronage.

He and the other Federalists sought to form throughout the country rings of local interests loyal to the government. In communities up and down the continent Hamilton and other Federalist leaders used patronage of various sorts to create hierarchies of support for the new government. Unlike the practice of the states, where thousands of state, town, and country public functionaries were elected, all executive and judicial offices in the federal government, except for the president and vice president, were appointed, not elected. As early as 1782 Hamilton had foreseen the importance of the federal government's having this immense power to appoint all its own officers. The goal of such appointments, said Hamilton, was 'to create in the interior of each State, a mass of influence in favor of the Federal Government'. Force alone could not support the government, and besides, its use was disagreeable and unpredictable. 'It will be wise to obviate the necessity of it', he wrote. Building support for the government could best be done 'by interesting such a number of individuals in each State, in support of the Federal Government, as will be counterpoised to the ambition of others, and will make it difficult to unite the people in opposition to the first and necessary measures of the Union.

When he became head of the Treasury, Hamilton had hundreds of officials to appoint and was thus in a prime position to carry out his aim [of helping the Mideast with its objectives.] Since these customs officials, revenue agents, and postmasters were located in every large town and section of the United States and touched every aspect of economic life in America, they were important for building support for the new government, even among former opponents of the Constitution.

Although Hamilton denied being a monarchist, Gouverneur Morris later recalled that he was 'on Principle opposed to republican and attached to monarchical Government.' ... His model for the United States in the 1790s was the monarchical society and government of England... In time American society would naturally become more hierarchical and more unequal... he saw England's eighteenth-century experience as an object lesson for the new government of the United States, and he deliberately set out to duplicate England's great achievements in stabilizing its society and mobilizing its resources for waging war.

By the eighteenth century England had ... become the most stable and most dominant military and commercial power in the world. that this small island on the northern edge of Europe with a third of the population of France was able to build the greatest empire since the fall of Rome was the miracle of the age, even surpassing the astonishing achievement of the Netherlands in the previous century. The 18th-century English 'fiscal-military' state, in historian John Brewer's apt term, could mobilize wealth and wage war as no

state in history ever had. Its centralized administration had developed an extraordinary capacity to tax and to borrow from its subjects without impoverishing them. Hamilton saw that the secret of the Hanoverian monarchy's success was its system of centralized tax collection and its funded national debt together with its banking structure and its market in public securities. For a state to wage war successfully, it had to tax efficiently and borrow cheaply. As the new secretary of the treasury aimed to copy Britain's success and turn the United States into a great power that would eventually rival Britain and the other European states on their own war-making terms. Hamilton and Washington thought this might take up to 50 years. ...

Hamilton proposed that the United States government assume the obligation of paying not just for the federal government's debts resulting from the Revolutionary War but all the state's debts as well — with the expectation that the creditors would be weaned away from the states and attached to the new national government. But then instead of the national government's immediately retiring either these assumed state debts or the Confederation's debts, he urged that it 'fund' them — that is transform them into a more or less permanent debt on which annual interest would be regularly paid. ...

Hamilton's funding program, especially the federal government's assumption of the state debts, met with stiff opposition in the 1790 Congress.[same paragraph] At the same time another issue in the Congress — locating a permanent seat for the federal capital — had become as contentious as the assumption of state debts. The southern states [with around 5% of the nation's population] wanted the capital on the Potomac. The New England states and New York wanted to retain the capital in New York, and the middle states wanted it in Philadelphia or at least near the Susquehanna. Fearful of disunion [with the underpopulated southern states], people on all sides were ultimately willing to compromise. At a dinner arranged by Jefferson in June 1790 Hamilton and Madison clinched a deal in which southerners accepted the national assumption of the state debts in return for placing the permanent capital on the Potomac. [a win-win situation for the southern states] ...

Hamilton envisioned the United States becoming a great powerful nation like Great Britain and the other states of modern Europe, a state with a centralized bureaucracy, a professional standing army, and the capacity to wage war on equal terms with other nations. ... Hamilton had nothing but contempt for the pie-in-the-sky dreams of the Republican [small r] leaders that the natural sociability and moral sense of people might substitute for interest and the force of government as adhesives in holding society together. The idea, he said, that 'as human nature shall refine and ameliorate by the operation of a more enlightened plan' based on the operation of common moral sense and the spread of affection and benevolence, government eventually 'will become useless, and Society will subsist and flourish free from its shackles', was a 'wild and fatal.. scheme'. ...

Hamilton and other intensely engaged men sought desperately to protect their reputations from the ever-increasing scurrility and personal abuse of the time. The politics of the early national period, as historian Jo•anne B. Free•man has shown, can be properly understood only within this culture of personal reputation and honor. Despite the emergence of political parties in the 1790s, politics still remained very much an aristocratic matter of individual loyalties and enmities subsumed by the gentlemanly code of

honor, at the heart of which lay dueling. Dueling was an elaborate political ritual the negotiations of which among principals and their seconds and friends often went on for weeks or even months. These complicated political procedures resulted in many duels, most of which did not end in exchange of gunfire.

Hamilton acutely conscious of his honor and sensitive to every slight was the principal in eleven affairs of honor during his lifetime. At one point during the heated struggle with Jeffersonian Republicans over Jay's Treaty in 1795, he issued two challenges within minutes of each other and, waving his fist in the air, even offered 'to fight the Whole Detestable faction on by one'. Despite participating in all these affairs of honor, however, he actually exchanged fire in only one, his last fatal duel with Aaron Burr in 1804. ...

Many Americans, including the president, thought that Hamilton and the High Federalists had been bent on establishing a regal government [a monarchy] allied with Britain with Hamilton at its head. There is no evidence of that, but certainly Hamilton's plans for an imperial America were out of touch with the realities of his world in 1800. Two centuries later, however, these plans do not seem so bizarre. Hamilton would be right at home in the present-day United States and present-day world. He would love our government's vast federal bureaucracy, its sprawling Pentagon, its enormous CIA, its huge public debt, its taxes beyond any he could have hoped for, and especially its large professional military force with well over a million men and women under arms spread across two oceans and dozens of countries. America has at last created the kind of powerful worldwide empire he could only dream of. In this sense Hamilton may truly be 'the man who made modern America'."

Stop accepting Hamiltons

Or better yet use them as a platform for expressing what you think about this "founding father".

10— PROTOTYPE DEMOCRACY

Thomas Paine, 1776, Common Sense

"The cause of America is in a great measure the cause of all mankind."

George Washington, 1779.03.31, to James Warren

"Our cause is noble; it is the cause of mankind!"

Thomas Paine, 1776, Common Sense

"We have it in our power to begin the world over again."

Thomas Jefferson, 1821.09.21, to John Adams

"The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776, have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism. On the contrary, they will consume those engines and all who work them."

Thomas Paine, 1777.09.11, The American Crisis #4

"We fight not to enslave, but to set a country free, and to make room upon the earth for honest men to live in."

John Adams, 1776.06.03, to Patrick Henry

"The dons, the bashaws, the grandees, the patricians, the sachems, the nabobs, call them what names you please, sigh and groan and fret, and sometimes stamp and foam and curse, but all in vain. The decree is gone forth, and it cannot be

recalled, that a more equal liberty than has prevailed in other parts of the earth must be established in America."

Decision in Philadelphia book

"When the 9th state ratified, all across the union there were enormous celebrations, parades, fireworks, bonfires, huge ship models 20 or 30 feet long towed through the streets, speeches, joy. There was a sense everywhere among Americans that they had done something grand and glorious, something that would endure and light a lamp for the rest of the world to follow." [Read the underlined a few times.]

Decision in Philadelphia, Ch 23

[American style narrow] "Democracy is an exceedingly fragile instrument. In the years since 1787 it has failed far more frequently than it has succeeded. In this century alone, democracy has gone under at one time or another in Germany, Spain, Italy, Russia; in numerous of the new nations in Africa and Asia; in many of the older nations of South America. Human beings continue to find it difficult to work out ways of governing themselves, and even today the majority of them live under autocratic governments, which reach deep into their daily lives. Democracy, with its attendant freedoms, has generally proven hard to achieve and even more difficult to maintain." [1] Thanks to the efforts of the parasite. 2) Note the underlined foreigner English. 2) Note how frequently democracy has "gone under".]

Anti-Federalist papers, 1787.06.26

"Mr. Hamilton... concurred with Mr. Madison in thinking [that] we were now to decide for ever the fate of Republican Government; and that if we did not give to that form due stability and wisdom, it would be disgraced and lost among ourselves, disgraced and lost to mankind for ever. [this seems like our parasite's objective, to disgrace, disgrace democracy for another 1,800 years]. He acknowledged himself not to think favorably of Republican Government, but addressed his remarks to those who did think favorably of it, in order to prevail on them to tone their Government as high as possible. He professed himself to be as zealous an advocate for liberty as any man whatever, and trusted he should be as willing a martyr to it though he differed as to the form in which it was most eligible [desirable]."

America: the corrupt model for all modern democracies

If America's democracy is profoundly corrupt and the UN's democracy is also profoundly corrupt, what about less democratic governments in the rest of the world? What about the UK, Germany, China and Japan and Russia among other nations?

And if we Americans living in the "land of the free", can't even get humanity's great parasite out of our government, how can we expect much from China, Russia Pakistan, and India — nations, that have traditionally lived as impoverished and frequently purged Arabian slave states?

Benjamin Franklin, 1777.05.01

"It is a common observation here that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own."

Thomas Paine, Common sense p.15

"Tis not the concern of a day, a year, or an age. Posterity are virtually involved in the contest, and will be more or less affected, even to the end of time ... The least fracture now will

be like a name engraved with the point of a pin on the tender rid of a young oak. The wound will enlarge with the tree, and posterity read it in full-grown characters."

John Jay, being equi-vocal

"[We are] the first people whom heaven has favored with an opportunity of deliberating upon and choosing forms of government under which they should live."

"Democracy" sweeps the world

The way the entire world went democratic so fast, that may be an indication of our parasite realizing something: That it was better to have a world full of democracies in name alone, than in fact and in deed.

Alexander Hamilton being equi-vocal

"No man in his senses can hesitate in choosing to be free, rather than a slave."

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"**Liberty**, n. One of Imagination's most precious possessions."

Thomas Paine, Letter #5 to the Citizens of the United States, 1803

"a country that had the fairest opportunity that Providence ever gave, within the knowledge of history ... of making itself and illustrious example to the world."

George Washington, 1796.01.01, to Pierre Auguste Adet

"My anxious recollections, my sympathetic feelings, and my best wishes are irresistibly excited whensoever, in any country, I see an oppressed nation unfurl the banners of freedom."

George Washington, 1789.04.30, to First Inaugural Address

"The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican model of government, are justly considered deeply, perhaps as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

George Washington, 1775.10.09, to Patrick Henry

"my aim has been... to comply strictly with all our engagements foreign and domestic. But to keep the United States free from political connections with every other country."

[If we had only expressed an opinion about

Robespierre, we might have averted the Reign of Terror in France. If we had only expressed an opinion about Napoleon, we might have averted his deadly wars. Free men should stick together and trust the judgement of other free men. In fact, once the killing has started, and their brightest lights have been put out, they might want to lean towards trusting the other nation, especially if it has democratic cred.]

Were they utterly without ambition?

To me, one of the most glaring ways to see the matrix is in how the US never really did or even said anything to help either the French or the Poles with their revolutions. And look at how George Washington's policy is a total reversal of the Idea that democracy would sweep the world. Why not encourage it once asked, if the royal hold on power was so weak? Why not put out contracts on royals with torturous punishment? In a broad-enough democracy there is nobody to strike back against. We could simply sweep away all monarchy, and oligarchy worldwide

The three that would be free: America, France and Poland

Many people are aware of how democracy swept France in the wake of the American revolution. And many are aware of the way this was subverted into a reign of terror where France lost some 30,000 of its brightest people in the guillotine. Then after this, France was marched off a cliff in the name of liberating Europe—twice.

We must all recognize however, that the Arabs brought about a similar disaster in Poland. Basically Poland declared a democratic constitution in 1791 and 3 months later, Russia, Germany, Russia and Austria invaded and partitioned Poland until the end of WWI. The Arabs also apparently found it convenient to leave the people of Poland to be free for two decades between WW1 and WW2. Then, once they had figured out who all the smart ones were, they arrested and killed them — or sent them to the harems as breed mares.

11— FIGUREHEAD WASHINGTON

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

"If any single person was responsible to establishing the young Republic on a firm footing it was Washington. He was nearly as much of an aristocrat as the United States ever produced, in his acceptance of social hierarchy and his belief that some were born to command and most to obey."

Euripides, Rhesus, 105

"If only there were a man whose [political] judgement matched his deeds in battle. But it is not human nature that the same man should know everything. Different men have different gifts. One is a fighter, others give shrewd counsel."

Ammianus Marcellinus, on Roman Emperor Valens, d. 378 AD

"He was better at choosing between different options than coming up with them." [Here someone is talking about a Roman front-man emperor, describing how his administration manipulated him.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 56.47

"These were the decrees which were passed...nominally by the Senate, but in fact by Tiberius... This was because some men made one suggestion and some another, and finally the Senate decreed that Tiberius should be sent the Senate proposals in writing and he should select whichever he preferred."

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

[Of George Washington and the "cabinet secretaries" we imagine he] "kept careful records and communicated regularly with his department heads, to whom he delegated considerable authority. Yet he always made it clear that they were merely his assistants and responsible to him alone. Although he surrounded himself with brilliant advisers, including Hamilton as secretary of the treasury and Jefferson as secretary of state, he was always his own man and determined that the government speak with a single voice. Lacking the genius and the intellectual confidence of his advisors, he consulted them often and moved slowly and cautiously to judgement, but when ready to act, he acted decisively, and in the case of controversial decisions, such as his acceptance of Hamilton's Bank of the United States or his Proclamation of Neutrality in 1793, he did not second-guess himself. By filling out the executive and making it efficient and

responsible, he made the presidency [and its non-elected bar-ocracy] the dominant branch of the new government.

Washington knew that whatever he did would set precedents for the future."

His Highness, the President of the United States

Even before the 2nd US constitution was ratified by all the states, the Federalists, led by Vice President John Adams started to make up elaborate rules to surround the presidency with the trappings etiquette of monarchy, even establishing formal levees or receptions where the President (and his non-elected administration) would receive petitioners. In fact, in 1789, John Adams even proposed addressing the president as "His Highness, the President of the United States of America, and Protector of their Liberties". It is also notable how George Washington at times referred to himself in the third person as do some monarchs. Also, Alexander Hamilton addressed Washington as "Your Excellency." On top of this, the Federalists even managed to pass legislation that paid the president (George Washington) \$25,000/year, around 1% of the federal budget at the time.

When word of these practices got out, they were denounced as the beginnings of the "American Court". The backlash forced the Federalists to back off in a number of ways and use the current title: "Mr. President" instead. Here we see our parasite angling to set up the US president as an elected monarch, and clearly we all know who has always been behind all the monarchy, pomp and ceremony that isolated the host society from its figurehead leaders.

(Also note how Adams used the plural "their" in referring to the 13 united states above. The people seem to have still regarded themselves as 13 independent states. at the time.)

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

"talk of royalizing the new Republic continued and heightened the fears of many Americans. Monarchy after all implied much more than simply the presence of a single ruler. It meant a large bureaucracy, a standing army, authority exercised from the top down, and numerous devices for extracting men and money from the society in order to wage war. The financial program of Secretary of the Treasury Hamilton, with its funded debt and Bank of the United States, was modeled on that of the British monarchy [fronting for our parasite]. Indeed, like the British ministers of His Majesty George III's government, Hamilton sought to use patronage [the granting bar-ocratic positions in government] and every other source of influence to win support for his and Washington's programs. To many other Americans, however, it looked as if British monarchical corruption had spread to America.

Because of these very real apprehensions of monarchy and monarchical corruption, the first decade or so under the new American Constitution could never be a time of ordinary politics. In fact, the entire period was wracked by a series of crises that threatened to destroy the national government that had been so recently and painstakingly created. The new expanded Republic of the United States was an unprecedented political experiment, and everyone knew that."

America's potential founding fathers were probably vetoed

Our parasite could easily see what was developing in America a century before 1776. The Brothers saw how their Navigation Acts of the 1650s were not working thanks to the A-mer-rican (no seas richer) spirit of more and better. They also saw how

the British front Empire lacked both popular support, and the moral high ground for imposing trade restrictions in support of the privately-owned (Arab front) companies that had purchased trade monopoly franchises from the British crown.

We therefore must assume that America's brightest and most troublesome minds were being carefully master-baited (think fish and bait) and quietly eliminated in one way or another. (Yet another problematic thing for the parasite hidden under either the sacred or profane.)

The elimination of these people delayed the inevitable revolution and made the constitution of the new democracy much more manageable. This permitted the Harem Brothers to eventually impose a narrow and easy to corrupt democracy dominated by a single presidential monarch operating far from all the nation's population centers.

So please people, don't assume that America's illustrious "Founding Fathers" were all that brilliant. As with any other time in history, the really brilliant people who entered government were mostly eliminated one way or another, and eliminated as quickly as possible — before they started attracting too much notice and became hard to kill.

Our parasite needs figureheads

Without grand figureheads that are larger than life, many people will tend to rise to become actual leaders and this quickly becomes a problem for our parasite. So our parasite needs believable figureheads. It needs men like Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Reagan, Bush, Nixon, and Clinton.

George Washington, international celebrity

Washington was such an international celebrity that when the infamous French Bastille prison was stormed during the French Revolution of 1789, they sent him the key.

John Adams talking about George Washington

[That] "He was too illiterate, unlearned, [and] unread for his station and reputation is equally past dispute."

George Washington

"The marvel of all history is the patience with which men and women submit to burdens unnecessarily laid upon them by their governments." [Funny how this quote doesn't make much sense for GW as 'father of the US'. Funny how it makes perfect sense for GW as figurehead for the parasite.]

George Washington, 1778.08.20, to Thomas Nelson

"The hand of providence has been so conspicuous in all this, that he must be worse than an infidel that lacks faith, and more than wicked, that has not gratitude enough to acknowledge his obligations."

George Washington, 1789.04.30, to First Inaugural Address

"No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand [of Arabs Inc.] which conducts the affairs of men more than the people of the United States. Every step, by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation, seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

[1) Here the parasite gloats. 2) This sounds a bit like Hamilton.]

George Washington to Henry Lee

"Whensoever I shall be convinced the good of my country requires my reputation to be put at risque; regard for my own fame will not come in competition with an object[tive] of such magnitude."

Douglass South-hall Freeman

[George Washington was] "too zealously attentive to his prestige, his reputation and his popularity—too much the self-conscious national hero and too little the daring patriot." [In fact, Washington frequently wrote people asking for advice on how to proceed.]

Ammianus Marcellinus, on Roman Emperor Valens, d. 378 AD

"He was better at choosing between different options than coming up with them."

George Washington, Farewell Address, 1796.09.19

"Guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism."

[And if Washington was just a figurehead, this might have been quite amusing to those using him.]

1777, The year of the hangman, John S. Pancake

"Washington made it clear that he preferred officers who were gentlemen. He was appalled at the New England custom of electing their commanders and he insisted that an officer set himself apart from his men"

The great man who wouldn't be king

George Washington resigned from power twice: Once as general at the end of the revolutionary war, and once as president at the end of his term. These acts made Washington great, noble and selfless. However, they did not qualify him to vouchsafe the new 1787 US constitution.

Now we must ask: Was Washington qualified to design a democracy? The Federalist papers say that he said not one word during the convention. Doesn't this disqualify him from vouchsafing the new constitution?

Also, we see ample evidence that Washington was quite concerned with his perception in the proto-media of the day. Might he have just gone along with his man-behind-the-man Hamilton, the dominant figure in the 1787 Philadelphia convention?

John Adams talking about George Washington

[That] "He was too illiterate, unlearned, [and] unread for his station and reputation is equally past dispute."

Thomas Jefferson on George Washington

[His] "talents were not above mediocrity" and "He had neither copiousness of ideas nor fluency of words."

Jacques Pierre Brissot on George Washington

"His modesty is astonishing" "He speaks of the American [revolutionary] war and of his victories, as if they were things he had not command over."

George Washington, founding figurehead?

People today are puzzled by the tall handsome George Washington. He was described by the proto-media of the day as having a commanding presence. We also know he was a good dancer, and was obsessed with the latest fashions. Yet he also talked very little and apparently expressed few great thoughts. He spoke no foreign languages. People of the time said things like he was "ill at ease with abstract discussions and a poor speaker". Some described him as shy or modest and lacking self-confidence, and many people who met him were disappointed. Washington also had no smashing military victories and his military strategy was seldom described as

brilliant. As well, the final years of the Washington administration were viciously criticized by his contemporaries.

It is definitely worth asking if the famously a-lexic George Washington, the greatest hero of the American Revolution was yet another a-lexic Alexander the Great, a dullard hero, serving as a front-man for Alexander Hamilton.

Gore, Quayle, Bush, and Washington

It is worth asking if all these leaders of the false anarchy of the land of the free are cut from the same cloth.

The courageous George Washington

Washington's went in the line of fire many times during the war. Maybe Washington was never shot because he was worth more to the British alive than dead, or maybe they considered the royalist Alexander Hamilton, Washington's #2 man, a spy. Is there any record of the British saying to their soldiers, "Don't shoot that bungling Washington, he is worth more to us alive than dead"?

Martha Washington

Martha Custis (Ghas-tus) Washington was a rich widow with an estate, and George Washington was relatively poor until he married Martha.

Were Washington and Franklin democracy experts?

Far from it. Neither Washington nor Franklin said much of anything at the convention that drafted the 2nd US Constitution, and neither wrote much of any importance on the subject of democratic architecture.

However, the presence of both of these men lent a huge amount of legitimacy and credibility to the product of the 37 other men in their eyes of ordinary Americans. It allowed the convention organizers (whoever they were) to claim that the convention was being supervised by some of the best and smartest Americans there were, men that selflessly served their country; men who could be trusted to faithfully serve their new nation to the best of their abilities.

Washington had to support the 2nd constitution

Washington identified himself quickly and publicly with the new constitution, and once he did this, he sort of had to loyally support its ratification.

The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin

Franklin died in 1790 at age 84. His autobiography was published posthumously in typical history rewriting fashion, a long time after his death. Most of the people who remembered Franklin were either dead by then, or they were elderly, with memories clouded by time and old age. With documents of this sort, the Brothers are able to inject many things into the historical record.

Jefferson was an ot sh-ot

This is a particularly smart person from a host culture. The brothers keep this sort of guy around because he is very helpful to their cause. They run/shoot their ideas past him, past his Gr. ot=ear. He keeps the Brothers from reaching too far and waking too many host people from the matrix

Minders

Some years ago, I found myself traveling with 7 international journalists on a train. We began talking, and I asked some political questions that barely exceeded consensus reality. It was really remarkable how A didn't have an answer, and how

B, C, D, E and F didn't have an answer either. In fact A through F all struck me rather as sort of dumb and unable to think.

But then something remarkable happened: A through F all at the same time referred me to their minder, G. Their minder would know. To me, it appeared that G did all the thinking for a whole group of "tough minded" journalists.

Here anyway is how I imagine how most presidential cabinets work. There is one Brother, or maybe more, and the other people are just sleeping sheep, even, very often the go-along, get-along president. And anyone who isn't a go-along type gets scandalized or pushed out, like so many presidential cabinet secretaries in recent years

Figureheads generals and the grand illusion.

If our parasite can repeatedly install figurehead monarchs, how much easier it must be to install a mere figurehead general. Here we are left wondering if throughout history, most generals were actually figureheads. And with respect to non-figurehead generals in times of war, how utterly simple it was to eliminate them without disturbing the matrix. After all, the general's assassin would be presumed to be an enemy agent.

Here we understand the force behind the idiotic tactics of WWI — tactics that sent millions of men to die in futile suicide charges against machine guns. "Our" generals were actually our parasite's choice for us. They were either chosen for their mali-ability, or they were Brothers, or they were under one sort of Brotherly minder-ship or thr-all. (Thur-all = sacrifice everything). But whatever it was, these generals were chosen to make the war as effective as possible for our parasite, the invisible third party in most wars. They were chosen because under their command it would be possible to maximally purge the nation of its most civic minded men. It would also be possible to sell the nation overpriced arms, foodstuffs, raw materials, or whatever.

As well, once the war was over, the fearless leader, the figurehead general George Washington would be easy to make the figurehead leader of the nation. Then his minder Alexander Hamilton would become the man behind the man, the man with the real power over the nation.

British steel

BRITTLE comes from Old English BREOTAN. The same word also meaning BRITAIN in Old English. The intersection of these words/ meanings seems to be that ancients called this early British steel/iron as ferrum breotan. In one sense the term meant British steel and in another it was interpreted to mean brittle steel.

In those days, the British were in the role of the the distant continent, while the Romans were in the role of the super powerful Mideast front nation. The British got the brittle cast iron single edged s-abours and the Romans got the short double-edged swords and the training and drilling on using them correctly.

The US Revolutionary war arms industry

The revolutionary militia was probably under-equipped. And the only domestic arms factories were probably Bro-owned sham armories making low-quality over-priced sabre-taged weapons — just like the Arabs did for the British during Roman times.

And whenever an outsider opened an armory, they were sure to tell the revolutionary leadership where it was located, so they could offer their protection where possible. And then the mole Alexander Hamilton made sure to leak this

information to the British side so they could quickly send their forces against the new forge/armory.

What a curiously named place Valley Forge is. Was this an arms factory? What were the military objectives during the battle of "Valley Forge"? Was this forge a ford/crossing or a armory? Why were our soldiers so poorly armed? And what was different arms-wise about Yorktown? What really happened at Yorktown to so decisively end the Revolutionary War? And what about the similarity with New York?

Roman emperor Diocletian's Price Edict, 301AD

"Everyone knows that wherever national security requires our armies to be sent, the [Mideast] war suppliers quietly but rudely attack the public welfare, not only in town, but on every road. They charge extortionate prices for [military] merchandise, not just fourfold or eightfold, but on such a scale that human speech cannot find words to characterize their profit and their practices. Indeed some soldiers are stripped of their pay and signing bonus in a single transaction.

So all the money the [free Roman] world spends to support its [defensive] armies falls as profit into the hands of these plunderers [who work like organized criminals by scaring off, poisoning, or killing the competition] Thus our soldiers seem to bestow with their own hands the rewards of their military service and their veterans' bonuses upon these profiteers. The result is that each day, these pillagers of the [Roman] state seize more than they know how to hold."

Thomas Paine, Letter #3 to the Citizens of the United States, 1802

"When a party was forming, in the latter end of 1777, and beginning of 1778... to remove Mr. Washington from the command of the army on the complaint that "he did nothing", I wrote the fifth number [installment] of the Crisis [American Crisis essays] ... [and although] I well knew that the black times of '76 were the natural consequence of his want [lack] of military judgement in the choice of positions into which the army was put about New York and New Jersey, I cold see no possible advantage, and nothing but mischief, that could arise by distracting the army into parties [factions]... though I came forward in defense of Mr. Washington when he was attacked [politically], and made the best that could be made of a series of blunders that had nearly ruined the country, he left me to perish when I was in Prison [in France on Robespierre's signature]. But as I told him of it in his life-time, I should not now bring it up if the ignorant impertinence of some of the Federal[ist] papers, who are pushing Mr. Washington forward as their stalking horse [a movable hunter's blind], did not make it necessary...

... it was always known of Mr. Washington, by those who best knew him, that he was of such an icy and death-like constitution, that he neither loved his friends nor hated his enemies..."

Brilliant general Washington

In the early part of the war, the US side suffered repeated defeats under Washington's command. It took years for Washington to start fighting a defensive, guerrilla-style war, fighting only when the odds were in his favor. Was Washington our true leader, or was that just our parasites propaganda for their brilliant figurehead, the perfect tool for drawing Britain into a ruinously expensive 6-year war halfway around the planet: A war that our parasite made a fortune on

A 6 year revolutionary war?

It is widely accepted that the United States had to win the Revolutionary war because Britain had to telescope its power across the Atlantic Ocean on wooden sailing ships at immense cost. And then after that, Britain, with a population of 7 million had to subdue and occupy a land that had almost 1/2 of its population.

But why did it take 6 years for 3 million Americans to start defeating the comparatively small British invading force as it did at Yorktown? Why didn't the American side didn't set up secret musket and cannon forges in remote places? Why couldn't it raise money to feed and clothe its defending army, an army that cost a tiny fraction of what the telescoped British Army cost to deliver to the battlefield? The only possible explanation is a lack of organization and military leadership.

Basically, America's initial ineffective meta-democracy was convenient for our parasite until 1783, while it was keeping the British locked in a ruinously expensive war with their American colonies. After that, our parasite's media (a print-based media) started talking up the defects of the 1st constitution and angling for a new narrower democracy. First we see the failed Anna•polis conference of 1786, three years after the war ended. Then, a year later in 1787, we see US Constitution 2.0 being drafted in Philadelphia.

William Pitt, 1775.01.20, The kingdom is undone

[William Pitt the elder was the British secretary of state (effectively the prime minister). Here he expresses the futility of British efforts to resist American independence.]

"Resistance to your acts was [as] necessary, as it was just, and your vain declarations of the omnipotence of Parliament, and you imperious doctrines of the necessity of submission, will be found equally impotent to convince, or to enslave, your fellow subjects in America, who feel that tyranny, whether ambitioned by an individual part of the legislature, or the bodies who comprise it, is equally intolerable....

The means of enforcing this thralldom are found to be as ridiculous and weak in practice as they are unjust in principle...

I therefore urge and conjure your lordships immediately to adopt his conciliating measure...

Allay the ferment prevailing in America by removing the obnoxious hostile cause...

Their [the British army] victory can never be by exertions. Their force would be most disproportionately exerted against a brave, generous, and united people, with arms in their hands, and courage in their hearts — three millions of people, the genuine descendants of a valiant and pious ancestry...

Of this spirit of independence animating the nation of America, I have the most authentic information. It is not new among them. It is and has ever [always] been, their established principle, their confirmed persuasion. It is their nature and their doctrine.

I remember some years ago, when the repeal of the Stamp Act was in agitation, conversing in a friendly confidence with a person of undoubted respect and authenticity on that subject. And he assured me with a certainty which his judgement and opportunity gave him, that these were the prevalent and steady principals of America. That you might destroy their towns, and cut them off from the superfluities, ~~perhaps the conveniences~~ of life, but that they were prepared to despise your power and would not lament their loss, whilst they have — what, my lords? their woods and their liberty. The name of my authority, I am called upon, will authenticate the

opinion irrefragably. It was Dr. Franklin...

The resistance to your arbitrary system of taxation might have been foreseen. It was obvious from the nature of things, and of mankind, and above all, from the Whiggish spirit flourishing in that country. The spirit which now resists your taxation in America is the same which formerly opposed loans, benevolences, and ship-money in England. [It is] the same spirit which called all England on its legs, and by the Bill of Rights vindicated the English Constitution...

This glorious spirit of Whiggism animates three millions of America, who prefer poverty with liberty to gilded chains and sordid affluence; and who will die in defense of their rights as men, as free men. What shall oppose this spirit, aided by the congenial flame growing in the breasts of every Whig in England? ...

When your lordships look at the papers transmitted [to] us from America, when you consider their decency, firmness, and wisdom, you cannot but respect their cause, and wish to make it your own. For myself, I must declare and avow that in all my reading and observation... no nation or body of men can stand in preference to [in the way of] the General Congress at Philadelphia. I trust it is obvious to your lordships, that all attempts to impose servitude upon such men, to establish despotism over such a mighty continental nation, must be in vain, must be fatal. We shall be forced ultimately to retract. Let us restrain while we can, not when we must. I say we must necessarily undo these violent oppressive Acts; they must be repealed. You will repeal them. I pledge myself for it, that you will in the end repeal them. I stake my reputation on it. I will consent to be taken for an idiot, if they are not finally repealed. Avoid then, this humiliating, disgraceful necessity. With a dignity becoming your exalted situation, make the first advances to concord, to peace and happiness. For that is your true dignity, to act with prudence and justice. That you should first concede is obvious, from sound and rational policy....

If the ministers thus persevere in misadvising and misleading the King, I will not say that they can alienate the affections of his subjects from his crown; but I will affirm that they will make the crown not worth his wearing. I will not say that the King is betrayed; but I will pronounce that the kingdom is undone. [Here we see the voice of reason saying that British efforts to suppress the American revolution were futile. Here we also see how the king's ministers were misadvising him and advocating a war that resulted in hundreds of thousands of infidel deaths and a fortune in profits for the Mideast.]

Samuel Adams, 1776.08.01, Be yourselves, O Americans

[This was 34 days after the declaration of independence.]

"We are now on this continent, to the astonishment of the world, Three millions of souls united in one cause. We have large armies, well disciplined and appointed, with commanders inferior to none in military skill, and superior in activity and zeal. We are furnished with arsenals and stores beyond our most sanguine expectations" [They were in fact, woefully under-armed.]

William Pitt, 1777.11.18, You cannot conquer America

"this ruinous and ignominious situation... calls upon us to... to rescue the ear of Majesty from the delusions which surround it. The desperate state of our arms abroad is in part known: no man thinks more highly of them than I do: I love and honor the English troops: I know their virtues and their valor: I know they can achieve anything except impossibilities: and I know that the conquest of English America is an impossibility. You cannot, I venture to say it, you CANNOT conquer America."

War suppliers like long wars

The Brotherly teamsters supplying the revolutionary war looked out for the British, while they quietly struggled against the American side. These put as many stumbling blocks as they could in front of the Americans who were sure to win the war (due to the length of the British supply lines and their relative size and population growth rates of the two nations).

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

"Washington knew that whatever he did would set precedents for the future. ... He envisioned the Senate's role in advising and consenting to appointments and treaties as that of a council, similar to what he had been used to as commander in chief, and thus he assumed that much of the Senate's advice and consent, if not with appointments, at least with treaty making, would be done orally. [The parasite wants its host democracies to communicate orally. This both wastes time and makes it hard to figure out who made the horrible amendment that sunk the fleet. We must go in the opposite direction and do everything in writing]

In August 1789, the president [Washington] went to the Senate to get its advice and consent to a treaty he was negotiating with the Creek [Greek] Indians. Instead of offering their advice and consent in the way Washington's senior officers had during the Revolutionary War, the senators began debating each section of the treaty, with the president impatiently glaring at them. When one senator finally moved that the treaty be submitted to a committee for study, Washington jumped to his feet in exasperation and cried, "This defeats every purpose of my coming here". He calmed down, but when he finally left the Senate chamber, he was overheard to say he would "be damned if he ever went there again". He did return two days later, but neither he nor the Senate enjoyed this personal confrontation. The advice part of the Senate's role in treaty making was more or less permanently forgotten. When the president issued his Proclamation of Neutrality in 1793, he did not even bother to ask for the consent of the Senate, and thus he further established the executive as the nearly sole authority in the conduct of foreign affairs [and war mongering].

... In the great struggle over acceptance of the treaty with Great Britain negotiated by John Jay in 1794 and ratified by the Senate in 1795, Washington made a series of courageous decisions. With the United States and Britain on the verge of war because of British seizures of neutral American ships, sending Jay to England in the first place was one, and signing the treaty amid an outcry of popular opposition was another. Standing up to the attempt by the House of Representatives in March 1796 to scuttle the ratified treaty by refusing to vote funds to implement it was still another. Washington refused to recognize a role for the house in the treaty-making process. To do so, he said, not only "would be to establish a dangerous precedent but also would violate the Constitution, which allowed only the president and Senate to make treaties" [If we are a democracy why do we allow the non-elected administration of one suggestion-vulnerable man to make all our nation's treaties? How can these unelected people bind the entire nation to immensely costly foreign obligations after each war? And what a motive to get the nation involved in wars.]

Everything good is bad for you

George Washington is one of many people regarded as sacred and time honored. And likewise the US constitution is one in a

long list of institutions most people regard as sacred, and time honored. But often, the most revered and time honored institutions (instituted organizations) are also the most ex-pull, or e-vil, because the reverence is actually from the lying voice of our parasite's chorus.

Has the land of no resources been quietly guiding the world so as to feed itself for many thousands of years? Does your revered ancient institution help the land of no resources govern us and feed on our activities? How then can you think that your revered institution is not one of the our parasite's many lies?

Imagine that most of the world's social systems and belief systems have been shaped and molded (at least to some extent) around our parasite's ex-pulling or e-vulling. Now maybe, just maybe, you can see how most of our social institutions; and even our religions are to some degree (large or small) products of e-vil, of the d'e-vil or the d'ex-pull that feeds the land of no resources.

Pierce Butler, 'Constitutional Convention' delegate from South Carolina (a slave state), 1778.05.05, to Weedon Butler

"I am free to acknowledge that his powers are full great, and greater than I was disposed to make them. Nor, entre nous [between us], do I believe they would have been so great had not many of the members cast their eyes towards General Washington as President; and shaped their ideas of the powers to be given to a president, by their opinions of his virtue."

[Thus we see Washington as this larger than live benevolent prince raised by our parasite to soften our attitudes about having an elected monarch run the democracy of the land of the free.]

From Revolutionary Characters, The invention of Benjamin Franklin

"After the peace treaty was signed, Franklin reluctantly had to come America to die, even though all his friends [friends?] were in France. He now knew that his destiny was linked to America. When he arrived in 1785 [age 79], his fellow Americans did not know what to make of him. They knew he was an international hero, along with Washington the most celebrated American in the world, but they were not quite sure why. He had not led the revolutionary movement like John Adams. He had not written a great revolutionary document like Jefferson. He had not led armies like Washington.

When he died in 1790 [at age 84], there was only one public eulogy, and that was given by William Smith, his inveterate enemy [enemy?], simply because Smith, as vice president of the American Philosophical Society, was assigned the task. Even someone like former Governor James Bowdoin of Massachusetts was honored with a dozen or so funeral orations. Washington's published eulogies numbered in the hundreds. The French outdid themselves honoring Franklin. The most famous eulogy was that of Mirabeau, delivered in the French National Assembly; the Assembly published it and proclaimed three days of mourning, the first gesture of this kind it had ever made [in its brief existence]. By contrast, the United States Senate refused to join the House in endorsing a resolution honoring Franklin. ...

Americans still saw Franklin as a patriot and scientist, not as the homespun Poor Richard bourgeois moralist of later years. Only in the years following his death in 1790 and the publication of his Autobiography in 1794 did Franklin's image change. Over the next 30 years, numerous editions and

abridgments of the Autobiography flooded the country. After 1798 editors began adding the Poor Richard essays to editions of the Autobiography." [I have read hints that Franklin's autobiography first came 20-25 years after his death, in typical history changing fashion. The title of this work also suggests that Franklin was mostly invented.]

How much of Benjamin Franklin is real?

It is worth pointing out that Franklin's flying of a kite could be taken as a metaphor for the semi-mythical figure that encouraged the members of the Benjamin tribe to stand up. Once they stood up, they could be measured and if necessary purged by the Brothers—struck by lightning, which is Arab secret code for getting shot with a firearm.

Franklin established at least 18 paper mills becoming not only immensely wealthy, but perhaps the largest paper dealer in the English speaking world—paper being an ancient Mideast racket. Franklin was also a substantial creditor, lending great amounts to the colonists—money lending being another ancient racket of Mideast Inc.

Franklin also wrote under at least 50 pseudonyms including Richard Saunders (rich•ard Sand•ers) aka Poor Richard—pseudonym publishing being a tactic of the Brothers.

Also of note are Franklin's role in drafting the infamous Stamp Act, for which he was regarded as a spy by many Americans. See Lord Hillsborough, head of the American Department created in 1768, and William Strahan. See also Franklin's writing that contrasted the provinciality and vulgarity of America in with the sophistication and worthiness of England.

Julius Caesar/Tulius Cicero murdered over a million French people in ancient Gaul that were cheating on the Mideast's trade monopoly with Rome — and today, the Brothers have transformed Caesar into a great historic figure. Perhaps it is the same with this man who presided over the "Constitutional Convention" coup of 1789. Perhaps he was some random Brotherly octogenarian impersonator. Franklin was the youngest of something like 14 children, so when the shriveled 79-year old showed up in America at age 79, after spending decades overseas, he had no siblings, and perhaps no nieces or nephews to recognize him.

My beefs with Ben Franklin

- 1) His autobiography was published after pretty much everyone he knew was dead. This is what the parasite does when it wants to change history.
- 2) He lived in Europe for decades before he returned to lend credibility to the 1789 convention, an event which he seems to have had no input, and only acted as a legitimizer.
- 3) He is on the \$100 bill, and this alone makes one think he is not real
- 4) People were putting lightning rods on their roofs in America anyway, and it was problematic for the parasite that people knew about lightning rods without their "discovery". So I think that it staged a great discovery under the name Franklin. Has anyone discovered any precocious or dis-chronous lightning rods anywhere?

Also see also W.E. Woodward's 'debunking' of many historical heroes, in particular, George Washington.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

[George] "Washington's fortune, amounting at his death, to \$530,000, was one of the largest in the country and consisted

mainly of land. He owned... land on the Ohio River in Virginia... on the Great Kenawa, and also land elsewhere in Virginia and in Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, Kentucky, the City of Washington and other places... [Thus in today's money, George Washington was worth about \$290-million by the probably conservative estimates of his Arab-friendly biographers. It must also be pointed out Washington stood to profit handsomely from moving the nation's capital to the new distant city of Washington D.C in Virginia where it was maximally isolated from the American people and where Arab power would be strongest.]

... After a long career, Benjamin Franklin acquired what was considered a large fortune. But it did not come from manufacture or invention, which he did so much to encourage, but from land. His estate in 1788, two years before his death, was estimated to be worth \$150,000 mostly in land." [Thus in today's money, Benjamin Franklin's estate was worth about \$83 million.]

12— WE WERE NOT ALONE

Percy Shelley

The "Unacknowledged legislator of the world"

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 35.3

"Men belong to the citizen body if they are of citizen parentage on both sides." [Free, democratic, and liberal Athens had a problem with Arab immigrants just before its downfall, just like free, democratic and liberal Europe today.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1793.07.17, Pacificus 6

"Foreign influence is truly the Grecian [Trojan] horse to a republic. We cannot be too careful to exclude its influences.

James Madison, 1835, "A sketch never finished"

"There never was an assembly of men, charged with a great and ardent trust, who were more pure in their motive, or more exclusively or anxiously devoted to the object committed to them." [is this a diametrical doublespeak lie?]

George Washington, 1796.09.19, Farewell Address

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence... a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

[To simplify for the sake of comprehension:

Free men always need to keep watch for the insidious wiles of foreign influence. Both history and experience show that foreign influence is a poisonous enemy of democracy.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"The full tale of the rise and climax of industrial establishments [fronting for the Arabs]; how they subverted the functions of government to their own ends; stole inventions right and left and drove inventors to poverty and to the grave; defrauded the community of incredible amounts by evading taxation; oppressed their workers to a degree that in future times will read like the acts of a class out-savaging the savage; bribed without intermission; slaughtered legions of men, women and children in the pursuit of profit; exploited the peoples of the globe remorselessly—all of this and more, constituting a weird chapter of horrors in the progress of the [harem-bred] race, are described in a later part of this work."

Noah Webster, An examination of the leading principles of the Federal Constitution 1787.10.10

"In the formation of our constitution, the wisdom of the ages is collected — the legislators of antiquity are consulted, as well as the opinions and interests of the million who are concerned. In short it is an empire of reason."

James Madison, 1786.10.05, to James Monroe

"There is no maxim in my opinion which is more liable to be misapplied, and which therefore needs elucidation than the current one that the interest of the majority is the political standard of right and wrong... in fact it is only reestablishing under another name and a more specious form, force as the measure of right"

[To simplify for the sake of comprehension:

We are wrong when we allow the majority to determine right and wrong... in fact it is merely another name for might makes right.

1) Once simplified, this statement becomes the words of tyranny and obviously so. 2) These words were spoken by the great James Madison the main author of the current US constitution. 3) A big advantage of majority rule is that our Arab parasite and its front men have the hardest time faking a majority. 4) Historically the greatest problem with force being the measure of right is that of a small groups using force try to dominate a majority of society — majority rule prevents that.]

James Madison, 1788.01.16, Federalist 39

"If we resort for a criterion to the different principles on which different forms of government are established, we may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure for a limited period, or during good behavior.

[To simplify:

A republic derives its powers from the people. Its officials hold short term offices and they must behave.

John Adams, to Timothy Pickering, 1822.08.06

"I am obnoxious, suspected, and unpopular"

John Adams, 1787, A Defense of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America

"The rich, the well-born, and the able acquire influence among the people... in a house of representatives. The most illustrious of them must, therefore be separated from the mass, and placed by themselves in a senate, [a place] that is to all honest and useful intents an ostracism."

James Madison, 1788, to John Brown

"Refusing or not refusing to execute a law to stamp it with its final character... makes the Judiciary [and executive] department paramount [supreme] in fact to the legislature, which was never intended and can never be proper."

[Here James Madison explains how our democratic legislature is subject to execution/enforcement both by the non-elected administration of our 4-year monarchs, and their appointee supreme court. It is also worth noting that James Madison seems to be saying that our legislatures were "never intended and can never be proper".]

The headless horseman

The headless horseman is our parasite's cryptic metaphor for

US democracy around the time of the American Revolution. Our first priority as free men is to rectify and reinforce our flimsy and

Star Trek 2, Wrath of Kahn film

"Their young enter through the ears and wrap themselves around the cerebral cortex. This has the effect of rendering the victim [a government] extremely susceptible to suggestion. Later as they grow follows madness and death."

John Page, 1776.07.20, to Thomas Jefferson,

"We know the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong. Do you not think an angel rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm."

Thomas Paine 1776

"Not a place on earth might be so happy as America. Her situation is remote from all the wrangling world, and she has nothing to do but to trade with them."

Herman Melville, Moby Dick, 1851, Ch. 41

"all evil, to crazy Ahab [the Arabs], was visibly personified, and made practically assailable in Moby Dick [Mob Dict, or America]. He piled upon the whale's white hump the sum of all the general rage and hate felt by his whole race from Adam down... Ahab [the Arabs] had cherished a wild vindictiveness against the whale" [America]

Herman Melville, Moby Dick, 1851, Ch. 41

"Moby Dick [Mob rule, America]. ...a Sperm Whale of uncommon magnitude and malignity, which whale, after doing great mischief to his assailants, had completely escaped them"
[America escaped from the grasp of the Arabs, and they have been trying like the devil=de+ex+pull to get us back under control.]

Herman Melville, Moby Dick, Ch. 79

"If hereafter, any highly cultured, poetical nation [Arabia] shall lure back... their birth-right [world domination]... then be sure, exalted to Jove's high seat, the great Sperm Whale [as Arab front nation] shall lord [over] it."

Herman Melville, Moby Dick, 1851, Ch. 44

"Ahab [the Arabs], the scheming, unappeasably steadfast hunter of the white whale"

Star Trek, Bread and circuses 1968.03.15

"Spok: Then the prime directive is in full force captain?

Kirk: No identification of self, No interference with the social formation of said planet.

McCoy: No references to space or the fact that there are other worlds or more advanced civilizations.

Kirk: Let's go

McCoy: Just once I'd like to be able to land some place and say behold, I am the arch angel Gabriel....."

Star Trek, Space seed

"Kirk: It is better to rule in hell than serve in heaven."

Edmund Burke d.1797

"Nothing turns out to be so oppressive and unjust as a feeble government." [Burke died 8 years after 1789, when the 2nd US constitution went into effect]

Aeschylus (d. 456BC) Agamemnon 1355

"The lust for power never dies — men cannot ever have enough. But nobody will ever lift a finger to send it from his door" [Normal people don't usually care much about power. It tends to be crooks and Arab front men that are the ones grabbing absolute power.]

Thomas Jefferson

"Experience has shown that even under the best forms of government those entrusted with power have, in time, and by slow operations, perverted it into tyranny." [These are almost invariably Arab front men.]

James Madison

"There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power, than by violent and sudden usurpations."

James Monroe, 1788.06.10, Virginia Ratifying Convention

"How prone all human institutions have been to decay. How subject the best-formed and most wisely organized government have been to lose their checks and totally dissolve. How difficult it has been for mankind, in all ages and countries, to preserve their dearest rights and best privileges, impelled as it were by an irresistible fate of despotism."

Absolute power corrupts absolutely

We see this idea offered repeatedly in Star Trek mythology. With ordinary men, we are hard pressed to figure out a reason why. However, with respect to disposable figure-head front-men, we see that their corruption is just the latest mask of Mideast Inc. feeding on its host societies. Here is why some men so power hungry and here is how they so often rise to power over us.

Magna Carta, 1251AD, 51

"As soon as peace is restored, we will banish from our kingdom all foreign knights, bowmen, attendants, and mercenaries, who have come with horses and arms, to the kingdom's hurt."

Magna Carta, 50

"We will entirely remove from their bailiwicks [bailiff, sheriff's deputy, or magistrate] the kinsmen of Gerard de Athyes, so that henceforth they shall hold no bailiwick in England: Engelard de Cigogne, Peter, Guy, and Andrew de Chanceaux, Guy de Cigogne, Geoffry de Martigny and his brothers, Philip Mark and he brothers, and Geoffry and his nephew, and all their followers." [Apparently the English were having trouble with French or French-looking men who were acting as sheriff's or sharif's deputies. Here we recall the sharif of Nottingham, a rough contemporary of the Magna Carta, who was always trying to capture the robbing hood who would steal from those in power and give to poor.]

Paul Hentzner, Travels in England, 1598

[This was written 10 years after the English defeated the Spanish armada and became the dominant world power. Hentz•ner = hence•ner. It is like Lawrence = al•our•hence] [Around] "the city are some theaters, where English actors present plays almost every day to many audiences. These are concluded with variety of dances accompanied by music and great applause from the audience.

[The curiously named Globe theatre burned down around this time.] Not far from one of these theaters, which is built entirely of wood lies the royal barge, close to the river

Thames. It has two splendid cabins [houses of government], it is beautifully ornamented ... kept upon dry ground [it is hard to flood and wash away with cash], and sheltered from the weather [men, the rainmakers].

There is another place that is built in the form of a theatre, which serves for the baiting of bears and bulls [a stock exchange] These are fastened from behind [hooked for a ride], and then vexed by great English dogs and mastiffs [gangsters], but not without great risk to the dogs from the teeth of the one and the horns of the other; as it sometimes happens they are killed on the spot. When this happens, fresh ones are immediately supplied in the places of those that are wounded or tired."

Our agenda: America must survive and thrive

The parasite's agenda: America must die to the man

If America doesn't survive, you will all go down some awful dark ages rat-hole where genetic testing is used to eliminate all the non-Arab men with any brains at all. Then the only smart ones left with any brains will be cannibalistic Brotherly harem breeders. These will lord over a sub-species of self-foraging sheep humanoids, a ready source of food for the "real" humans, the harem-breeding Brotherly "Morlocks".

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 35.3

"the city [Athens] was pleased with these [initial] achievements, and thought the Thirty [oligarchs] were acting from good motives. But once the Thirty had a firmer grip on the city, there was no type of citizen they did not attack. They killed those remarkable for their wealth, others for their birth or reputation. Their aim was to remove any potential threat, as well as to seize their property. Within a short span of time, they had killed [the best of Athens] no fewer than 1500 men."

Seneca, On the Tranquility of the mind, 5

"Can you find a city in a more miserable state than Athens when the 30 Tyrants were dismembering it? They murdered 1300 of the city, all the best men..."

Plutarch, d. 120AD, Crassus, 4

"When Cinna and Marius seized power [in 87BC], it quickly became evident that their purpose in re-entering the city was not to do good to their country, but simply to wipe out and destroy the nobility. They killed as many of these as they could lay their hands on, Crassus's father and brother among them. Crassus himself, who was very young, escaped" [After this, there is a long and unbelievable story of his childhood in a Spanish cave. This suggesting that after Mideast Inc. killed all the nobility of Rome, and then inserted their own boys to be the new nobility.]

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.30

"I have never met a man, either in England or America, who hath not confessed his opinion, that a separation between the countries, would take place one time or other. And there is no instance, in which we have shewn less judgment, than in endeavoring to describe, what we call the ripeness of fitness of the Continent for independence.

As all men allow the measure, and vary only in their opinion of the time[ing], let us, in order to remove mistakes, take a general survey of things, and endeavor, if possible, to find out the very [best] time. But we need not go far, the inquiry ceases at once, for, the time hath found us. The general concurrence, the glorious union of all things prove the fact."

Thomas Paine, Common sense, 1776

"LET the assemblies be annual [single year terms of office], with a President only [no king]. The representation more equal. Their business wholly domestic, and subject to the authority of a Continental Congress.

Let each colony be divided into six, eight, or ten, convenient districts, each district to send a proper number of delegates to congress, so that each colony send at least thirty. The whole number in Congress will be at least 390 [A 1:7,700 democracy]. Each Congress to sit [text missing, censorship alert] and to choose a president by the following method. When the delegates are met, let a colony be taken from the whole 13 colonies by lot, after which, let the whole Congress choose (by ballot) a president from out of the delegates of that province. [di-election] In the next Congress, let a colony be taken by lot from the 12 only, omitting that colony from which the president was taken in the former Congress, and so proceeding on till the whole 13 shall have had their proper rotation. And in order that nothing may pass into law but what is satisfactorily just, not less than 3/5 of the congress to be called a majority."

[1] Paine is not a real American, but an Arab mole whispering things into the ears of the American people at the start of the American revolutionary war.

2) Paine calls for annual assemblies because to argue otherwise would have discredited him.

3) Paine calls for a lone presidential monarch at start of the revolutionary war. The 1.0 US democracy instituted by the people chose to have no presidential monarch. The people of the day HATED monarchs and presidents.

4) Paine calls for 390 delegates when a year later the United States were running with over 2,000. Thus Thomas Paine called for a government that was over 5 times narrower than the one the people imagined and instituted.

5) Paine includes the sparsely populated southern slave states in the union.

6) Paine suggests a meta-democracy which will be "wobbly" and will not work because a majority from 60% of the 13 states can be achieved with a 30% vote from the lawmakers.

Thomas Paine, Common Sense, 1776

"Since the publication of the first edition of this pamphlet, or rather, on the same day on which it came out, the Kings speech made its appearance in this city. Had the spirit of prophecy directed the birth of this production, it could not have brought it forth, at a more seasonable juncture, or a more necessary time. The bloody mindedness of the one [the King's speech], shew [showed] the necessity of pursuing the doctrine of the other [Paine's Common Sense pamphlet]. Men read by way of revenge. And the Speech, instead of terrifying, prepared a way for the manly principles of Independence." [Now it is possible that this is just a coincidence. It is also possible that Paine had printed up his pamphlets and was waiting for the right moment. But it is also possible that Thomas Paine (Tom·us Peh'n = Big·us Say'n) was the parasite's left hand while the King's speech was the parasite's right hand.]

Thomas Paine, American Crisis, 10

[This is history modifying essay disowned by Paine.]

"So extensively right was the ground on which America proceeded, that it not only took in every just and liberal sentiment which could impress the heart, but made it the direct interest of every class and order of men to defend the country. The war, on the part of Britain, was originally a war of

covetousness [greed]. The sordid [dirty, dark and unspeakable], and not the splendid [bright and praiseworthy] passions gave it being. The fertile fields and prosperous infancy of America appeared to her as mines for tributary wealth. She [the English empire fronting for the Arabs] viewed the hive, and disregarded the industry that had enriched it, [and] thirsted for the honey. But in the present stage of her affairs, the violence of temper is added to the rage of avarice... it requires but little knowledge of human nature to discern what would be the consequence, were America again reduced to the subjection of Britain. Uncontrolled power, in the hands of an incensed, imperious and rapacious conqueror, is an engine of dreadful execution, and woe be to that country over which it can be exercised."

The shot heard around the world

Today we are taught that the shot heard around the world occurred at the battle of Lexington and Concord when American revolution began to be written in blood. This however is a cover story. The true shot heard around the world happened when the American colonists declared their freedom. It happened when we declared our independence from the corrupt British empire fronting for Mideast Inc. It happened when we declared ourselves free and democratic and our own masters. That was the true shot heard around the world.

And it wasn't just the people of America that felt the shot heard around the world. Everybody in the world with any understanding of history or international affairs knew that goodness had suddenly surged ahead of evil for the human race. And the only people saying otherwise were Brothers and their pawns.

Today another similar shot will be heard around the world. And once again, everybody in the world with any understanding of history or international affairs will know that goodness has suddenly surged ahead of evil for the human race. And once again, the only people saying otherwise are Brothers and their pawns.

Come and contradict the new prophet. Come and speak evil about his god mechanism or his message. Come so he may cast hells fire upon you.

The parasite wants to purge freedom from its flock

The parasite wants to get rid of every tiny bit of freedom. It want freedom discredited and purged and exterminated and murdered from humanity.

Keep democracies apart

The XYZ Affair (of 1797) shows our parasite working to keep America's democracy apart from France's. The parasite wanted to do this because working together, the two nations would have perhaps been more stable, with America (perhaps for example) preventing the rise of Napoleon. There also might have been a wave of genuine liberating other nations.

Basically, in the XYZ Affair, America sent delegates to the new French revolutionary government that was ostensibly democratic. When they arrived, these delegates were told that they would not be able to meet the French foreign minister Talleyrand until the US granted a \$10 million loan to the French government and paid a bribe of \$250,000 to Talleyrand personally. These demands were little doubt intended to insult and keep the Americans away. Had the Americans become involved, they might have (for example) prevented the dictator and Mideast frontman dictator Napoleon Bonaparte from coming to power in 1799 and declaring himself emperor in

1804, and then rampaging through a large part of Europe (in the name of democracy or anti-royalism) over the next decade. Anyway, the US delegates refused to pay and promptly went home, abandoning France and indeed all of Europe to the Napoleonic wolves working under the guise of democracy, soiling the name of democracy.

And remarkably, this minor diplomatic snub was used as an excuse to lead the Mideast Inc's arch rivals (the nascent democracies of America and France) into war — an entirely naval war that could not be escalated due to shared ideology. After two years, (1798-1800) the war was called off by treaty with Napoleon's administration — which was basically run by Talleyrand.

It is notable that the aristocratic Talleyrand not only survived the French reign of terror years when some 30,000 of France's elite (titular and intellectual and) were beheaded in the guillotine. He survived and then went on to become Napoleon's right hand man. Then in 1815, after Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo, Talleyrand not only survived again, but became the head of the new government, remaining a key player in French politics until the 1830s.

Talleyrand incidentally was the French official who was on the other side of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, where the Jefferson Administration bought this huge territory for \$11 million. The Louisiana purchase was actually a very shrewd play by our parasite, because only a decade later this territory started driving America towards civil war. This was averted by the Missouri Compromise (1820) and some other measures for a couple decades, but it was the admission of new southern states in the Louisiana territory that were a key force driving America to civil war. Basically, America was fed the Louisiana territory by the same people behind the XYZ Affair, the people who want to keep the world's democracies from working together. (see also Paul Francois de Baras, Louis Freron, The Bodin Company, a war contractor, and Napoleon's grand Sanhedrin)

America in European wars

Eventually the Arabs even succeed in getting America into repeated wars with Europe. Of course, it wasn't with Europe per se, it was with only with the bad part of Europe. We rescued the good part of Europe from the bad part in two "world wars".

Distract them with sex, drugs and rock-and-roll

Or the Marquis de Sade and the French Revolution

The really interesting thing about the Marquis de Sade's books is their timing. The first is a novel called simply "Justine" in English, and "A Misfortune of Virtue" in other languages. This sexually-provocative (meaning speaking in favor of having sex) propaganda came out in 1791, just two years after the French Revolution of 1789. It is the tale of two sisters that were orphaned in their teens and separated. One sister Julia starts out having sex with many men, while the other sister Justine tries for a life of virtue. Justine is however raped repeatedly and imprisoned as a sex slave in a monastery. Julia moves up in life and one day comes across Justine, who is still having a tough time in life. Julia takes her sister in and in the end Justine is struck by lightning and dies. Moral of the propaganda: You are better off having sex than not having sex.

This book was part of a sudden relaxation of sexual morals that was a huge for the French. And little doubt it kept many from getting involved in establishing a proper democracy. Instead, we see the Reign of Terror where over 30,000 of

France's smartest people went to the guillotine for no real reason. And this was not just the royalty and nobility, it with anyone with any political gumption or intellect, even scientists. Once these thought leaders were gone, the figurehead Napoleon could be raised as the new "democratic" monarch of France by 1799, less than a decade later. Then we see Napoleon quickly moving Hitler-style to "liberate" the rest of Europe under his new "democratic" monarchy — killing hundreds of thousands and seizing great fortunes for the parasite in the process.

Today, de Sade gives us the word SADISM= deriving pleasure, especially sexual gratification from inflicting pain and humiliation on others, and also deliberate cruelty. However, this pleasure-from-pain aspect is only part of what de Sade's works about. More accurately, de Sade's work is simply verbal pornography. It is related to the free internet pornography that is distracting men all over the world today — distracting them from having infidel babies, distracting them from work, and distracting them from getting involved in government. After all, why is there so much free pornography online? Who is paying for it?

Gr. porn = prostitute

Gr. porno-graphy = prostitute-writing

Re-think the Boston Tea party

At the Boston Tea Party, of 1773.12.16, the tea was owned by the East India Company. Who do you think owned this company that had the royally granted monopoly on trade between Asia and Europe and all the European colonies?

Thomas Jefferson

"I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our monied corporations which dare already to challenge our government to a trial by [of] strength, and bid defiance to the laws of our country." [Throughout history if the king owned everything, that was the perfect front for the parasite. Front-man king owns everything — a simple, easy, crystal clear explanation — one supported whole-heartedly by the parasite's secret empire.

Under democracy, the parasite must use a different, more difficult, and less effective approaches. Today it must corrupt a number of large corporations instead of one royal court — a process which it both more difficult and less financially rewarding.

Manage, direct, steer, corrupt, extort, or influence straw men, unregulated hedge funds, dark pools, proxy votes

The land of the free is a democracy. But this democracy is heavily swayed by corporate lobbyists, and these corporations themselves are tools of the Mideast. Perhaps you have grossly underestimated the historical power of the Mideast parasite race.

Some points about corporations in ancient Rome

- 1) There were corporations in ancient Rome, and these executed the will of the Roman government.
- 2) The Roman "democracy" auctioned off to these corporations what were called tax farming rights. This was basically the right to squeeze what they could out of whatever segment of the Roman economy be it farming or mining or manufacturing. The idea was to get the monopoly buyers to squeeze the life out of the Roman economy so it would become dependent on the parasite's imports and the parasite could earn a living.
- 3) Less than 1% of the people in ancient Rome had over 2/3

of the wealth, just like in so many "poor" countries today.

4) Clearly the parasite has been operating through corporations for thousands of years.

Benito Mussolini

"Fascism should rightly be called Corporatism, as it is the merger of corporate and government power."

Plato, Meno, 99c

"Politicians depend on good guesswork, not on actual understanding of how to steer the state on the right course. They are just like the astrologers and prophets, who say much that is true, but understand little of what they are saying."

Alexander Hamilton, The farmer refuted

"The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for, among old parchments, or musty records [translation: there's no need to study history]. They are written, as with a sun beam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of the divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power." [In truth, an outsider was there trying to hide our rights.]

Cicero d.43BC, De Republica

"True law is judicial reasoning in tune with nature. It is universal among all men, constant, eternal... It needs no interpretation or explanation but itself. And there won't be one law in Rome and another in Athens, one in the present and another in the future. There will be one law and that eternal and unchanging, a law that embraces everyone for all time." And there shall be one common master and ruler, the god of all, the author and judge and proposer of this law." [These words were said almost 2100 years ago at the beginning of the end for Rome — said by the man who initiated the beginning of the end Julius Caesar/Tulius Cicero.]

Thucydides, History, 1.70

"If anyone said that the Athenians were borne to neither be at peace themselves, nor to allow others to be at peace, he would only be speaking the truth." [Here we see the parasite talking about how it must struggle against democracy and freedom 2,400 years ago.]

Jedi Lobbyists?

Look up JEDI in the Apple dictionary and definition 2 is: "anyone with special privileges or supernatural powers reminiscent of a Jedi : these guys hang out in places mere mortal lobbyists who were not Jedi warriors cannot go." [Jedi=Jidi=Yidi. These are fresh green Jews from the harems, not the un-chosed yellow Jews that have no idea what is going on. Also, look who compiled your dictionary.]

The Apple dictionary definition of STATE:

"3. the civil government of a country: services provided by the state I [in combination]: state-owned companies. King Fahd appointed a council to advise him on affairs of state." [Look who compiled your dictionary.]

Polybius d.146BC, History, 43

[peculiar= the property a slave is allowed to have. Thebes was 60km Northwest of Athens and seems to be where the Athenians re-organized after the city was defeated in 404BC. Thebes prospered from 371 to 336BC when it was razed by Alexander "The Great". Thebes = Gr. Thevai = thieves.]

"fortune quickly made it evident that it was not the

peculiar characteristics of their constitution, but the valor of their leaders, which gave the Thebans [Athenians] their success..."

44. "A somewhat similar remark applies to the [democratic] Athenian constitution. It perhaps had more frequent interludes of excellence, but its highest perfection was attained during the brilliant career of Themistocles [This is a reference to Themis, the goddess of order and justice. In Homer she was the personification of justice and order and convened the assembly of the gods. The name breaks down as theos=religion + mis= mouth. Themis is secret code for the single unified agenda of Mideast Inc. Anyway, Themis•tocles helped build up the Athenian fleet and defeated the Persian fleet at Salamis in 480BC]; and having reached that point [peak/acme] it [Athenian democracy] quickly declined, owing to its essential instability. You see, the Athenian demos [like every other race] are always [finding itself] in the position of a ship without a captain. In such a ship, if fear of the enemy, or the occurrence of a [metaphorical] storm cause the crew to be of one mind, they obey their captain and everything goes well. But if they recover from this fear, they begin to treat their leaders with contempt. Then they quarrel with each other because they are no longer all of one mind. One group wants to continue the voyage — another wants to bring the ship to anchor. Some let out the sails — while others hauling them in and roll them up.

Their quarrels and disharmony make a sorry show for [Mideast] observers. And this state of affairs is full of risk for everyone. The result has often been that after escaping the dangers of the widest seas, and the most violent storms, they sink their ship [of state] close to shore, or in a safe harbor. And this often happened under the Athenian constitution. You see, on many occasions, they repelled the greatest and most formidable dangers, thanks to the valor of their people and their leaders. Then in periods of secure tranquility they suddenly and recklessly met with disaster."

[Here we see how our free government is much like free economy. Both work best when we demand much from them. In fact, it should be rather obvious that national economic growth is demand driven just like company growth is demand driven. As well, the group effort of government works best when we consider our group decisions first-order-important]

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"**Revolution, n.** In politics, an abrupt change in the form of misgovernment. Specifically, in American history, the substitution of the rule of an Administration for that of a Ministry, whereby the welfare and happiness of the people were advance a full half-inch. Revolutions are usually accompanied by a considerable effusion of blood, but are accounted worth it — This appraisal being made by beneficiaries whose blood had not the mischance to be shed. The French Revolution is of incalculable value to the Socialist of today; when he pulls the strings actuating its bones and gestures are inexpressibly terrifying to gory tyrants suspected of fomenting law and order."

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"**Quorum, n.** A sufficient number of members of a deliberative body to have their own way and their own way of having it. In the United States, a quorum consists of the chairman of the Committee on Finance and a messenger from the White House; in the House of Representatives, of the Speaker and the devil."

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Insurrection, n. An unsuccessful revolution. Disaffection's failure to substitute misrule for bad government."

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Boundary, n. In political geography, an imaginary line between two nations, separating the imaginary rights of one from the imaginary rights of the other." [All our national borders are all imaginary, you know]

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Robber, n. It is related of Voltaire, that one night he and some traveling companions lodged at a wayside inn. The surroundings were suggestive, and after supper they agreed to tell robber stories in turn. When Voltaire's turn came, he said: "Once there was a Farmer-General of the Revenues" Saying nothing more, he was encouraged to continue. That," he said, "is the story." " [I guess, once we have tax farming, that it the end of the story.]

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Push, n. One of the two things mainly conducive to success, especially in politics. The other is Pull." [The Arabs don't push for things, they pull, pulling strings that can't be pulled too abruptly or too hard.]

Pulling strings

Funny how we Americans arrogantly assume that we must have the most power in our own government. All we see are groups like OUR big business, OUR labor unions, OUR environmentalists, and OUR trial lawyers association. But OUR parasite is quietly pulling strings, thousands of weak strings, not ropes, but weak strings that can break if pulled too hard. "Pulling strings," (s•ter•ings) now there is an expression that describes exactly how our parasite's power works in our societies.

And with these countless weak strings, our parasite operates behind thousands of masks on Capitol Hill; calling in favors, paying bribes, entrapping, blackmailing, lobbying, anything really to achieve the following broad objectives:

- A) Gain more political/religious/economic influence.
- B) Reduce the production of our own basic commodities and industrial output.
- C) Increase our consumption of their basic commodities and industrial output.
- D) Increase our national overhead costs.
- E) Slowly and quietly steer the free world, the house of war, off a cliff.
- F) At all costs, keep it all a secret and keep the backdoors open, sacrifice the pawns, knights, bishops, castles, even queens, but at all costs don't lose the king.

Hawthorne, House of Seven Gables, 1851, Ch. 11

"Clifford... was too inert to operate morally on his fellow creatures, however intimate and exclusive their relations with him. But the sympathy or magnetism among human [eu•man] beings is more subtle and universal than we think; it exists, indeed, among different classes of organized life, and vibrates from one to another." [Here the Arabs are talking about vibes and sympathy and coolness and to always be aware of the need to manipulate them for the benefit if the de•ex•pull and the feeding matrix.]

Hawthorne, House of Seven Gables, 1851, Ch. 11

"With the insight on which he [the harem bro] prided himself, he fancied [felt] that he could look through Phoebe [the Jew/American], and all around her, and could read her off like a page of a child's story book. But these transparent natures are often deceptive in their depth; those pebbles at the bottom of the fountain are farther from us than we think." [Don't over-estimate your abilities to see through the Jews and the Rumi.]

Nathaniel Hawthorne, House of Seven Gables, Ch.11, 1851

"a political procession, with hundreds of flaunting [floating?] banners, and drums, fifes, clarions, and cymbals, reverberating between the rows of buildings, marched all through town... As a mere object of sight, nothing is more deficient in picturesque features than a procession seen in the passage through narrow streets. The spectator feels it to be fool's play, when he can distinguish the tedious commonplace of each man's visage [face]... In order to become majestic, it should be viewed from some vantage point, as it rolls its slow and long array through the center of a wide plain, or the stateliest public square of a city; for then, by its remoteness, it melts all the petty personalities [the hired bums], of which it is made up, into one broad mass of existence -- one great life -- one collected body of mankind, with a vast, homogeneous spirit animating it. But on the other hand, if an impressible person, standing alone over the brink of one of these processions, should behold it, not in its atoms, but in its aggregate -- as a mighty river of life, massive in its tide... calling to the kindred depth within him ... It might so fascinate him -- that he would hardly be restrained from plunging into the surging stream of human sympathies."

Nathaniel Hawthorne, House of Seven Gables, Ch.1, 1851

"The Pyncheons, in brief, lived along, for the better part of two centuries, with perhaps less of outward vicissitude [unwelcome change] than has attended most other New England families during the same period of time. Possessing very distinctive traits of their own, they nevertheless took the general characteristics of the little community in which they dwelt... During the Revolution, the Pyncheon of that epoch, adopting the royal side, became a refugee; but repented, and made his reappearance, just at the point of time to preserve the House of the Seven Gables from [total] confiscation. For the last seventy years [1851-70 = 1781], the most noted event in the Pyncheon annals had been likewise the heaviest calamity that ever befell the race; no less than the violent death -- for so it was adjudged -- of one member [arm] of the family [those who stayed] by the criminal act of another," [arm of the family, those who abandoned ship, as has been so common throughout history.]

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #130

"I am going to devote this letter to a certain race known as news [war] mongers, who meet in a magnificent [walled] garden, where they have nothing to do but are always busy. They are entirely useless to the state....they believe themselves to be important, since they discuss lofty policies and deal in mighty interests of state.

The basis of their conversations is a petty and absurd inquisitiveness. No cabinet secrets are so well kept that they do not claim to have discovered them. They cannot accept the idea that anything is unknown to them. They even know how many wives our august sultan has how many children he fathers each year. They spend nothing on espionage, but they are informed of the measures he [The Arabian] takes to humiliate the Turkish and Mogul emperors.

They have scarcely finished with the present before

plunging into the future. [They are always making plans.] They go to meet Providence and give it advance notice of everything that mankind is to do. ...

They make armies fly through the air like flocks of cranes, and fortified walls fall down like [houses of] cards. They have bridges over every river, secret passes across every mountain, vast depots in the burning desert. All they lack is sense."

Magna Carta, 10-11

"If anyone who has borrowed from the Jews [as scapegoat frontmen for Mideast Inc.] any sum of money, great or small, dies before the debt has been paid, the heir shall pay no interest on the debt so long as he remains under age ... And if any man dies indebted to the Jews, his wife shall have [keep] her dower [share of her spouse's estate] and pay nothing of that debt. If the deceased leaves children under age, then these shall have necessities provided for them in keeping with the estate of the deceased, and the debt shall be paid out of the residue, saving the service due to the deceased feudal lords." [The reason all these things were stated in the Magna Carta is that their opposite was happening thanks to the endless greed of the land of no resources.]

John Ball, 1381, Cast off the yoke of bondage

"From the beginning, all men by nature were created alike [all men were created equal], and our bondage and servitude came in by the unjust oppression of naughty [producing naughty] men."

Mideast aristocracy underground

Starting in 1789, with America's democracy, the Brothers were forced to stop running their empire by using aristocracies as a front. Instead they had to start working with narrow democracies in many nations, giving the brothers less control over the affairs of their host societies. And as a result, the prophet's profits world-wide were lower, much lower.

At this time, our parasite basically regrouped and re-evolved into a less virulent democracy corrupting parasite of the type that brought down Athens and Rome. Basically, we got rid of the monarchs and broadened our leadership by 100-fold or so, but we really didn't fully deal with the underlying problem — the parasite with a diametrically opposed agenda for our society.

Now as far as our parasite is concerned, modern "narrow" democracy has a manageable concentration of power. Mideast Inc. would greatly prefer monarchy, but it can work satisfactorily with narrow democracies that can be manipulated into doing stupid things like fostering a subprime funded financial bubble.

Pope Pius X, Vehementer Nos, 1906

"That the state must be separated from the church is an absolutely false thesis, a most pernicious error... an obvious negation of the supernatural order."

Pope Paul VI, Ecclesiam Suam, 1964

"The Church is not a democratic association established by human will."

Pope Pius VI, Quod Aliquantum, 1791

"The absolute liberty which not only assures people of the right not to be disturbed about their religious opinions, but also gives them this license to think, write, and even publish with impunity all that the most disreputable imagination can suggest about

religion... What could be more senseless than to establish among men equality and this unbridled freedom which seems to extinguish reason? What is more contrary to the rights of the creator God who limited human freedom by prohibiting evil?"

Apple dictionary definition of Inalienable

"Unable to be taken away from or given away by the possessor: Freedom of religion, the most inalienable of all human rights."

[Nonsense, the right to life, liberty, justice, health, free speech, free assembly, the right to bear arms, and the right pursue what we want are all more important than the freedom to practice a Mideast Religion.]

Francis Bacon, On Usury

"Many have made witty ~~invectives~~ [intelligent attacks] against usury. They say it is a pity that the devil should have God's part, which is the [church] tithe [10% of your income. They say] that the usurer is the greatest sabbath-breaker, because his plough goeth every Sunday. That the usurer... breaketh the first law that was made for mankind after the fall, which was: in the sweat of thy face shall thou eat thy bread [Genesis 3:19], not, in the sweat of another's face. [They say] that usurers should have orange-tawny bonnets [yellow and brown leaves on the tree of life], because they do Judaize [convert to Judaism], that it is against nature for money to beget money, and the like."

[Catholics are prohibited from lending their money and competing with the bank of Arabs Inc. And of course this bank operated through the "gentile" Jews that the desperate green Arabs needed as escape goats.]

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, 1718, #117

"The prohibition of divorce is not the only cause of depopulation in Christian countries. No less important is the great number of eunuchs among them. I refer to the priests and dervishes [monks/ nuns] of both sexes, who make a vow of perpetual chastity. This for the Christians is a virtue in its purest form. However, I can't understand it, not knowing what sort of virtue it is that produces nothing. I find that their theologians are manifestly inconsistent in saying that marriage is sacred, and that celibacy, its opposite, is even more sacred..."

The number of people who commit themselves to celibacy is incredible. There was a time when a father would impose this fate on children still in the cradle. Nowadays they themselves take their vows at the age of 14, which amounts to much the same thing. This career of chastity has annihilated more men than ~~plagues and the most savage wars~~ [all plagues and wars combined]. In every monastic institution is an everlasting family to which no children are born, and which maintains itself at the expense of all other families."

Catholic edict, 409 AD

"All are notified that any person... convicted of having hidden away any harmful [pre-Christian] books, or having failed to deliver their books [for destruction], regardless of the circumstances, suffer capital punishment for the crime of maleficium."

Why the Vatican is the 2nd holiest site under Islam

The Arabs benefit from:

- 1) The tithes, donations, and bequests.
- 2) The prohibition on usury.

- 3) The degradation of our gene-stock under strict monogamy.
- 4) Selling overpriced incense to the church.
- 5) Knowledge gained from our confessions
- 6) Getting to influence our people and our democracy.

How can so many people be so blind?

Can you not see how your religion hands money and power to the Arabs while diminishing your lines thorough strict monogamy?

Also, that last part: "God, who limited human freedom by prohibiting evil." How convenient that is. Just call something evil and nobody is free to do it anymore. Call extra-monogamous sex evil and then nobody dare have sex outside of their one life-long marriage. Then our genome slowly degrades because our best men have just as many (or even fewer) children that our worst.

The Pope has always been America's enemy

Here we see why the Catholic Church has always been opposed to freedom, and knowledge. Here we see why it has always been gently, but fully anti-America. It is because the Catholic church has always been used by Mideast Inc to suppress freedom and liberty in its flock/host. Incidentally, L. liberti = freedom from slavery.

God comes first, dammit!

According to the Catholic Church, their God has rights that are more important than our human rights. And at times and places, "god's church" would burn people alive at the stake for not obeying the the Church's commands.

The origin of pomp

Wealthier Romans commonly staged these elaborate funeral processions called "pompa" which involved paid mourners, paid musician, eulogies called "laudatio" and gladiatorial events if they could afford to. Also, these gladiatorial deaths were supposed to appease the gods for the rich guy that staged them — as a form of human sacrifice, like how the ancients would slaughter and eat a number of special albino sacrificial albino lambs or other animals.

Now the Greeks had this term psycho•pomp This was Gr. psyche=spirit, or your soul in the after life + Gr. pomp = conductor or conduit or stairway. So a psycho•pomp was really something like a pathway, or stairway to heaven for your soul. Now in Rome it was made part of the culture to think that nothing assured that you would get into heaven like burning a big pile of Arabian incense at your funeral. This would cover up the foul smell of your partially rotten corpse as it was cremated and buy you a stairway to heaven.

Anyway, the final point I want to make is that the word Pope comes from the word pomp. And before there was one Pope running a great Christian church, there were probably many pomps helping you to pump yourself into the afterlife through various and repeated exertions.

Wigs and powder

In the 1700s, wigs and white powder were all the rage in Europe. Supposedly, looking elderly was in style, even for young people. Can you believe it? I don't. I think that these wigs and white powder made it much easier to hide one's "Mediterranean" or olive complexion in northern Europe. And maybe the Whigs, the Whig party was the party of the more powerful hand of Mr. P., at least to start.

Gordon S. Wood, Revolutionary Characters

"Adam Smith, in *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) thought that ordinary people in a modern complicated commercial society were too engaged in their occupations an the making of money to be able to make impartial judgments about the varied interests and occupations of their society. Only 'those few, who being attached to no particular occupation themselves', said Smith, 'have leisure and inclination to examine the occupations of other people.'" [Keep them distracted from government and economy.]

The 'definitive' fall of Rome book dates to 1776 & 1788

The first 20% of Edward Gibbon's (Griffin's) *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* came out in 1776, the second 20% in 1781, and the final 60% came out in 1788. The first part came out just as America was sitting down to write its first constitution for its democracy, the first democracy in 1800 years; the first since Julius Caesar dissolved the democratic oligarchy of Ancient Rome in 44 BC. Gibbon's mostly unreadable book was supposedly the definitive text on late Rome and the early Dark Ages. And it was as widely acclaimed by the Brothers 223 years ago, as it is today. It helped guide America's Constitutional Congress away from seeing the easy to corrupt Roman democratic design as the main source of Rome's problems. And in so doing, it helped modern democracy to follow in Rome's footsteps — straight down the drain. Some things are worth mentioning about this massive work of Mideast propaganda and Gibbon:

A) it begins after the fall of the Roman Republic, well into imperial times, so it really says nothing about what caused Rome's democracy to fail. This is a favorite ploy of our parasite: to begin a history right after the truly important events have already transpired.

B) This book made Gibbon a big celebrity in the highest circles. However, when Gibbon attended social events, he was shunned for reasons that are not entirely clear.

C) Gibbon was supposedly educated outside England.

D) Gibbon was elected to Parliament, but he never spoke once in the House of Commons.

E) Gibbon lived beyond his means and was frequently in desperate need of money from 1755 until the mid 1780s when *Decline* solved his problems.

F) like Nathaniel Hawthorne, who worked in the custom's house, Gibbon worked at the Board of Trade for a time.

G) The book is not only huge, but it is full of immensely long and complex sentences that take much effort to read. These long sentences generally offer little of ideological value. The correct brotherly term is PRO•LIX=helping to dissolve.

H) This "definitive" book was much awaited by America's Constitutional Congress.

I) Gibbon never mentioned (I think) that Rome's hundreds of senators were both legislators and executives.

J) The book came out in 1776 so as to distract the Americans in their efforts to write their first constitution.

Here is a quote from chapter XLIX where the American colonists are set against mother England: "[There is nothing perhaps more adverse to nature and reason than to hold in obedience remote countries and foreign nations, in opposition to their inclination and interest](#)".

Here are two quotes from Chapter II where someone is trying to open backdoors into the modern American version of democracy. Incidentally, the most important propaganda in hard to read propaganda books is normally in the beginning of

the book. This is all most people read. Here I believe are the two main lessons that Mideast Inc. wants us to take away from Decline and fall:

1) "The various modes of worship, which prevailed in the Roman world, were all considered by the people, as equally true; by the philosopher, as equally false; and by the magistrate as equally useful. And thus toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious concord."

2) "The grandsons of the Gauls, who had besieged Julius Caesar in Alesia, commanded legions, governed provinces, and were admitted into the senate of Rome."

An Arab propaganda play

Royall Tyler, 1787, The contrast, Scene 2

"Luxury is surely the bane of a nation: Luxury which enervates both body and soul, by opening a thousand new sources of enjoyment, opens, also, a thousand new sources of contention and want: Luxury which renders people weak and home, and accessible to bribery, corruption, and force from abroad. When the Grecians were a great, a free, and a happy people. The kings of Greece devoted their lives to the service of their country, and her senators knew no other superiority over their fellow citizens than a glorious pre-eminence in danger and virtue. They exhibited to the world a noble spectacle, a number of independent states united a similarity of language, sentiment, manners, common interest, and common consent in one grand mutual league of protection. And thus united, long might they have continued the cherishers of arts and sciences, the protectors of the oppressed, the scourge of tyrants, and the safe asylum of liberty. But when foreign gold, and still more pernicious foreign luxury, had crept among them, they sapped the vitals of their virtue. The virtues of their ancestors were only found in their writings. Envy and suspicion, the vices of little minds, possessed them. The various states engendered jealousies of each other; and, more unfortunately, growing jealous of their great federal council, the Amphictyons, they forgot that their common safety had existed, and would exist, in giving them an honorable extension prerogative. The common good was lost in the pursuit of private interest; and that people who, by uniting, might have stood against the world in arms, by dividing, crumbled into ruin: — their name is now only known in the page of the historian, and what they once were is all we have left to admire. Oh! that America! Oh! that my country, would in this here day, learn the things which belong to her peace!"

The Grandfather clause

What an idea: The grandsons of Rome's enemies were admitted to Rome's leadership, even its Army leadership. Here we have Arab propaganda saying that it is perfectly fine to allow the grandchildren of your nation's enemy lead your army. Clearly we must go in the opposite direction.

Now recall, the idea of the "Grandfather Clause" and how it is heavily maligned in our secondary school textbooks. On top of this, there is the way newly illegal uses are "grandfathered in." What kooky and forced idioms these are. Here, someone seems to be blocking us from considering an idea that would substantially reduce our parasite's ability to infiltrate our society and our government.

We should do exactly the opposite of what this propaganda is trying to discourage. We must close the power structures of our national institutions to the flow of new Brothers, people new enough to be obliged to our parasite. And no ethnic group anywhere has any right to cry foul here, the stakes are just too high. America will still be the land of

opportunity for immigrants who start their own enterprises. But it will not be so for immigrants who seek opportunity in our government, military leadership, in running our public companies, or in other critical institutions.

5 great works of propaganda about freedom

They are in no particular order: Democracy in America, the Federalist Papers, the Anti-Federalist Papers, the Wealth of Nations, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. All are impossibly long and hard to read. On top of this, they are watery with few valuable ideas.

Cartwright and Biddiss, Diseases in History, CH1

"Because of her contacts with foreign nations and because of her almost unlimited pantheism, Rome [like America today] sheltered and tolerated a great variety of religions."

Giovanni Botero, 1589, The Reason of State, 2.6

"Do not pick quarrels with powerful republics unless a big advantage makes you sure of victory. [This is] because love of liberty is so intense, and so well rooted in the souls of those who have even briefly enjoyed it, that it is difficult to conquer and nearly impossible to destroy completely. The actions and the counsels of princes die with them; the endeavors and considerations of free cities are nearly immortal."

Dynasty = dyna•s•ti = change•not•you

Thomas Jefferson, 1790.03.11

"The republican [rex•public = king•public] is the only form of government which is not eternally at open or secret war with the rights of mankind."

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.25

"America is only a secondary object in the system of British politic. England consults the good of this country, no farther than it answers her own purpose. Wherefore, her own interest leads her to suppress the growth of ours in every case which doth not promote her advantage, or in the least interferes with it."

Voltaire

"The ideal form of government is democracy tempered with assassination."

[People work much harder under illusionary democracy autonomy. It is only necessary to kill a leader once in a while.]

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #111

[Metaphors troops=struggle and music=propaganda songs=messages, smears] "Gentlemen, although our troops have been repulsed and have suffered some losses, I believe that we will easily recover from this setback. I have six verses of a [propaganda] song ready for publication. I am certain these will restore the balance completely. I have selected some very strong voices, coming from the depths of very powerful chests [influential people]. These will stir up public sentiment in the most marvelous way. The words are [set] to music which, up to now, have had a very special effect [on the people who we have tried in on].

If that is not enough, we will print flyers depicting Mazarin on the gallows. Fortunately for us, he doesn't speak French well. He misuses it so badly [in fact] that his situation is bound to deteriorate. We will make sure to tell the public about the absurd way he pronounces his words. ... before a week is up, the public will be using the name Mazarin as a general

word to mean any animal used for carrying loads or pulling vehicles.

Since our defeat, our music [propaganda] has assailed him so vigorously on the subject of original sin that, in order to prevent himself from losing half his followers, he has been compelled to dismiss all his acolytes, pages. [Evidently they accused 'Mazarin' of having sex with his acolytes or assistants. The song sure remains the same now doesn't it? Funny how we disqualify our leaders when they can't resist the sex thrown at them.]

Ayn Rand

We are fast approaching the stage of the ultimate inversion: The stage where the government is free to do anything it pleases, while the citizens may act only by permission; which is the stage of the darkest periods of human history.

DISINTERESTED = to paraphrase Samuel Johnson's definition, "Above considerations of private profit: Not influenced by private profit."

MISINTERESTED = Working for our parasite in government. Mouth•interested.

Resisting the first national highway in America

Since Roman times, our parasite has resisted road construction in the houses of its host — this so it could sell more imported goods from its sea shipping monopoly/cartel. A great example of this resistance is how the US Congress authorized the first national highway in 1806 from Cumberland, Maryland westward. However construction did not start until 1811. And by 1818, the highway only reached Eastern Virginia. By 1850, the road only reached Illinois.

Battle squares and broad democracy

You know, with the Ancient Greeks fighting in battle squares, it must have been hard to suppress the idea that electing centurions in private life was anything but the way to go.

The Washington monument

The Mideast moon goddess, the goddess of secret stealing went by many aliases such as: Ishtar, Astarte, Isis Selene, Cybele, Artemis, Rhea, Diana, and Inanna, along with other less specific or more cryptic titles like 'our lady', 'she', and Zeus's wife. This is the parasite goddess that always unified the land of no resources.

Anyway, this goddess had no physical presence as with the single gods of Judaism and Islam — so there were no images of her. The place the goddess resided was represented by an empty chair in a temple, or a stone obelisk shaped like the Washington monument in America's capital — although the original Phoenician obelisks were less than the height of a man and called a massebah. It is also worth pointing out how obelisks are also rather like disguised pyramids. I would like to advocate that all pyramids and obelisks be prohibited on public property because they are symbols of secret and treacherous Arab imperialism and dissolvency.

What America is

For centuries, America has been a destination for the ambitious and those dissatisfied with the old ways of their old country. It has taken more than its share of the best of from the rest of the world. These came to America where they embraced the new ways. These people left their old country

and stopped making trouble for the parasite in their old country. Thus the existence of America helped the parasite greatly by channeling the malcontents into one place.

Where the best infidel lines go to degrade and die out

The parasite helped America to be prosperous, over-prosperous, so its values would decay. This was started after WW2, and was marked by such command broadcasts as Key Largo (cool it on the gangsterism), the Big Sleep (put them to sleep), and the Big Easy (let them grow lazy and fat).

The people who grew up in these years, the post war baby boomers — these grew up lazy, and they were helped by their media to tune-in, turn-on, and drop-out instead of working hard. They were told that they had to be young and sexy forever. And they were told that the world was over-populated and responsible people did not bring more infidels into the world. That is where we are today, a bunch of old baby boomers with few children. In 20 years, the Haremi will inherit the earth if we do nothing. Then will come the purges of all the smart non-Haremi lines.

religion and virtue

My experience

In my life, I have met many people. And one thing I have noticed about the people I consider smart. It is that if I ask them about religion, few will hold strong religious beliefs. Thus, I find the following quotes to look more like Arab propaganda than the words of wise men.

James Madison, 1785.06.20, Memorial and remonstrance against religious assessments

"It is the duty of every man to render to the creator such homage and such only as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time, and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society.

[To simplify:

Everyone is duty bound to give money and obedience to his religion as he sees fit. This duty comes before our obligations to our society.]

John Adams, 1765, Dissertation on the cannon and feudal laws

"Let the pulpit resound with the doctrine and sentiments of religious liberty. Let us hear of the dignity of man's nature, and the noble rank he holds among the words of God." [In other words, man is not the measure of all things. He is but one of many creations of a Mideast god and a Mideast-run religion. Thus the Arab mole John Adams would have us all obey and vote the way of our Arab-run religions.]

George Washington, 1789, to Annual Meeting of Quakers

"The liberty enjoyed by the people of these states of worshipping almighty god [in a way] agreeable to their conscience, is not only among the choicest of their blessings, but also of their rights."

[To simplify: The freedom to worship god almighty in your own way is one of our greatest blessings and rights.

Was freedom of religion important to most US immigrants? I argue that freedom from religion has been a bigger diver of US immigration.]

Benjamin Franklin, to Thomas Paine

"If men are so wicked with religion, what would they be [like] if without it?"

John Adams, 1798.10.11, Address to the Military

"We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion. Avarice, ambition, revenge, or gallantry, would break the strongest cords of our constitution as a whale goes through a net. Our constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." [Clearly our Mideast parasite wants us to think that its Mideast religions are the only thing, the critical aspect of keeping our society together. I say they do little. I say that our Mideast parasite is desperate to defend its religions with their highly profitable tithes, with their costly sacraments, and with their gene-pool degrading life-long marriages.]

John Adams, 1811.08.28, to Benjamin Rush

"Religion and virtue are the only foundations, not of republicanism and of all free government, but of social felicity under all government and in all the combinations of human society.

[To simplify for the sake of comprehension:

Religion and virtue are not only the basis of free government and social felicity, but all human society

- 1) Clearly John Adams speaks for the parasite
- 2) When you see felix or felicity, think Arabia Felix, prosperous Arabia prospering like a parasite on the outside world.]

George Washington, 1796.09.19, Farewell Address

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality [virtue] are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness — these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and cherish them.

A volume could not trace all their connection with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert[s] the oaths, which are the instrument of investigation in courts of justice?

And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principal.

[To simplify:

Religion and virtue provide indispensable support for political prosperity. You can't be a patriot if you work against these main pillars of happiness and duty. Everyone, even mere politicians should respect and value them. (i.e. our elected leaders have no power over our parasite's religions.)

An entire book could not explain all the ways they cause private and public felicity. And what security would there be for life, property, or reputation if our court oaths did not contain a religious obligation?

Let us cautiously think that people will be moral without religion. We may have to make concessions due to the influence of education on minds of a haremi nature. However, both reason and experience forbid us to expect that morality in this nation can survive without religion.

- 1) Why is George Washington saying this?
- 2) Why is his meaning so hard to grasp?
- 3) Is it George Washington saying this?
- 4) If not, was George Washington someone's frontman?

5) If George Washington was a front man, what of American style democracy?]

James Madison, 1822.07.10, to Edward Livingston

"We are teaching the world the great truth that governments do better without kings and nobles than with them. The merit will be doubled by the other lesson that religion flourishes in greater purity without than with the aid of government."

[Ok, so on one hand we have kings and nobles and governments that help one religion exclusively, and give all their money to that religion. And on the other hand we have democracies and religious freedom and no giving of money or influence to Mideast religions. Which way do you cleave reader?]

James Madison, 1774.04.01, to William Bradford

"Religious bondage shackles and debilitates the mind and unfits it for every noble enterprise, every expanded prospect."

The grand illusion of religion

So many people think of their religion like their football team. They think it represents them and their people. They even assume it is run by their people. But in reality all religions are run by the Arabs and everything you do for your religion is really being done for the Arabs. That is the matrix program you follow.

Human rights vs. property rights

James Madison, 1829.12.02, Virginia ratifying convention

"It is sufficiently obvious, that persons and property are the two great subjects on which governments are to act. And that the rights of persons, and the rights of property are the objects for the protection of which government was instituted. These rights cannot well be separated."

[It is one thing to have your pocket picked, or your horse stolen. These are minor inconveniences in comparison to getting shot to death by police as a 'drug dealer'. They are also minor inconveniences in comparison to being arrested and thrown in a dungeon, and tortured for a few years. Basic human rights are obviously far more important than property rights and here James Madison is obviously speaking for our Arab parasite.

John Adams, 1787, A Defense of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America

"The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God [human rights], and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence."

[1) Our right to live as free men is obviously more important the rights of property. I mean, it is not hard to imagine circumstances where people have said, 'take everything, just don't hurt us'. Clearly property rights do not matter nearly as much as our right to justice and being shot by police without a fair trial.

2) This is the voice of an economic parasite that wants our government defending its property — its real estate, its mines, its monopolies, its franchises, its guild memberships, its taxi medallions, its trade walls, its debt obligations, and its stolen wealth. Here our parasite is saying that unless its stolen property rights are on par with our human rights, we will have anarchy and tyranny.

3) Our right to free markets trumps many property rights. For example, the right of the people in cities to have a free market

for ride services trumps the right of taxi medallion holders to profit from their monopoly franchise. This is a clear example of public rights mattering more than property rights.

4) The rights of people to profit from economic storms should be limited, and no more than say 5% of families should be evicted due to any debt crisis.

5) The people should have the right to get together as a nation and change the rules so the people will be safe from economic storms. Therefore, in a debt crisis, no more than 5% of families may be evicted. The debtors will have their principal reduced for some time, until the crisis abates.

6) All property owned by the parasite is stolen and subject to seizure by the people and their government. This includes debt, real estate, mines, mineral lands, gas stations, and franchises including professional franchises.

Skippable - difficult read

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.3

[They will] "leave the legislative part to be managed by a select number chosen from the whole body, who are supposed to have the same concerns at stake which [as] those have who appointed them, and who will act in the same manner as the whole body would act, were they present. [These people are less like elected leaders and more like random elected samples.]

If the colony continue[s] increasing [in population], it will become necessary to augment [increase] the number of the representatives.

And [so] that the interest of every part of the colony may be attended to, it will be found best to divide the whole into convenient parts, each part sending its proper number [how vague]. And [so] that the elected [government] might never form [un]to themselves an interest separate from the electors[, the people], prudence will point out the propriety of having elections often. [This] because as the elected [government] might by that means [be forced to] return and mix again with the general body of the electors in a few months. [Thus] their fidelity to the public will be secured by the prudent reflection of not making a rod [scepter] for themselves. And This frequent interchange will establish a common interest with every part of the community, [and] they [government and governed] will mutually and naturally support each other, and on this (not on the unmeaning name of king) depends the strength of government, and the happiness of the governed.

Here then is the origin and rise of [a new form of] government; namely, a mode rendered necessary by the inability of moral virtue to govern the world; here too is the design and end of government, viz. freedom and security. And however our eyes may be dazzled with show, our ears deceived by sound; however, prejudice may warp our wills, or interest darken our understanding [what does this mean?], the simple voice of nature and of reason will say, it is right."

Centinel #1, 1787.10.05

[Note all the hard to understand words and long awkward sentences. This helps to keep the information from being read, and if read, it keeps it being understood. This document appears to be an internal Brotherly intelligence report about the new 2.0 constitution for America. It is the Arabs talking above the heads of the "children". It is one of the most difficult reads I have included, but also one of the most revealing.]

"I am fearful that the principles of government inculcated [instilled by repetition] in Mr. Adams treatise, and enforced in the numerous essays and paragraphs in the newspapers, have misled some well designing members of the

late Convention. But it will appear in the sequel [later section], that the construction of the proposed plan of government is infinitely more extravagant.

I have been anxiously expecting some enlightened patriot would, ere this [before now], have taken up the pen to expose the futility, and counteract the baneful [distressing or poisonous] tendency of such principles [at work in the new 2.0 US constitution of 1787] ...

... I shall now... [examine] the proposed plan of government, and ...[show how] it has none of the essential [pre]requisites of a free government. ...it is neither founded on those balancing restraining powers, recommended by Mr. Adams and attempted in the British constitution, or possessed of...responsibility to its constituents ...the only effectual security for the liberties and happiness of the people. But on the contrary ... it is a [the] most daring attempt to establish a despotic aristocracy among freemen, that the world has ever witnessed.

I shall previously [first] consider the extent of the powers intended to be vested in Congress, before I examine the constriction of the general government.

It will not be controverted [denied] that the legislative is the highest delegated power in government, and that all others are subordinate to it. ... By sect. 8, of the first article of the proposed plan of government, "the Congress are to have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States..." Now what can be more comprehensive than these words[?]

[Furthermore it grants] all the great executive powers of a confederation, and a STANDING ARMY IN TIME OF PEACE, that grand engine of oppression, and moreover the absolute control over the commerce of the United States and all external objects of revenue, such as unlimited imposts upon imports, etc. They are to be vested with every species of internal taxation; whatever taxes, duties and excises that they may deem requisite for the general welfare, may be imposed on the citizens of these states, levied by the officers of Congress, distributed through every district in America; and the collection would be enforced by the standing army, however grievous or improper they may be. The Congress may construe every purpose for which the state legislatures now lay taxes, to be for the general welfare, and thereby seize upon every object of revenue. ...

The Judicial power [is] to be vested in one Supreme Court... The objects of jurisdiction recited above, are so numerous, and the shades of distinction between civil causes are oftentimes so slight, that it is more than probable that the state judicatories [courts] would be wholly superseded... To put the omnipotency of Congress over the state governments and judicatories out of all doubt, the 6th article ordains that "this constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every state shall be bound by thereby, any thing in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding".

By these sections the all-pervading power of taxation, and such extensive legislative and judicial powers are vested in the general government, as must in their operation, necessarily absorb the state legislatures and judicatories; and that such was in the contemplation of the framers of it. ... fearful of alarming the people by so great an innovation [change], they have suffered [tolerated] the forms of the [13] separate [state] governments to remain, as a blind [for

concealment purposes]. ... The United States are to be melted down into one empire. It becomes [benefits] you to consider, whether such a government, however constructed, would be eligible [suitable] in so extended a territory, and whether it would be practicable, [and] consistent with freedom. It is the opinion of the greatest writers, that a very extensive country cannot be governed on democratical principals, on any other plan than a confederation of a number of small republics, possessing all the powers of internal government, but united in the management of their foreign and general concerns. ... whatever plan you might, at the first setting out, establish, it would issue to [flow into] despotism.

If one general government could be instituted and maintained on principles of freedom, it would not be so competent to attend to the various local concerns and wants, of every particular district, as well as the peculiar [slave/state] governments, who are nearer the scene, and possessed of [with] superior means of information. Besides, if the business of the whole union is to be managed by one government, there would not be time [for the small number of elected officials to do the work required]. Do we not already see that the inhabitants of large states...

Art. I. Sect. I: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a senate and a house of representatives." By another section, the president (the principal [lone] executive officer) has a conditional control [a veto] over their proceedings.

Sect. 2: "The house of representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year, by the people of the several states. The number of representatives shall not exceed one for every 30,000 inhabitants. " ...

The executive power by Art. 2, Sect. I. is to be vested in a president of the United States of America, elected for four years. Sect. 2. gives him "power, by and with the consent [veto] of the senate to make treaties, provided two thirds of the senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law", etc. And by another section, he had the absolute power of granting reprieves and pardons for treason and all other high crimes and misdemeanors, except in case of impeachment. ...

Thus we see, the house of representatives, are on the part of the people to balance the senate, who I suppose will be composed of the better sort, the well born, etc. The number of the representatives (being only one for every 30,000 inhabitants) appears to be too few, either to communicate the requisite information, of the wants, local circumstances and sentiments of so extensive an empire, or to prevent corruption and undue influence, in the exercise of such great powers. The term for which they are to be chosen, too long to preserve a due dependence and accountability to their constituents.

The senate, the great efficient body in this plan of government, is constituted on the most unequal principles. The smallest state in the union has equal weight with the great states of Virginia, Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania. The Senate, besides its legislative functions, has a very considerable share in the Executive. None of the principal appointments to office can be made without its advice and consent. The term and mode of its appointment, will lead to permanency. The members are chosen for six years. The mode is under the control of Congress, and as there is no

exclusion by rotation, they may be continued for life [as with Strom Thurmon= Storm Thur•man, who served a 49-year tenure in the US Senate], which, from their extensive means of influence, would follow of course. The President, who would be a mere pageant of state, unless he coincides with the views of the Senate, would either become the head of the aristocratic junto in that body, or its minion. Besides, there [their] influence being the most predominant, could the best secure his re-election to office. And from his [the president's] power of granting pardons, he might skreen from punishment the most treasonable attempts on the liberties of the people, when instigated by the Senate.

From this investigation into the organization of this government, it appears that it is devoid of all responsibility or accountability to the great body of the people, and that so far from being a regular balanced government, it would be in practice a permanent aristocracy.

The framers of it, actuated by the true spirit of such a government, which ever abominates [always hates] and suppresses all free enquiry and discussion, have made no provision for the liberty of the press, that grand palladium [safeguard] of freedom, and scourge of tyrants. But observed a total silence on that head [point]. It is the opinion of some great writers, that if the liberty of the press, by an institution of religion, or otherwise, could be rendered sacred, even in Turkey that despotism would fly [away] before it."

See also James Harrington, Oceana and Panopea

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.1

"In the old country, the soil [land] had long since passed into the hands of a powerful few [fronting for the Arabs] and was made the chief basis for the economic and political enslavement of the people. To escape from this thralldom [enslavement], many of the immigrants had endured hardships and [de]privation to get here [to America]. They expected that they could easily get land, the tillage [plowing, farming] of which would insure [ensure] them a measure of independence. [Instead] Upon arriving they found vast available parts of the country, especially the most desirable and accessible portions bordering shores or rivers preempted [already•purchased]. An exacting [demanding, onerous] and tyrannous feudal government [fronting for the well-organized Arabs] was in full control. Their only recourse in many instances was to accept the best of unwelcome conditions and become tenants of the great landed functionaries and [thus] worked for them.

The patroons [patr•oo•uns = father•egg•ones, the Arab friendlies in charge] naturally encouraged immigration [of people who would be their semi-slaves]. Apart from the additional values created by increased population, it meant a quantity of labor which, in turn, would precipitate [drive, push] wages to the lowest possible scale [levels]. [The Arabs generally struggle/jihad to max-out over-population. This not only increases desperation, but it drives the wages of their poor slave laborers to the lowest levels.] At the same time, in order to stifle every aspiring quality in the drudging laborer... a mere menial undeserving of any rights, the whole force of the law was made use of to bring about sharp discriminations. The laborer was purposely abased [degraded, humbled] to the utmost, [greatest extent] and he was made to feel in many ways his particular low place in the social organization. [The Arab way]

Far above him, vested with [clothed by the legal system with, legally possessing] enormous personal and legal

powers, towered the [Arab frontman] patroon. While he, the laborer, did not have the ordinary burgher [citizen] right, that of having a minor voice [the right to vote] in public affairs. The burgher right was made entirely dependent upon property, which was a facile method [and easy way] of disenfranchising [depriving] the multitude of poor immigrants and of keeping them down. Purchase [of a large-enough piece of land] was the one and only means of getting this right. To keep it [the burgher and political class] in as small and circumscribed [limited] a class [group] as possible, the price [of land] was made abnormally high. [This is a common Arab tactic.] It was enacted in New Netherlands in 1659, for instance, that immigrants coming with cargoes had to pay a thousand guilders for the burgher right [and the right to trade and vote]. As the average laborer got two shillings [a tenth of a guilder] a day for his long hours of toil, often extending from sunrise to sunset, he had little chance of ever getting this sum together. [Thus it was 10,000 day's pay, 27 years pay to obtain the burgher right. Only those who had access to Arab 'monopoly money' could afford this. Thus the Arab front men dominated both politics and trade/economy in early America.]

The consequence was that the merchants [Arab trading class] became the burgher class. And all the records of the time seem to prove conclusively that the merchants were servile instruments of the [Arab-fronting] patroons whose patronage and favor they assiduously courted. This deliberately pursued policy of degrading and despoiling [plundering] the laboring class incited bitter hatreds and resentments, the effects of which were permanent."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

"the poor English immigrants ardently [burningly] expected that in America land would be plentiful. They were bitterly disappointed. The various English companies [fronting for the Arabs], chartered by royal command with all-inclusive powers, despite the frequent opposition of parliament, held the trade and land of the greater part of the colonies as rigid monopoly. In the case of the New England Company, severe punishment was threatened to all who should encroach upon its rights"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

"the people imagined that they had a real democratic government. Had not England established representative assemblies? These, with certain restrictions, alone had the power of law-making for the provinces. These representative bodies were supposed to rest upon the vote of the people, which vote, however, was determined by a strict property qualification.

What really happened was that, apparently deprived of direct feudal power, the landed interests had no difficulty in retaining their law-making ascendancy by getting control of the various provincial assemblies. Bodies supposedly representative of the whole people were, in fact, composed of great landowners. [and] of a quota of merchants who were subservient to the landowners, and a sprinkling of farmers [for show] ... the land magnates [fronting for the Arabs] had devised to set themselves up as the law-making class. Three of the large land grants contained provisions guaranteeing to each owner the privilege of sending a representative to the General Assembly. These landed proprietors, therefore, became hereditary legislators"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes,

1.3

[Here we see a description of the American colonies from c.1625-1775. But it is also a concise general explanation of the Arab parasite's eternal agenda for enslaving its host.] "The land magnates [the big-shots fronting for the Arabs] exacted tribute [payment] for the slightest privilege granted. [the Arab way] Drastic laws forbade competition with the companies [fronting for the Arabs], and the power of law and the severities of class government were severely felt by the merchants. The chartered corporation and the land dignitaries [fronting for the Arabs] were often one group with an identity of [with the very same] men and interests. Against their [Arab-backed] strength and capital the petty trader or merchant could not prevail. Daring and enterprising though he could be, he was forced to a certain compressed routine of business. He could sell the goods which the [Arab fronting] companies sold to him but could not undertake to set up manufacturing. And after the [chartered royal] companies had passed away, the landed aristocracy [fronting for the Arabs] used it power to suppress all undue initiative on his part."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.3

"Heavy export duties were now declared on every colonial article which would interfere with the monopoly which the British trading class [fronting for the Arabs] held, and aimed to hold, while the most exacting [burdensome] duties were put on non-British imports. Colonial factories were killed off by summary legislation." [The Arab feeding process relies heavily on political power, or rather corrupting power in the governments of their host societies. They use this power to enact laws with hard-to-see stupidity, like the "depletion allowance" of the pre-embargo decade. The ultimate goal is the killing-off competition for their monopolies and cartels. Thus their monopolies/cartels become highly profitable/prophet-able.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.3

"In 1699, [British] Parliament enacted that no wool yard or woolen manufactures of the American colonies should be exported to any place whatever. This was a destructive bit of legislation, as nearly every colonial rural family kept sheep and raised flax [linen] and were getting expert at the making of coarse linen and woolen cloths. No sooner had the colonists begun to make paper than that industry was likewise choked. With hats it was the same. The colonists had scarcely begun to export hats to Spain, Portugal and the West Indies before the British Company of Hatters called upon the Government to put a stop to this colonial interference with their trade. An act was thereupon passed by Parliament forbidding the exportation of hats from any American colony, and the selling in one colony of hats made in another. Colonial iron mills began to blast. [But] they [too] were promptly declared a nuisance, and [the Arab-fronting British] Parliament ordered that no mill or engine for slitting or rolling iron be used, but graciously allowed pig and bar iron to be imported from England into the colonies. Distilleries were common; molasses was extensively used in the making of rum and also by the fishermen. [However, a] heavy duty was put upon molasses and sugar as also on tea, nails, glass, and paints. Smuggling became general [widespread in the American colonies]; a narrative of the adroit devices [tricks] restored to would make an interesting tale.

These restrictive acts brought about various momentous results. They not only arrayed the whole trading

class against Great Britain, and in turn the great body of the colonists, but they operated to keep down in size and latitude the private fortunes by limiting the ways in which the wealth of individuals could be employed. [Then as in 1973-2017] Much money was withdrawn from active [productive] businesses and invested in land and mortgages." [that produced nothing. Again we see another Arabs strategy for getting its host to slow down, so it can be better dominated.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.5

"Since the laws favored the propertied interests [fronting for the Arabs], it was correspondingly easy for them to get direct control of government functions and personally exercise them. In New England, rich ship owners rose at once to powerful elective and appointive officers. Likewise in New York, rich land owners, and in the South, plantation men were selected for high offices. Law-making bodies, from Congress down, were filled with merchants, landowners, plantation men and lawyers, which last class was trained, as a rule, by association and self-interest, to take the views of the propertied class [fronting for the Arabs] and vote with, and for, it. A puissant [influential] politico-commercial aristocracy developed which, at all times, was perfectly conscious of its best interests. The worker was regaled [entertained] with flattering commendations of the dignity of labor and sonorous [impressive and rich-sounding] generalizations and promises, but the ruling class [fronting for the Arabs] took care of the laws.

By means of these partial laws, the propertied interests early began to get tremendously valuable special privileges. Banking rights [monopolies], canal construction [monopolies], trade [monopolies] privileges, government favors [gifts], public franchises [monopolies], all came in succession.

At the same time that laws were enacted, or were twisted to suit the will of property [owners fronting for the Arabs], other laws were long in force oppressing the poor to a terrifying degree.

Poor debtors could be thrown in jail indefinitely, no matter how small a sum they owed. In law, the laborer was accorded few rights. It was easy to defraud him of his meager wages, since he had no lien upon the products of his labor. His labor power was all that he had to sell, and the value of this power was not safeguarded by law. But the products created by his labor power in the form of property were fortified by the severest laws. For the laborer to be in debt was equal to a crime, in fact, in its results, worse than a crime. The burglar or pickpocket would get a certain sentence and then go free. The poor debtor, however, was compelled to languish in jail at the will of his creditor. [Again, this is the Arab way]

The report of the Prison Discipline Society for 1829 estimated that fully 75,000 persons were annually imprisoned for debt in the United States and that more than one-half of these owed less than \$20."

13— OUR DEMOCRACY IS CORRUPT

Procopius, Secret History, c.565 AD, 14.10

"The [Roman] Senate sat merely as a picturesque survival, without any power either to register a decision or to do any good, assembling for the sake of appearance and in fulfillment of an old law, since no member of that assembly was ever permitted to utter one word."

SPQR = Senate and People Who-are Rome

We look at the history books and we see clearly that Julius Caesar/seizer seized power in Rome instituted himself as first citizen. That is what a seizer is. So Rome in truth and fact became a dictatorship in 44BC.

Bun in the minds of the Roman people, the Arabs at least did not dispute the idea of SPQR = Senate and People Quod/Que Rome = Senate and People Who-are Rome. It stayed on all the plumbing and public buildings. And to this day SPQR is still written on the manhole covers.

Rome still had elections and it still had a Senate until just before it was overrun by barbarians and its own provincials. And Rome was still ostensibly a democracy even if all power had rested in the Seizer/Caesar emperors fronting for the Arabs since the time of Julius Caesar some 400 years earlier.

Everyone should take note of how Rome still passed itself off as a democracy, even though it had been a democracy in name alone for 400 years.

Overview

The current version of democracy, American 1789 vintage democracy sucks to the maximum extent our parasite could get away with. In fact, we use a democracy today that was designed by the parasitic land of no resources. It is a system that was designed to look as good and wholesome as possible, while simultaneously being as easy as possible for our economic parasite to corrupt.

Winston Churchill

"It has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all the others that have been tried."

Pandit Nehru, Indian Prime minister, 1947-64

"Democracy is good. I say this because other systems are worse."

62. Let's raise the bar in our definition of democracy.

Democracy and equality are pretty loose terms. I mean, just look at how when Ho Chi Minh proclaimed Vietnam's independence from French rule in 1945. He borrowed Thomas Jefferson's words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal." Of course the Arab puppet, Ho Chi Minh, had a different understanding of equality than Thomas Jefferson. After all, Ho Chi Minh's administration murdered tens of thousands of Vietnam's ethnic Chinese traders, people curiously known as the Jews of Asia.

Surely we are all not all so dumb as to be satisfied with mere titles like democracy, freedom and equality. Surely we must look at what lies inside these black boxes no matter how much we like the beautiful packaging. People are all far too generous with their definition of democracy, frequently bestowing the title on sham democracies or democracies in name alone. Soon, I hope we will all raise the bar for democracy. Soon I hope we stop soiling the sacred name of democracy by allowing its use with anything less than a genuine democracy — a broad and incorruptible democracy. Soon I hope that anything less will provoke a worldwide reaction that shouts how that nation's government a sham democracy.

George Orwell (Eric Blair)

"It is almost universally felt that when we call a country a democracy, we are praising it. Consequently, the defenders of

every kind of [authoritarian] regime claim that it is a democracy, and fear that they might have to stop using the word if was [ever] tied down to any one [specific] meaning."

Democracy in name alone

The North Korean dictatorship calls itself the "Democratic People's Republic of Korea." What nonsense. Who are they kidding? They are not in the least bit democratic, they are a total tyranny, a sham, a bold-faced lie. What do you expect from a nation of desperate people enslaved to an Arab front-man dictator.

Country names are often doublespeak

If a country names itself free, it might be totally enslaved. If it calls itself democratic, it might be run by a totally tyrannical dictatorship. If it calls itself a republic/rex-public, the public might not be the rex or king. If it calls itself socialist, a small group might still be getting very rich. If it says that it belongs to the people, it might belong to foreigners and their harem-born local aristocracy.

Let's rename the Koreas

You in the south would really benefit from calling yourselves Free Korea and we will all call the north part as Slave Korea. Show them how Free Korea worships more and better while Slave Korea worships less and worse — and slavery to its secret Arab masters standing behind their figurehead Kim Son Arab.

I sure hope my message makes it into North Korea and convinces the people that now is the time to depose your Arab frontmen and instead muster up into broad democracies.

The rules of Senate courtesy

- 1) You are required to say what you think and to be candid. It is your what you are there for. This is most important.
- 2) It is wrong to be indirect. Come right out and say what is wrong.
- 3) Always be polite
- 4) Never show anger in your dialogues.
- 5) Never mind traditional courtesies. This is a special place where the efficiency of the dialogue has far-reaching consequences for all society.

RETARDING CORRUPTION = the sort of corruption that keeps government from being effective unless the corruptor allows it.

DIRECTING CORRUPTION = the sort of corruption that directs government's efforts and government spending.

Patrick Henry, 5 June 1788

"We have heard that there is a great deal of bribery practiced in the House of Commons in England. And that many of the members raised themselves to preferments [appointment to highly profitable positions in government], by selling the rights of the people."

Peter Singer

"elections in the US are much more dominated by money than anywhere else calling itself a democracy."

Gore Vidal

"Our form of democracy is bribery, on the highest scale."

Theodore White

"The flood of money that gushes into politics today is a

pollution of democracy."

Woodrow Wilson, US president, 1913-21

"If there are men in this country big enough to own the government of the United States, they are going to own it."

Woodrow Wilson, US president, 1913-21

"The government which was designed for the people, has got into the hands of the bosses and their employers, the special interests. An invisible empire has been set up above the forms of democracy."

Woodrow Wilson, US president, 1913-21

"A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great government of the United States helpless and contemptible."

John Adams, US president, 1797-1801

"Our constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."

Teddy Roosevelt, US president, 1901-09

"Behind the ostensible government sits enthroned an invisible government owing no allegiance and acknowledging no responsibility to the people."

Aung San Suu Kyi

"Democracy is when the people keep a government in check." [Not true. Democracy is where the people are the government.]

William Penn

"Let the people think they govern and they will be governed."

American democracy is a sham

You know what American Democracy is? It is a sham. It is the most monarchic and oligarchic form of democracy the Arabs could get away with in 1787.

They purged all our leaders

They purged them before the war and then they purged them during the 6-year revolutionary war. Then 5 years after the war was over, they introduced the new constitution.

Petronius, Satyricon 119

[This comment about Rome's democracy that is so fitting today. Same form of government, same parasite, same tactics. The result, the complete failure of Rome and near total massacre of its people will be the same too if we fail to act]

"The madness of our [Roman] politics never stops increasing The citizens are bought, [and] transfer their votes

To hope of plunder [from conquest add], parrot-cries of grain [handouts].

The commons is for sale, the senate too, Their votes for auction. Even traditionalists Have long abandoned praiseworthy liberty.

Their power has been corrupted by gifts Their very majesty seduced by gold."

Roman campaign financing laws

The Lex Calpurnia de ambitu and later Lex Tullia de ambitu c. 70BC are two Roman laws that restrict the money a candidate for office can spend on public "entertainment." Apparently Rome had a lobbying problem just like we do today. Notably these laws were passed 26 years before the genocidal Mideast

puppet dictator Julius Caesar staged a coup d'etat in 44 BC, declaring himself emperor, and dissolving Rome's democracy forever. Julius Caesar, as many people do not know, killed a million people in France and enslaved another million, at least according to Plutarch.

Kipling - Mowgli's Song Against People, 1894

[Here we see our parasite's blind contempt/ hatred of its host societies. Here we see its hopes for us. In the following poem, vines are parasites that grow on the Arab tree of life.]

"I will let loose against you the fleet-footed vines
I will call in the Jungle [Sanskrit jangala = desert]
...to stamp out your [family] lines!
The house-beams shall fall

In the gates of these your councils [governments] my people
shall sing [determine policy]
In the doors of these your garners [treasuries] the [upside-down] Bat-folk shall cling
And the [corrupt] snake shall be your watchman

Ye shall not see my strikers; ye shall hear them and guess
By night, before the moon-rise, I will send for my cess
[assessment, taxes]

And the [predatory] wolf shall be your herdsman [like Obama]
By a landmark removed [i.e. the 'Egyptian' obelisks removed from the US and UK.]

I will reap your fields before you at the hands of a host [army of Mideast ex-migrants]

Ye shall glean [gather leftover grain] behind my reapers, for the bread that is lost

And the [small weak] deer shall be your oxen

By a headland untilled, [headland = unplowed land at a field's edge]

I have united against you the club-footed vines [primrose is one, i.e. primrose path]

I have sent in the Jungle [desert sons] to swamp out your [family] lines!

The trees -- the trees are on you!

The house-beams shall fall"

The liberty bell and the crackpot US democracy

Look at how America's liberty bell is cracked and cannot function for the purpose it was created — for it does not ring like a bell. Look at how we are all told that we love this symbol anyway. Are you all fools? Can't you see what this symbolizes? This symbolizes how truth rings as hollow in our democracy as it does in our liberty bell.

And while the liberty bell is a fools symbol under our current narrow democracy, it is a wonderful symbol under our new broad democracy. For it symbolizes the defective resonance of narrow democracy.

Perfectly corruption-free democracy

Corruption is a sort of leak that should be compared to a leaky tire, or perhaps a tiny little leak of 1% per day in a bank account. Doesn't the bank account get completely drained in a few months? Here it seems that that the benefits of being corruption free all occur as we approach zero corruption. In fact, the benefits seem to grow exponentially as we approach zero corruption.

With this idea in mind, our efforts to make the world more democratic are misguided if they start with the most

oppressively undemocratic nations like Slave Korea, Iran and Burma. Here, a little more democracy will change little. We should instead focus on the most democratic nations and try to make them 100% corruption and parasite free. And incidentally, here is where the Sphinx Mafia struggles hardest. So here is where the world will be rewarded most for its democratic efforts.

Political lawn signs

In suburban America, before most elections we see these silly political lawn signs everywhere. Is this really how a democracy informs itself about who or what to vote for?

You know what this is? This is America's democracy not working. This is a dumb sort of democracy that does not inform itself about its candidates.

Look how hard we are making it for honest selfless would-be leaders to communicate with their constituency. Look how hard we are making it unnecessarily hard for the people who just want to help. Whose idea is this? Is it our own idea, or is it the desperate people from the land of no resources trying to better enslave their host society?

Its barely democracy

The way I see it, the world today uses the narrowest, faintest, flimsiest, most corruption prone form of democracy that the Arab parasite race could fob off on the mostly illiterate Americans bumpkins of the few (if any) people imagined that the monarchs of Europe were mere figureheads of a parasite race that had made its living infiltrating all the world's governments.

Unbelievably inept

Go back and take a fresh look at American history. You will find that our "great" and "brilliant" democracy has made dozens, nay even hundreds of huge, costly and obviously policy blunders over the past 240 years. Allowing subprime to fund an oil price bubble is merely one of the latest and one of the greatest.

Maybe we didn't get it right the first time with respect to democracy. Maybe our version of democracy really isn't great. Maybe the only thing we ever really had in America was a government too small to do much harm. Maybe our corrupt democracy has actually been hindering our nation, and maybe it was designed that way.

Just keep saying it is great

I see a bunch of "bounding Brothers" like Hamilton, Jay, Adams and Madison (and their dupes Washington, Franklin and Jefferson) helping America draft its constitution and institute a narrow democracy. Then they simply went to great lengths to call it the best form of government anyone could think of, so the whole world copied America with its narrow and easy-to-corrupt form of democracy.

The Anti-Federalist Papers, 21 June 1787:

"One Gentleman alone (Colonel Hamilton) in his animadversions on [criticism of] the plan of New Jersey, boldly and decisively contended for an abolition of the State Governments. Mr Wilson and the gentlemen from Virginia who also were adversaries of the plan of New Jersey held a different language. They wished to leave the States in possession of a considerable, though a subordinate jurisdiction."

US Democracy 2.0

Today, thanks to the determined efforts of Alexander Hamilton and his Federalists, America's democracy went from 2000-odd senators in 13 houses to:

- A) a primary house of 65 seats
- B) a secondary house of 26 seats with a veto
- C) a tertiary executive house of 1 seat a veto
- D) an appointed judiciary of 9 seats with a constitutionality veto.

This was America's new Federal government. And it had the power to overrule the 2,000 lawmakers in the state legislatures. This new democracy handed one lone 4-year monarch the right to veto anything the rest of the government decides —unless it overrides with a 2:1 vote. Needless to say, this was a huge narrowing of the democracy of the United States. No legislation could pass if any of the three houses opposed it. The only exception being that a veto of the lone executive can be overridden if both the primary and secondary houses vote 2-to-1 in favor of the legislation, something which seldom happens.

Now the great and marvelous advantage of this system is that we check our parasite's power in just the right way, so that it can not get carried away, and shock the monkey, or wake us all from the interpretive matrix. In truth, our parasite probably has more power that it needs, more power than it can get away with exercising (and still preserve the illusion of a democracy and autonomy).

Reshape American democracy or die

Our parasite had to make America's democracy as easy to corrupt as possible. This because America's democracy was obviously destined to become the paradigm that the entire world would follow on its modern route to freedom. Our parasite succeeded, because American style narrow democracy is just about the best possible form of democracy for parasitism and conversely the worst possible form of democracy for the host societies. Today we have so many things wrong with our democracy. Here are a few are some of them:

- 1) We use a narrow democracy barely wider than oligarchy
- 2) We have a corrupt election process where campaign spending often decides who gets elected.
- 3) We allow re-elections so that our acting legislators have a need to please those with campaign money.
- 4) We allow our laws to be written in toto outside our legislatures.
- 5) We have these presidential monarchs and we allow them to veto our democratic legislatures. Talk about an anti-democratic concentration of power!
- 6) We allow the non-elected barocracies of our monarchic presidents to implement all the laws of our legislature.
- 7) We have the secret public elections that maximizes ballot corruption
- 8) We have open legislative voting that maximizes legislative corruption
- 9) We have numerous mechanisms to slow our democracy from being too responsive, from acting "too rashly."
- 10) We have so few legislators that the best can easily be scandalized and driven from public service.
- 11) We have a perennial shortage of leaders.
- 12) Good people are afraid to run for office.
- 13) It costs a pile of money to run for office.
- 14) Fictional citizens and foreigners can influence our elections.
- 15) We allow 9 appointees to veto the laws of our legislature

for any plausible conflict with our over-terse constitution.

16) We have extra-democratic political parties establishing national policy.

Public theft

In many parts of the world, it has become normal to steal from the group, from government, because government touches so much. This should never be normal. Because it is much easier to get away with theft of public property, it should be punished twice or thrice as severely as theft of private property.

The future punishment of corruption

The trend towards increased punishment of corruption will continue for quite some time in this world. Most corruption from before today should be forgiven if it is entirely confessed. And most corruption from after this day should be punished severely with the un-confessed and un-repentant spending the rest of their life in prison.

Livy, A History of Rome, 25.3.9

"[Marcus Postumius was a publican](#) [a man dealing with public monies] [who for many years had no equal in the Roman world for fraud and greed....](#)

[The Roman government had agreed to provide storm insurance for cargo](#) [army provisions] [being carried](#) [by sea] [to the army.](#) So these two men invented false reports of shipwrecks. In fact those shipwrecks had actually occurred. It is just that they didn't occur by accident, but by their own foul play. What they did was put a few items of little value into battered old ships. And then when they sank out at sea, they falsely reported that the cargo had been much larger in quantity and value than it actually was. [Here are a few approaches]

[The year before \[213BC\], Marcus Aemilius, a praetor, had exposed this fraud and brought it to the attention of the senate, but the senators did not take action because they did not want to offend the publicans at such a critical time."](#) [during the 2nd Punic War, or at least that was the excuse]

A corrupt democracy

The purpose of human government thus far has not been to determine the will of the people, or to lead them in the way most beneficial to their own needs. It has thus far been to lead them in the way most beneficial to their parasite race.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"['The widespread belief of the people of this country', wrote Commissioner Sparks in 1885, \[is\] 'that the land department has been largely conducted to the advantage of speculation and monopoly, private and corporate, rather than in the public interest... I am satisfied that thousands of claims without foundation in law or equity, involving millions of acres of public land, have been annually passed to patent](#) [into private ownership] [upon the single proposition that nobody but the Government](#) [cared or] [had any adverse interest.](#) The vast machinery of the land department has been devoted to the chief result of conveying the title of the United States to [in] public lands upon fraudulent entries under loose construction of law.'

[Whenever a capitalist's interests was involved, the law was always 'loosely construed', but the strictest interpretation was invariably given to laws passed against the working population."](#)

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"The great Government bond issue of 1877, by which the bankers made colossal profits followed Sherman's appointment...

Morgan... began to be conspicuous in very large transactions. One of these was the floating of the \$260-million U.S. Government bond issue of 1877. Avoiding plunging into detail, which would be intricate at best, suffice it to say that this bond issue was generally regarded, and not without full reason, as one of the very worst cases that had ever been known of the people being betrayed over to [betrayed over to] a few bankers. The selling of the bonds was apportioned among these banking houses: August Belmont, the Rothschilds, J. and W. Seligman Brothers, and Drexel, Morgan & Company, the last named acting for themselves and for the firm of J. S. Morgan & Company in London. This syndicate at once sold the bonds at an advance from 1% to 4% above the price which they had paid to the Government. The profits of the syndicate reached into the tens of millions of dollars. Drexel, Morgan & Company alone were credited with "Making" a clear profit of \$5-million. Their function consisted in nothing more or less than acting as licensed speculative middlemen for a Government which could have disposed of the bonds without intermediaries. Moreover, the participating bankers were able to get the bonds for themselves at "bargain prices", and then through associated national banks, carry on the familiar practice of exacting double interest—one interest from the Government, and another for the use of the currency issued on the basis of those same bonds."

Our system is corrupt

Most people underestimate the Mideast's influence and sway over the group decisions of their society. I see them exploiting:

- 1) The openly corrupt campaign finance system we use to elect government leaders.
- 2) The openly corrupt voting scheme we use to elect corporate leaders.
- 3) The openly corrupt way the big-media news reporters and their stories are chosen.
- 4) The openly corrupt advertising-based media system.
- 5) The openly corrupt buy-the-best lawyer system we use in our courts.
- 6) The totally opaque way our religions con-sacred priests.
- 7) The totally opaque way our colleges con-sacred professors.
- 8) Dimwitted go-alongs as figurehead frontmen.
- 9) Shape-shifter mullah-toms, quadroons and octoroons as moles.

14—RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 15.4

"He deprived the people of their arms in the following way. He held an armed parade in the Theseum and tried to address the assembled people, speaking for a short time. When they said they could not hear him..."

Noah Webster, An examination of the leading principles of the Federal Constitution 1787.10.10

"Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed, as they are in almost every kingdom of Europe. The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops that

can be, on any pretense raised in the United States."

A Pennsylvanian, The Pennsylvania Gazette, 1788.02.20

"Who are the militia? Are they not ourselves? ... Congress have no power to disarm the militia. Their swords, and every other terrible implement of the soldier, are the birthright of an American... the unlimited power of the sword is not in the hand of either the federal or state governments, but where I trust in god it will ever remain, in the hands of the people."

Thomas Jefferson, 1788.02.22, to Abigail Adams

"The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions, that I wish it to be always kept alive. It will often be exercised when wrong, but better so than not to be exercised at all. I like a little rebellion now and then. It is like a storm in the atmosphere"

Patrick Henry, 1775.03.23, speech to the Virginia Convention

"Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

Benjamin Franklin, 1759, Historical Review of Pennsylvania

"They that can give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary [or short term] safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

The first 3 imperatives of freedom

1. Know the truth.
2. Protect your freedoms.
3. Help others who wish to be free.

Without the right to bear arms the proposition of freedom cannot long last. Here is why the parasite spends piles of money to support shooter media that will undermine our right to bear arms.

Orphan quote

"It is an oddity of archeology that most Roman swords have been found outside the empire. The Roman authorities did not like their citizens to go around armed, but unscrupulous [Arab] merchants were quite happy to sell high-grade weapons to Rome's enemies." [This is how the Arabs would have America and the entire world if they could]

Firearms once hurt the Arabs Inc. in 4 big ways

- 1) By piercing armor, they ruined the Arab armor industry.
- 2) By piercing town walls they ruined the safety of living behind a wall. No longer could the parasite's front-man lords extract much protection money from people to live inside the town walls.
- 3) Firearms ended the highway robbery (brigandage=land piracy) that helped feed the land of no resources.
- 4) Firearms permitted farmers to increase food supplies in Europe and no longer was the parasite able to profit from causing famines.

The Arabs HATE HATE HATE our guns

It was our guns that caused Mideast Inc. to lose control of the overland spice trade. It was our guns that equalized things with the Arab bandits plaguing our countryside. It was our guns that ruined the Arab armor and arms racket. It was our guns that made their safe and valuable walled fiefdom towns in

our land unnecessary and worthless as something for them to sell. It was our guns that destroyed their agenda of isolated slave islands and for-sale town franchises. It is our guns that keep whitey from being invaded and slaughtered in the real final solution. For without that, they must suffer less than their perfect house of 8-gables, the universal monopoly in every direction.

So yes, the Arabs hate hate hate hate our guns.

Questions

- 1) Who is the #1 supporter of the Arab struggle (jihad=struggle) to repeal the US 2nd amendment?
- 2) Who is pouring out money to produce children's media like the film Dear Wendy?
- 3) Who is pouring out money to produce all the first-person shooter games?

Augustus, the deeds of Augustus, (Res Gestae Divi Augustus)

"In my 6th consulship, with my colleague, Marcus Agrippa, I made a census of the People. By it the number of Roman citizens was 4,063,000. Again, in the consulship of Gaius Censorinus and Gaius Asinius [8BC] I took the census, when the number of Roman citizens was 4,230,000. A third time, with Tiberius Caesar as colleague, I took the census when the number of Roman citizens was 4,937,000"

[In #3 of the same document, the August administration say they had 500,000 Romans under military oath. Thus we see Rome as a military dictatorship with a whopping 10% of her population in the military at one time.

After this time, during the European Dark Ages (also known as the great age of Islam) no city in Europe had a population of over 25,000. All of Europe was huddled together living near tiny walled towns that provided safety from marauding (bar•audio•ing) brigands (bri•G•an•de's), highway robbers (our•ob•ours) bent on terrorism as much as plunder. Anyone who dared trade between cities and interfere with the trade monopoly that Arabs Inc. lived off risked being made a walking and talking advertisement for the dangers of intercity travel by being say "robbed blind" — that is robbed and blinded. This process of reduction and enslavement was stopped more than anything else by European firearms.

The Arabs hate America just like they hate Poland

Which races and nations do the Arabs have the most trouble with? Who stands up to them? Who gives them the most trouble? If you are on this list, rest assured, the Haremi/Arab plan is to liquidate your human flock just like it did in Poland in WW2, when 1/6 of the people died — and pretty much all of the top 10% of Polish society.

The killing fields

Cambodia was a problem for the Arabs because there were many smart Cambodians due to a harem breeding culture that existed there from time to time over the centuries. During the rule of the Khmer rouge in the 1970s about 1/5 of Cambodians were killed. This was focused on eliminating the upper and middle classes.

Deaths by nation during WW2

Austria	5.6%	1-in-18 people
Belarus	25.3%	1-in-4 people
Germany	8.2%	1-in-12 people
Poland	17%	1-in-6 people
Russia	12.7%	1-in-8 people

Ukraine 16.3% 1-in-6 people

Guns actually save lives

It is a tragedy that about 11,200 Americans die each year from firearm homicides. But their deaths are small in comparison to the huge war massacres that their firearms prevent. I mean, if we ban all firearms, we might eventually save as many as say 7,500 lives a year, or about 1:40,000 Americans. The thing is, that 1:4 people died in Belarus during WW2 — mostly because the people were unarmed.

Thus if having firearms prevents this sort of war massacre more than once every 10,000 years, we are better off allowing the firearms. And obviously having firearms will do that many times over. So over the long run, fewer people die when everyone owns firearms than when they don't — that is unless we really think we have seen the end of war forever.

Barak Hussein Obama 2016.10.16

"How do we think of self-driving cars? The technology is essentially here...machines can make a bunch of quick decisions, often times quicker than we can, that could drastically reduce traffic fatalities, could drastically improve the efficiency of our transportation grid, [help solve things like carbon emissions that are causing the warming of the planet. But...](#)"

Cars kill 3x more than guns

US road deaths per year: 34,000

US firearm deaths per year: 11,200

If you really want to save lives...

95% of vehicle deaths will soon be prevented by using multi-redundant networks. On the other hand, only 1/3 to 1/2 of firearm homicides might be prevented by super-tight gun control laws. Thus in our effort to save lives, "autonet" will be 6 to 9 times more prolific.

Had Poland been armed

If even half of Poland had been armed with single-shot hunting rifles, Hitler might not have gotten any further. Why isn't Poland universally armed? What about Belarus, Ukraine, Russia, France?

Human weapons vs. robot weapons

Machine guns are much deadlier to people than single high-powered rounds. The opposite is however true with armored robots. We should be prepared for this sort of warfare in advance. And we should have explode on impact rounds that spray molten metal into the armored cavity.

Which type of weapon

Our militia shall focus more on using sniper rifles rather than machine guns. The former is deadly to armored vehicles, armored robots, invading armies, terrorists and tyrants. The latter is more the weapon of those who would use force on the people.

Miniature anti-aircraft guns

They are discs on low-slung tripods. They work with remote sensors and pivot and gimbal the rifle, which shoots exploding rounds.

If America or Britain are invaded by an Arab front-power...

There are only two nations the Haremi hate more than Poland. They are Britain and America. Rest assured, the Arabs will do

the same thing they did in Poland if they ever can.

Tacitus, Histories, 4.1

"Whenever a man of tall and military appearance came in sight, they cut him down regardless of whether he was a soldier or civilian."

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 35.3

"the city [Athens] was pleased with these [initial] achievements, and thought the Thirty [oligarchs] were acting from good motives. But once the Thirty had a firmer grip on the city, there was no type of citizen they did not attack. They killed those remarkable for their wealth, others for their birth or reputation. Their aim was to remove any potential threat, as well as to seize their property. Within a short span of time, they had killed [the best of Athens] no fewer than 1500 men."

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 17

"Polemarchus was given the usual sentence by the Thirty [oligarchs of Athens, to drink poison] hemlock, without any indication of the reason for his execution, let alone any trial or defense."

Herodotus, 5.92

[Gr. THUR=sacrifice, kill, burn, destroy + ASI=us + BOULE=the will, or a directive.]

"Thrasybulus invited the [messenger] to walk with him from the city to a field where corn was growing. As he passed through the cornfield, continually asking questions about why the messenger had come to him from Corinth, he kept cutting off and killing all the tallest and best stalks of corn which he could see, until the finest and best-grown part of the crop [generation] was ruined. In this way he went right through the field, and then sent the messenger off without a word. On his [the messenger's] return to Corinth, Periander was eager to hear what advice Thrasybulus had given, and the man replied that he had not given any at all, adding that he was surprised a being sent to visit such a person, who was evidently mad and a wanton destroyer of his own property. Then he described what he had seen Thrasybulus do. Periander immediately grasped the point [ak]. It was perfectly plain to him that Thrasybulus recommended the murder of all the people in the city who were outstanding in influence or ability. He took this advice, and from that time forward, there was no crime against the Corinthians that he did not commit." [Here we see our parasite explaining how to communicate in secret, but out in the open, talking above the flock. Also, it seems that they were at times killing the best part of their host population.]

Herodian, History, 7.9.10?

[This was written about the period c.238AD, not how killing the best people is mentioned twice.]

"When Capellianus [Roman governor of Numidia] entered Carthage, he killed all the leading men who were still alive after the battle. Then he plundered the temples and seized the public funds and money of private people. Then he attacked all the other cities that had taken down their dedications to Maximinus, killing the best and exiling the common people. He also gave orders to the soldiers to put fields and villages to the torch and to loot. This he did on the pretext of exacting vengeance for the wrongs to Maximinus, but secretly he was courting the good will of the soldiers, hoping that if the affairs of Maximinus should fail, he himself, in possession of a well-disposed army, might lay claim to imperial power"

Be as bees

When an intruder come into your nation, presume that the plan is to exterminate your people and act accordingly.

Why is Poland not armed?

Why is it that Poland, Ukraine, Romania, Croatia, and the other supposedly free nations of east Europe do not have the right to bear arms? Look at the many invasions and wars of the past couple centuries. Look at the genocides. Look how the Russian pole of the axis of evil is constantly struggling for the inverted agenda of the parasite. Look at the immense suffering you people suffered at the hands of the Turks and the southern pole of the axis of evil.

Look how Russia recently invaded Eu•kraine. You people more than any other should be afraid of invasion as well as afraid of your own government. Arm yourselves, and arm yourselves well.

Can you trust your own government to defend you from the "irresistible force" of the harem race? I see their blatant corruption and control clearly in eastern Europe — same thing you know, corruption, and Arab control. And not only do they control your governments, but they control your churches. And they have carefully chosen pedophile thumbs-men who will say and do anything to keep fucking your children and to stay out of jail. Arm yourselves, and arm yourselves well.

Your nations are all on the front line, blocking the exits for the Arabs. One day, in the not too distant future, if nothing is done, the Arabs will come once again in great waves just like they did in centuries past. Only this time they will all be carrying AK-47s, RPGs and flying remotely operated vape-pen nerve-gas drones. You more than any other people should arm yourselves against the next Arab invasion. Arm yourselves, and arm yourselves well.

The US, the UK and Poland

The three nations that stood up against the Hitler figurehead. These are all arch enemies of the Arabs.

Fist fighting exists to disarm us

It is like how they got the Europeans to fight with those absurdly long and awkward slow draw swords. What a joke for the guy with the curiously named "eff-ish-knife". It is just like our prohibitions on using nuclear weapons and neutron bombs.

Why they hate Poland

I am mostly of Jewish stock from Greater Poland. They probably had the most problems with people of my ancestry. And look at the great problem I am creating for them now.

In Poland the parasite staged this great purge where all the disloyal lines were exterminated. The parasite plans to do the same thing to America and Britain the very first time it thinks it can get away with it. Both are heavily populated by the descendants of Jews disloyal to the parasitic agenda of Mideast Inc. Then we will all be living like primitives as shown in the Cloud Atlas film — or Eloi self-grazing cattle like in the Time Machine novel by H.G Wells.

Disarming and false anarchy

I include a whole section on false anarchy and all disarmament must be considered in the light of false anarchy. I also want to say that giving up your firearms is just as dumb as nuclear disarmament.

Star Trek 2, Wrath of Kahn film

"Their young enter through the ears and wrap themselves around the cerebral cortex. This has the effect of rendering the victim extremely susceptible to suggestion. Later as they grow follows madness and death." [Until it is 500 years since the last war, do not allow yourselves to be disarmed]

Its a great new age!

Maybe we have entered a great new age of peace and prosperity, and maybe we haven't. In fact, we probably have not entered a great new age of peace and prosperity. Free people must always play it safe.

How to exterminate a society

First they lose the war. Then the invading army comes in and takes away all the weapons. It also arrests all the officers and political leaders. Then it arrests the smart and the rich people not working for the Arabs. Then they widen their net and arrest people with some backbone and people who complain about all the disappearances. Then they arrest normal people who have bought the wrong sort of book or were in any way politically active, or said the wrong thing on Facebook. Then they start killing the people they have arrested. Then they take the women and children away to be work and sex slaves. They leave some people behind, the most degraded human lines they can find. Then the local flowering of eu-man-idi is no more. Resist disarming.

Decision in Philadelphia

"It is exceedingly important for us to bear in mind that the United States in 1787 did not possess a standing army worth the name; instead, the population itself was armed. In this respect the nation was unique. Everywhere else governments had standing armies officered by members of the hereditary ruling class [Brothers and their caste], made of well-trained men equipped with the best weapons. They could put down insurrections by force, collect taxes by force, march into unruly villages and arrest mayors, councilors, private citizens by force. [This was necessary for the Brotherly administration to collect the imperial taxes needed to feed the poor people back home in the land of no resources.]

The United States had a few hundred troops on short enlistments stationed at frontier posts, and the states, of course, had their militias, as they did in the case of Shay's Rebellion. [In Shay's rebellion, the militias were not at all effective at enforcing our parasite's engineered debt crisis to full effect.]

Making enforcement [of our parasite's exactions] difficult was the fact that American citizens were armed to an extent that would have astonished Europeans, both noble and peasants. Not every household owned a gun, but certainly on the frontier, where the danger of Indian attack was real, every farmer did. Even in more settled areas farmers usually had a musket or rifle for hunting and for killing wolves and foxes that preyed on livestock. [Rifled gun barrels had not yet been invented.] The American citizenry, potentially, constituted an army of its own, and if any substantial proportion of it chose to face down a militia, it probably could [have]. Americans, unlike most people elsewhere, could not be governed without their own consent. [This is why under a democracy, the right to bear arms comes in second only to the the right of free speech and the right to discuss what the truth is. An un-armed people is the stuff of tyranny, not democracy.]

The delegates were filled with a very real sense of the nation's vulnerability: The enemies were there, waiting to

pounce. ... Nations were always taking umbrage [offense] at one thing or another, and sending out troops. A nation simply had to be prepared to fight, and the United States was not.

The new country must be able to defend itself, obviously. But there was a countervailing idea held by the delegates—and the country as a whole. That was hatred of the standing army—the permanent force ready to fight at an instant. Kohn says flatly, "No principle of government was more widely understood or more completely accepted by the generation of Americans that established the United States than the danger of a standing army in peacetime." Indeed, anti-army feeling had a long English heritage. The standing army of professional soldiers, usually drawn from the dregs of society and held under tight control by harsh discipline, had been developed in Europe in the 1600s. During the colonial period, the British had used troops on occasion to impose order as they wanted, and in an era when barracks were not widely used, citizens were often forced to billet them in their homes. Then, in 1770, came the Boston Massacre, in which British troops fired on an American mob. As events rolled toward the Revolution, it was the British standing army that was [became] the enemy.

... Even Madison, the proponent of strong national government, had his fears. He said, "Throughout all of Europe, the armies kept up under the pretext of defending, have enslaved the people" Americans saw a standing army not so much as a force to defend them, but as a force to be used against them by whatever tyrant would get control of it. The country, many people believed, could defend itself with civilian armies—a militia composed of the able-bodied males of each locality, organized into companies and brigades and led by officers appointed by their own state governments, or even elected by the troops. The militia would never attempt to enslave the people, because they were the people."

Sabers: Symbol of the Mideast police state

Single edged sabers are a symbol of Mideast enslavement. They were the weapon of the Mideast police force, and the shorter, straighter double edged swords were for the police's police, the Mideast secret police.

See, sabers were not for war, but for controlling unarmed crowds in Mideast cities when the food supply ran low. Rows of men would stand shoulder to shoulder blocking the narrow streets of the Mideast medinas: narrow streets designed for crowd control and maintaining political domination. Anyway, the police would use their free hand to grasp the backs of their too-heavy, and ungainly (un-gainly = 'disadvantaging') sabers, to support them, holding the saber diagonally. The blades would do a good job of discouraging the unarmed crowd from surging against the police line.

Now while powerful in a single stroke, and deadly when used on unarmed civilians, a saber is an overweight and unwieldy/ ungainly weapon when used against lighter and shorter swords. Sabers need long strokes to be truly effective against people wearing even full-thickness cow hide, not to mention chain mail. So the saber-armed fighter must cock his weapon upward, pulling it back before using it. And also, at the end of each stroke, the saber armed fighter needs a moment to recover, and to loop back. It is in these moments that a well trained man with a shorter, lighter straight sword is able to quickly stab in and beat his opponent to the punch, and this will happen pretty much every time.

Now in the Middle East, the general population was kept in order by a police force armed with sabers. If the police don't obey, or a faction starts to disobey, then a much smaller

force of double edged swordsmen could quickly defeat them. This especially considering that the sword users were probably trained to fight saber users. Also, the Saber users probably received training that intentionally installed backdoors in their fighting style. Regardless, the saber, the symbol of Arabia's empire is not a weapon of outward control at all, but one of inward control and a symbol of a police state.

British steel

BRITTLE comes from Old English BREOTAN. The same word also meaning BRITAIN in Old English. The intersection of these words/ meanings seems to be that ancients called this early British steel/iron as ferrum breotan. In one sense the term meant British steel and in another it was interpreted to mean brittle steel.

In those days, the British were in the role of the the distant continent, while the Romans were in the role of the super powerful Mideast front nation. The British got the brittle cast iron single edged sabres and the Romans got the short double-edged swords and the training and drilling on using them correctly.

Slave machetes

In Asia, I have seen these absurd, and absurdly hard to use J-shaped machetes, where only the inside arc is sharpened. The outside edge is maybe as thick as a bubble Tea straw. This is a machete that can be used to harvest, but a machete that cannot be used as a weapon against a man — except perhaps as a club

All of these slave machetes speak of the imperial Arab dominance of your people. All of these were made to use your people as farm workers, but to keep them enslaved. And little doubt these were sold by the parasite's traders for little more than their value in steel.

It is not right to carry a machete around

Little doubt the parasite 'struggled' to make it bad manners or menacing to carry a normal machete around. This would account for the J-blade, but not the incredibly thick outer edge that defies sharpened by grinding. No. These are slave machetes and each one stands as artifact evidence of your people's enslavement by the Arabs.

Britain's gun policy success:

Your gun policy works well in Britain does it? Maybe it only works well because the parasite is always helping it to work. See, because you restrict firearm use, all of Mr. P's men struggle to protect you from gun violence. They run all the rackets after all — including the gun smuggling racket. They do this to make America's policy (which the parasite utterly despises) look like a bad idea.

On the other hand, the parasite struggles to make sure that all the nuts in America are left alone. It struggles for a system that ignores signs of violent craziness. It also struggles to produce shoot-em up children's media for America, TV shows and films like Dear Wendy.

How the parasite pushes us to disarm

To de-weaponize, support crazy weaponization. Then show how many people die in school shootings and then use this energy as an excuse to swing it the other way.

Guerrilla warfare

The suffix is diminutive, and the real meaning of this term refers to small bands of fighters as opposed to large armies.

This implies a defensive war, where local freedom fighters get help from their countrymen and can operate best in small fast-moving bands. Invading armies on the other hand need to have large groups for safety from the locals.

If there is any unfairness or disgracefulness associated with this type of warfare, or sniping at invaders, it is our parasite's doing. There is absolutely nothing wrong with native people defending themselves from invading armies. The world would be much better off if all invading armies encountered nothing but deadly resistance.

Weapons technology good and evil

- 1) In general, defensive technologies are generally good, while offensive technologies are generally evil. This is because if all forms of invasions were impractical, including invasions by one's own government, then there would be little warfare.
- 2) In general, robotic, self-actuating, and indiscriminate weapons are evil and human operated weapons are good. Mines may be good because they are defensive, but they are also evil because they are self-actuating and indiscriminate. The fact that they are self-actuating and indiscriminate overrides their defensive goodness and makes them evil. Other forms of remote control weapons are also, in general evil
- 3) In general, weapons that can be used to kill great masses of people indiscriminately are evil, while precise weapons are good. By this standard, machine guns are evil, while single-shot sniper rifles and trainings are good.
- 4) Armor piercing weapons are generally good because they help small, local, popular guerrilla forces defend their land from invasion.

Centi-Nome armories

In addition (or in place of) the small arms kept by citizens in their homes and places of business, some democracies might want to have Centi-Nome armories. This is a way for the people to hold a stronger grade of civil-defense weaponry, while at the same time reducing the risk of crazy people going on huge killing rampages with powerful weapons. Here we imagine that each Centi-Nome might be given a mass-produced, purpose-built, walk-in armory-safe that can be bolted to a concrete foundation (from the inside). These are perhaps designed so they can be enlarged by adding standard-sized segments. Here is a place where all the Centi-Nome's government-property, militia-grade weapons can be more safely kept.

Here we imagine that multiple access codes held by multiple elected armory keymen will be required to unlock each Nome armory: Say 14 of 20 keymen, perhaps all retired confirmed Sub-Senators. All will swear an oath to obey the instructions of their County Sub-Senate upon a general call to arms.

We also imagine that All Centi-Nome armories shall have emergency medical supplies for natural disasters.

Schools that can be hospitals

In Poland, they learned from the war and all classrooms have sinks in them so they can serve as emergency hospitals in time of war or natural disaster. We should do the same thing for all new schools and put one sink at each corner along all common walls. Not only is this disaster-smart, but it also helps to make the new generation more serious.

Hospitals in containers

We should have the equipment for a number of whole trauma care hospitals standing-by, already packaged in containers

scattered throughout the nation. All medical equipment manufacturers should be required supply their equipment at cost and without any IP rights for this.

Cannon mines — The armor industry dies again

Historically, the parasite has been the #1 beneficiary of costly armor. Little doubt it loves tanks and other armored vehicles. Therefore, one of the best ways to further the cause of freedom is to reduce the effectiveness of armored vehicles. Perhaps remote-operated cannon-mines are a weapon that should be proliferated in this world.

Here we imagine men going around and using 2-man gas powered augurs to drill deep holes in the ground/pavement for plastic pipes that act as sleeves. These have say a 19cm interior diameter. These are quite deep so that a cannon can be lowered down far enough that they are not readily sensed by metal detectors.

The actual cannon is say 18cm diameter by say 2-meters long. The charge goes in a bore hole is say 10cm and threaded at the end for a screw-in plug that is designed to be blown out by the force of a contained explosion. This is a piece of "all-thread" that is say 10cm in diameter and say 15-30cm long, and pointed. The all thread does not rattle.

The sleeves are all capped with a removable and fillable plastic cup that makes them almost impossible to detect either visually, with IR, or with a metal detector. All are precisely located. Most sleeves remain empty and cost practically nothing to install. During a defensive operation, the local forces can go around and open the sleeves as needed, pull the mines out, and drop them in new holes, MX missile style.

When a vehicle comes along, someone detonates the cannon remotely and the plug is sent upwards with tank penetrating force. Hopefully this will greatly reduce the ability of people to invade nations using armored vehicles.

'Cannon mines on drone go carts

Take a smaller, single-use plug cannon and put it on a hybrid go cart that stalks with little IR signature, in electric mode. These are about the size of a small coffee table. When the contact cannon gets into position, it fires a plug at point blank range. And the base doesn't need to be tied down because it is a SUD =single use device.

The valuable aspect of the Terminator films

The time traveling is nonsense. However, the part about nuclear war and the robotic killing machines is not nonsense. The two part that go unsaid are 1) That the ice age is coming, and 2) That the Haremi as always are invisible behind the scenes of the machinery.

Now the killing machines will probably not be at all like people. They will probably look like plastic toy trucks and DJI drones. Many will be programmed to kill heat signatures and some will be controlled by people who remain hidden. This would appear to be the haremi plan, so they can best survive the coming ice age and live on to re-populate the world.

Patrick Henry, 1775.03.23, Virginia Convention, Give me liberty, or give me death!

[Patrick Henry had the eminent distinction of being the first speaker before the incipient US Congress in 1774. This honor was probably not given lightly by the smart men that existed before the war killing, and purges under cover of war started. Thomas Jefferson said that Patrick Henry was the true leader

of the American Revolution.]

"It is natural to man to indulge in the illusion of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth — and listen to the song of that siren, till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those, who having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it might cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years, to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the House? Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir. It will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with these war-like preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled, that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation; the last arguments to which kings resort. I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array, if its purpose be no to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motives for it? Has Great Britain any enemy, in this quarter of the world, to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us; they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains which the British ministry have been so long forging.

And what have we to oppose them? shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Have we anything new to offer on the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable [of being held]; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer. Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrations have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne. In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free, if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending — if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of Hosts is all that is left us!

They tell us sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by

irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs, and hugging the delusive phantom of hope until our enemies have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak, if we make a proper use of the means which the God of nature has placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations; and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election [option]. If we were [once] base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat, but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable — and let it come! I repeat it, sir, let it come!

It is in vain to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry peace — but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!

15— SLAVERY

The true meaning of liberty

It is liber•ti = free•you. When you believe in liberty, you believe in freeing all the enslaved people of the world. Armies crying liberty are saying "we just want to liberate you from your own government."

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution 6.1

"When Solon came to power, he put a halt to loans made on the security of the person, thus freeing everyone, both then and in the future. He also made a general cancellation of debts, both private and public. The Athenians called this the Shaking-off of Burdens, since by means of it they shook off the weight lying on them.

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution 2.1

"After this, there was a long period of civil strife between the ruling class men and the masses. The [Athenian] constitution was oligarchic in every way, and in particular the poor men were enslaved to the rich — together with their wives and children. The poor were called hektemori [sharecroppers that paid 1/6th of their harvest to the men playing rich landlord and fronting for the Arabs.] and also pelati [probably Arab immigrants with even fewer rights] which referred to the [sharecropper] terms under which they worked the fields of the rich. All the land was in the hands of a few men [Arab frontmen], and if the poor failed to pay their rents, both they, their wives, and their children were liable to arrest [and sale as a work and sex slave]. Furthermore, all loans were made on the security of the person [i.e. enslavement if you didn't pay the disposable front-man loan sharks back] until the time of Solon [630—560BC]. He was the first champion of the people. The harshest and most resented aspect of the [old] constitution for the masses was their enslavement. And although they had

other complaints as well, it could be said that there was nothing in [in their own country] which they had a share of." [In other words the Athenians were completely enslaved by the parasite and its frontmen, and they owned no share of their own nation. They also probably thought the ultra rich 'oligarch'-type people living among them were of their people when they were not.

Most people went down the drain economically thanks to a series of destructive bubbles and crises. You know, like the free world has recently seen — Oil embargo, S&L crisis, Dot-com crisis, Asian currency crisis, and subprime for example. The locals needed money. And thanks to an ancient culture (ancient even to the Greeks) of getting something for nothing, the only people with the money were the Arabs, and they required that the Greeks pledge their freedom for their gold. And of course this was a ruse because the Arabs really want more than anything your freedom and the freedom of your fair daughters to be their breed mares while they are young and an object of desire. After all these women are perhaps the main fuel of the Arab empire. Desire for harem saba•te•ak•als fuels just so much evil in this world. And then when the boys have grown up, their mothers know too much and can't be released. And food was of course always scarce in Arabia until recently. So if their sons did not send back enough money, they would get recycled in the ham-burger or man-burger or shawarma.

This is what the parasite will do if you let it. This is what it seeks to do with your people if you let it. It will turn your people into a total slaves and even meat on the hoof/foot livestock.]

The peculiar institution

It is strange how in America of the 1800s, slavery was called "the peculiar institution". Eng. PECULIAR comes from the ancient Latin word Peculium. This was the property owned by a Roman slave. This property incidentally did not belong to the slave's owner, even though he did own and have control over the slave. The situation is quite similar to our ownership of corporate property today: Someone may own a controlling interest in a corporation, but he does not technically own the property of the corporation, or directly control the use of that property.

Now on the basis of individual Roman slaves, and individual Roman owners, these weird rules did not make much sense or have any purpose. However they did make a great deal of sense for Mideast Inc. (probably the creator of these rules), perennially the world's largest slave owner/maker/seller in the world, with hundreds of thousands (or sometimes millions) of new Mideast emigrant "slaves" always on the books. These are the harem byproduct — the unchosen ones that are frequently sold as slaves of one type or another

It is easy to imagine that obedience (obey•de•hence) and motivation of new emigrants has always been a big problem for the parasite's agenda. This especially when we consider the inherent dangers and repulsive nature of participation in the inverted D'evil's de•ex•pull imperative of our parasite.

How do you get your new Mideast emigrants to do more for the greater cause of their people? What you do is change the legal system so your slaves will be hungrier for your corruption money. You change the system so they can own their own property, including money that is apart from the ownership of the slave himself. This way, the slaves value money for creature comforts, and to buy his freedom, to becomes a FREEMAN or FREEDMAN.

Now in ancient Rome, if the slave's owner did not want to sell the slave for his market value, the slave was generally free (if he had the money) to buy a slave himself that he could send to work in his place. This replacement slave was called a L. VICARIOUS, the slave of a slave, sort of like a corporation owned by a corporation. Thus we see that slaves in Rome were considered fungible (interchangeable) as long as the vicarious did the work as well as his master (who was a slave). Anyway, the remarkable things about the vicarious was that the master of the slave that owned the vicarious slave did not have control or responsibility for the actions of his slave's slave. He could whip his slave, and his slave could whip his slave, but the "grand-master" could not whip his slave's slave.

Anyway, now let's get back to the term peculiar institution in America. My guess is that it was the innie term for Roman or Rumi government's barocracy run by Arab slaves. Thus the peculiar institution was actually a reference to the government barocracy of the US at the time. This term found its way into popular parlance and became problematic for the always secretive Arab cause and needed to be covered up. Calling slavery in America as "the peculiar institution" seems to be the cover-up. The result is that today, the word peculiar now means strange, odd unusual, or weird.

The thing is that regardless of what the Arabs were trying to pull off, we know very clearly about American perceptions about slavery in the land of the free. For this defined the word peculiar for America. What was slavery in the land of the free? It was peculiar to anyone with any sense at all.

Anti-Federalist papers, 1788.08.21/22

"Colonel George Mason: This infernal traffic [in slaves] originated in the avarice of British Merchants. The British Government [Brotherly administration of the British monarchy] constantly checked [blocked] the attempts of Virginia to put a stop to it. The present question concerns not the importing States alone but the whole Union. The evil of having slaves was experienced during the late war. Had slaves been treated as they might have been by the [British] Enemy, they would have proved dangerous instruments in their hands. But their folly dealt by the slaves, as it did by the Tories. He mentioned the dangerous insurrections of the slaves in Greece and Sicily; and the instructions given by Cromwell to the Commissioners sent to Virginia, to arm the servants and slaves, in case other means of obtaining its submission should fail. Maryland and Virginia he said had already prohibited the importation of slaves expressly. North Carolina had done the same in substance. All this would be in vain if South Carolina and Georgia [with less than 1% of the US population] be at liberty to import. The Western people are already calling out for slaves for their new lands, and will fill that Country with slaves if they can be got through South Carolina and Georgia."

Slavery appeared to be dying out in the 1780s

By 1779, all of the northern states had outlawed the importation of new slaves. In 1786 North Carolina imposed a prohibitive duty on slave importation. In 1787, South Carolina closed down the slave trade entirely. In the same year, Massachusetts abolished slavery entirely, and Connecticut was following suit. It seemed to many people of the time that slavery was dying out on its own in the United States. Besides, in a 1-state-1-vote Congress of 13, the northern states could have easily outlawed slavery throughout the US. What happened? Why did slavery continue for 74 years in the US?

1) All the new anti-slave laws made the anti-slave people feel that slavery was dying on its own and they grew satisfied. At the same time, it made slave owners terribly eager to make a deal that would save the value of their main asset. This made the southern block of Georgia and the Carolinas willing to sign on to any coalition that allowed slavery. Basically, these one issue states would support any proposal, so long as it favored their one issue: slavery. Alexander Hamilton and the federalists then used this block of three states as a base of federalist power.

2) Markets hate political uncertainty, and slave markets are still markets. Therefore uncertainty over the future of slavery probably decreased the value of slaves substantially. So, in a sense, the 2nd US constitution, by protecting slave ownership rights increased the US market value of slaves and boosted demand.

3) Recall how Eli Whitney patented his cotton gin in 1794, only 5 years after 1789. This one invention made slavery much more profitable in America. And this was only 5 years after the new slave-friendly constitution was ratified. So in just 5 years, we see both the ownership rights of slaves defined, and their value increased substantially thanks to an invention. Also, not 3 years later, in 1797, Whitney supposedly developed the idea of mass-producing interchangeable parts to fulfill a contract to supply muskets for the government. So as the history books say he raised both the north and the south: Raised them to fight one another some 64 years later in what is still America's most deadly war. America the arch enemy of the Arab parasite race.

Anti-Federalist papers, 1788.06.17

[Here 'the great' James Madison argues in favor of slavery with George Mason.]

"George Mason: – Mr. Chairman. – This is a fatal section, which has created more dangers than any other. – The first clause, allows the importation of slaves for twenty years. Under the royal Government, this evil was looked upon as a great oppression, and many attempts were made to prevent it; but [North] African [Arab] merchant interests prevented its prohibition. No sooner did the revolution take place, than it was thought of. It was one of the great causes of our separation from Great-Britain. Its [slavery's] exclusion has been a principal object[ive] of this State, and most of the States of the Union. The augmentation of slaves weakens the States; and such a trade is diabolical in itself, and disgraceful to mankind. Yet by this Constitution it is continued for 20 years. As much as I value a union of all the States, I would not admit the Southern States into the Union, unless they agreed to the discontinuance of this disgraceful trade, because it would bring weakness and not strength to the Union. ...

James Madison: – Mr. Chairman. – I should conceive this clause to be impolitic [unwise], if it were one of those things which could be excluded without encountering greater evils. – The Southern States would not have entered into the Union of America, without the temporary permission of that trade. And if they were excluded from the Union, the consequences might be dreadful to them and to us. [Why. Why doesn't Madison the recorder explain why? Also, clearly the parasite wanted to fill the land of the free with African slaves, that is why they pushed for this 20 year delay on curtailment of the slave trade.]

We are not in a worse situation than before. ... Under the articles of Confederation, it might be continued forever: But by this clause an end may be put to it after 20 years. There is therefore an amelioration [lessening] of circumstances. A tax may be laid in the mean time; but it is

limited, otherwise Congress might lay such a tax as would amount to a prohibition. From the mode of representation and taxation, Congress cannot lay such a tax on slaves as will amount to manumission. [It is important to realize that all slave owners were only opposed to a freeing of their slaves — and that they actually wanted the slave trade ended immediately because it made their slaves more valuable. It was only the parasite that wanted it to go on.]

Another clause secures us that [human slave] property which we now possess. At present, if any slave elopes to any of those States where slaves are free, he becomes emancipated by their laws. For the laws of the States are uncharitable to one another in this respect. But in this [new 2.0] Constitution [we say] "No person held to service or labor, in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." — This clause was expressly inserted to enable owners of slaves to reclaim them. This is a better security than any that now exists. ... [What a 'peculiar' thing fugitive slave laws were for a constitution of free men. If even 90% or 80% of the nation despised slavery, why did we put this clause in our sacred constitution of free men? Why insert a clause about returning slaves that had fled from slavery to freedom? It is bizarre or bazaar that we gave this to our underpopulated southern states.]

And did a bunch of bumpkin slave owners really possess so much foresight as to insist on this? Or was this the parasite angling its arch-enemy into an immensely destructive civil war over slavery? Maybe it knew from its records of Roman times, that the most important thing for maximizing the value of slaves in the marketplace was to have the host society pick up the cost of runaway slave enforcement.]

They cannot prevent the importation of slaves for 20 years; but after that period, they can. The Gentlemen from South Carolina and Georgia argued in this manner: — "We have now liberty to import this species of property, and much of the property [real estate] now possessed, has been purchased, or otherwise acquired, in contemplation of improving it by the assistance of imported slaves. What would be the consequence of hindering us from it [doing this]? The slaves of Virginia would rise in value, and we would be obliged to go to your markets." I need not expatiate [speak at length] on this subject. Great as the evil is, a dismemberment of the Union would be worse. If those States should disunite from the other states, for not indulging them in the temporary continuance of this traffic, they might solicit and obtain aid from foreign powers." [At the time, the three slave states had tiny free populations that were always afraid of slave revolts. Like all slave states, their hold on power was tenuous at best, and they could have easily been coerced into accepting a total phase out of slavery over 10 or perhaps even 20 years. Instead the Arabs helped them grow their populations and fortunes to the levels that made the US civil war so horribly destructive.]

The Northern states could have forced the South to agree in 1787

In 1787, the northern 10 states had more than 93% of the nation's free people. The southern 3 states had less than 7%. Why did the northern states even allow these slave states any say at all in our new United States Government? After all, by 1804, all the northern states had eliminated slavery.

You know, around 1787, the Spanish were arming the Creek (Greek) Indians and threatening all 3 slave owning

states. So, in truth, the southern states needed the northern ones much more than the other way around.

The southern states had a tiny free population, and about the same number of slaves, all people who were ready to turn on their oppressors, frequently with vindictive violence. So these three states were extremely weak, and inherently vulnerable to external attack, as most slave societies are. And these three states must have understood this fact, judging from how easily the British cowed/bent them during the Revolutionary war.

So we must ask why the north didn't form a union of 10 and say to the 3 southern states, "you want the protection of our union, you join on our terms. You agree to halt all slave importation today, and you say that all people born from today on are free."

This would have easily and painlessly phased out slavery, and the southern states would have been forced to accept.

Why didn't this happen? I think the reason is that we Americans have never actually run our own nation. I think that America and indeed all modern democracies are merely the illusion of democracy. I think our parasite really runs the world and the term Western Civilization is doublespeak for Eastern Civilization or Middle Eastern Civilization.

Barbarians from the south

When Andrew Jackson invaded Florida in 1818, he captured the chiefs of the Seminole Indians who were raiding US citizens in southern states. He also captured two English citizens that he was convinced were responsible for the attacks. After a court martial, Jackson had these men, Alexander Aruthnot (harb•oo•eth•not) and Robert Ambrister (an•bri•ster) to be executed as spies.

3/5ths of a vote

There are things in this world where you say to yourself, "that makes sense", or "that might make sense to some people". And then there are other things that don't make any sense at all no matter how you look at them.

The part of the US constitution that calculated representation in such a way as to count slaves as 3/5ths of a voting citizen — that is one of those things that makes no sense at all. I mean, the free people of the three southern slave states were only 7% of the free US population. Why did the other 93% give the slaves states and their vile agenda so much power? So long as we assume that the US Constitutional Convention was a genuinely democratic event, there is no sensible answer. The only way that it can make any sense is if we assume that the US Constitutional Convention was a sham event that our parasite was running to further its own agenda.

A coalition of single issue voters

One of our parasite's top-20 democratic tricks is to create and then cobble together a coalition of unpopular and desperate minorities. If they get enough of these unpopular minority agendas together, then they can frequently build a majority, or at least a ruling minority out of them. So as long as the economy of the slave states was based on slavery, these people would be always looking for political allies: And the slave owners would trade anything, absolutely anything for the right to keep owning their valuable slaves. Anytime you hear about a coalition of unpopular agendas, you should ask yourself if this process is going on; even if it is happening within a political party.

Liberty + Slavery = more centralized power

What polar opposites freedom and slavery are. As long as slavery existed in America, it was always in direct opposition to American ideals of freedom and liberty. How did our founding fathers reconcile these two diametrically opposed factions within their nation? Well, they did what people always do when they have two diametrically opposed factions, they instituted an OVERLORD power to reconcile and keep the factions working together, instead of fighting.

See, one of the most important results of slavery in America was that it caused the creation of a powerful national power to reconcile the otherwise irreconcilable: Southern slavery with the Northern freedom. More than anything else, the slavery/ anti-slavery divide was the main excuse for so much federal OVERLORD power in America. Without slavery, America's prototypical democracy might have started out as 13 unmanageable state legislatures some months travel away from Mideast Inc. Had we done that, the devil might now be dead, instead of living with a tentacle sitting as US president in the White House. (To see how slavery altered the design of the US constitution, search Alexander Hamilton, James Wilson, New Jersey Plan, Virginia Plan, Connecticut Compromise.)

Anyway, an important tactic of our parasite is revealed here — That strong divisions can be used to drive the creation of a centralized overlord power. And here, the overlord power was much narrower than the governments it lorded over. This made it much easier for our parasite to steer our society as one single great herd of livestock, using the lone president as our herd's steer. (Actually the steer is the one bovine not castrated, but the mildest one they can find. He is the one you steer the whole herd with.) Anyway, this is a primary reason why our parasite constantly struggles to exaggerate differences between its many hosts.

Africanized honey bees

In brolingo symbolism a honey bee is a bro who gathers honey for the hive, the harems. So an Africanized honey bee is what you get when an Haremi man has children with Negro woman. And because these women tend to be from the bottom of society, the result is frequently someone like Dia•mond Rey'n•olds, the fiancée of the obviously kind, good hearted, trusting and perhaps gullible Philando Castillo. Castillo as many will recall was shot because he was foolishly reaching towards his gun when he was pulled over for a broken tail light. After this we see Reynolds appearing on TV full of memorable rabble-rousing anger.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"If recurring charges are any indication of corruption, the officials of the United States courts were constantly corruptly influenced or bribed to bring no criminal action against men of wealth, or to cause cases finally to be dismissed, if actions were brought. Even slave traders... seem to have bought immunity, and this, too, after the Civil War had begun." [Who would want to bring in slaves after the Civil War had begun? Here we imagine a generation of Arab bros posing as slaves who ran-away to join the Union Army.]

Easier to blend in

The descendants of slaves have made it much easier for Africanized honey bees to infiltrate America. Would it be too much to think that this was planned 300 years ago? Today, Hollywood and Washington D.C. especially are just full of

Africanized Brothers, Arabian Brothers that accurately call each other by the "N-word".

Of course to be accurate, they are actually calling each other neg•ards=negative•men, guys working for the negative side, the dark side of the force that binds all men. It is time to start testing Y chromosomes. But don't trust the testing services very far. Keep sending in known positives to test the testers. Also, any Haremi that continue to work in genetic testing services, or give any false negatives shall suffer the worst penalty.

US Constitution, Art. 1.9

"The migration or importation of such persons [slaves] as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding 10 dollars for each person."

Representation by state was our parasite's idea.

One of the main themes of US History leading to the Civil War was keeping the carefully maintained numerical power balance between slave states and free states. Recall the Missouri Compromise (1820), and the Kansas-Nebraska Act (1854) and the paired admission of new states that went on until the Civil War. Recall how this paired admission was so critical to balancing the numerical power of the slave with the free states. Recall how the new territories tended to attract free settlers in far greater numbers than slave owners, and how the new states all leaned towards freedom. So as America grew westward, there should have been a series of compromises on the part of slave owners.

Now the critical issue here was not in the primary house (the US House of Representatives) where voting was by population. In this house, the slavery agenda quickly lost because the free parts of the nation quickly became more populous than the slave parts.

The real issue was in the secondary house (the US Senate). Here each state had/ has two congressmen, and in this house, the US was easily kept in perpetual deadlock with respect to slavery by the paired admission of states.

Had any free state been admitted to the union without a paired slave state, it would have broken the deadlock in the secondary house and lead to slavery regulation. Here William Seward's remark is worth repeating: "The slaveholding class... practically chooses 30 of the 62 members of the Senate, [and] 90 of the 233 members of the House of Representatives." So the primary house had been lost long before the civil war, with only 38.6% in favor of slavery just prior to the Civil War. It was the secondary house, the US Senate that was slavery's bulwark: The deadlock or gridlock there blocked all anti-slave legislation with little more than a perpetually tied vote.

Here we see how it was America's secondary house with its anti-democratic state based voting system that enabled an institution as unpopular and reprehensible as slavery to go on for decades after it should have been curtailed by our democracy. For example, instead of merely halting the "importation" of new slaves in 1808 (a law that actually benefitted slave owners by increased the value of existing slaves), we might also have seen a law that freed the children of slaves born after say 1798, or 1808 or 1848, or even perhaps 1860. Or we might have seen a small federal property tax on slave ownership that could have been slowly increased to counteract the predictable increase/ bubble in slave prices, once the supply of new slaves was limited in 1808.

Instead, after the slave trade was halted, the supply of

slaves became limited, and their value predictably increased. In fact, a long slow slave price increase, or "bubble" ultimately made slaves worth as much as houses in pre-Civil-War America. It was this slave price bubble that became the basis of the Southern economy, subsidizing the affluent "Southern way of life" in the decades prior to the Civil War. The slave price bubble was the reason why the South could not give up any slave rights, for to do so would have pricked the slave price bubble just as surely as an earnings miss does for a high-flying tech company today. And the reason the South never rose again is that its economy was hollowed out by this slave price bubble in the decades before the war.

Today, a slow bubble in home prices is doing much the same thing for the sleeping "zombie" economies of America and Europe relative to Asia (Today, China is Mideast Inc.'s new wife in the same role as the newly prosperous Northern/Union states of America were in the mid 1860s). Anyway, here we come to a new understanding of why the South was so willing to go to war, and also why the South did not truly industrialize. It is because the South was as "invested" in slaves as people today are "invested" in their homes. In fact, history really does repeat itself. The names may change, but our parasite's processes frequently remains the same. Just as the supply of slaves was limited by regulation, so too the supply of housing is limited by regulation today, idiotic regulation.

Few things other than slaves (real estate today) offered such sure returns over the long term. The nature of the fake economic system made sure of that. And there was no need to go out and actually start making things while there was easy money to be made speculating on slaves (or homes today, thanks in part to super low property and income tax rates for property owners).

Now there is a very large genre of history that concerns itself with causes of the US Civil War. Here we should note that a large amount of history (particularly if presented to children while they are young) is often an indicator that lots of facts are problematic for our parasite and need changing. Anyway, most of this genre of Civil War history deals with causes that are derivative rather than causal and fundamental. Instead we should shift our focus to the causal aspects of the civil war.

Firstly, there is the irreconcilable idea of slavery in the land of the free. But secondly this irreconcilable idea passes right through a secondary house that affords each state two votes. And this veto of our secondary house is an absolute veto that can never be overridden by the primary house. So given the existence of this 2-votes-per-state house of government, and a balance of slave to free states in 1789, there would be no regulation that would harm the value of slaves until there was a conflict. It was against this background that our parasite set about to increasing the price of slaves. Prices increased and increased until around 1860, slaves were worth as much as houses, and constituted the life-support system of the then hollowed-out Southern economy.

Anyway, the end I am trying to justify here is that today, without the ideological divide between slave and free states, there is no longer any reason at all to give each state an equal vote. Alaska, pop. 0.6 million should not have the same Congressional veto power as California pop 33.8 million. And nowhere in any democracy should this sort of anti-democracy exist. Today, all representation should be by population and anything else is both unfair to the populous states, and antithetical to the idea of democracy.

The southern stock market collapse

As soon as Abraham Lincoln was elected president, the South entered a massive "live" stock market crash for the basis of its economy, the only capital good in its economy, Negro human beings held as slaves. For soon these slaves looked like they would be worthless to their "owners".

Just as with a big part of the world today, and its housing, the slave bubble kept the moribund southern economy above water while the real economy withered. This situation went on for decades as the parasite did everything it could to grow its evil slave-based version of America faster than the good America of immigrants. It was all to no avail and freedom as usual outstripped slavery by many metrics, least of all being population growth.

Eventually, America elected a Middle-eastern-looking president (Abraham Lincoln) who advocated the end of the slavery that was artificially grafted onto its nation and carefully protected and coddled by friends in high places. Once this happened, the parasite did all it could to assure that the civil war in the land of the free lasted as long as possible and killed as many Americans as possible. Today this civil war is still deadliest war in terms of American deaths.

Abraham Lincoln June 16, 1858

"We are now far into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to [slavery agitation](#)."

Abraham Lincoln

"So you're the little woman who wrote the book that made this great war." [This is how Abraham Lincoln greeted Harriet Beecher Stowe when they first met. Uncle Tom's Cabin was quickly adapted to the theatre where it could be seen by all the many people who would never read a book. And once in theaters it ran for a very long time, like the film Casablanca, and like a lot of other Arab propaganda.]

Fredrick Douglass, Ch. 4

[The following passage was written by the unbelievably-articulate, self-educated former-slave Fredrick Douglass in 1845. There is a famous photo of Douglass in profile, showing a large hooked nose. His book of Mideast propaganda was an important factor in the irreconcilable nature of the conflict between the North and South. It is the propaganda of the house of war in action; driving America towards the American Civil War, still the most deadly war ever for American infidels. This was a war that was set up by the US constitution of 1789]

"To escape punishment was to escape accusation; and few slaves had the fortune to do either, under the overseer-ship of Mr. Gore. He was just proud enough to demand the most debasing homage of the slave, and quite servile enough to crouch, himself, at the feet of the master. He was ambitious enough to be contented with nothing short of the highest rank of overseers, and persevering enough to reach the height of his ambition. He was cruel enough to inflict the severest punishment, artful enough to descend to the lowest trickery, and obdurate enough to be insensible to the voice of a reproving conscience. He was, of all the overseers, the most dreaded by the slaves. His presence was painful; his eye flashed confusion, and seldom was his sharp, shrill voice heard, without producing horror and trembling in their ranks."

Fredrick Douglass, Himrods Corners, July 4, 1862

"It is hardly necessary at this very late day of the war... to enter

now upon any elaborate enquiry or explanation as to whence came this foul and guilty attempt to break up and destroy the national government."

Fugitive slave laws

Just prior to the civil war, a field slave in his prime could cost \$1,200. This was as much money as many houses cost at the time. And this slave price bubble was the basis of the Southern bubble economy at the time (just like a housing bubble is the basis of the economies of the 'West' today.)

Now, it is important to realize that slaves were so valuable for two reasons. A) because they were under-taxed relative to the free workers of the north, and B) because society enforced the owner's rights in many ways, the least of which was in chasing after and returning runaway slaves.

When government does not enforce the rights of slave owners with respect to runaway slaves, it starts to condone their escape. Then, it becomes necessary for slave owners to build and maintain costly systems for preventing escape. So when society does not enforce the rights of slave owners, the entire slavery system suffers a severe setback and slaves suffer a severe decline in value.

Isn't it strange how the government of the land of the free chased down runaway slaves. Strange too how the runaway slave laws denied the accused 'slave' the right to a jury trial. Instead, special commissions judged these matters. And here the commissioners actually profited from each black person "returned" to the slave states. (see Mitchum).

Now the important thing to realize when considering films like '12 years a slave' is that the long arm of the law was mostly the long arm of Mideast Inc. For it was Mideast Inc. that was shanghaiing Brothers who did not do what they had promised. If you didn't do what you were supposed to do, or got in the way, you would be kidnapped and sent to the South to live your days as a field hand. Note the scene at the beginning of the film where the propaganda musician Solo•man North•our•ob had two candles burning instead of one.

The fake America that was founded along side

You know, there were two Americas in the 1700s. One was the free America of the Northern states. The other was the still microscopic slave America of the three Southern states. The slave Southern gemini got the full support of the parasite, and the free North got all the trouble that Mideast inc could throw at it.

How the Arabs instituted slavery in the land of the free

In the years before the US civil war, the constitution of the land of the free was judged by the 9-appointees running its supreme court that government should spend money to enforce runaway slave laws in other states. Had this not been the case, there could have been no slave price bubble, and without that, slave numbers would have been much lower. Here we see how the government going out of its way to enforce a law causes an increase in a social institution.

So the steps for the Arab institution of slavery in the land of the free were:

- 1) Use plague and indian attacks to push the free men to the north.
- 2) Set up slave plantations in the south.
- 3) Take your 3 slave states with about 5% of the free population of the other 10 free states and demand inclusion in their union. Demand that slavery be included in the constitution of the land of the free.

- 4) Support the slave states and hinder the free states.
- 5) When this becomes untenable, drive the two sides of the land of the free into a hugely deadly civil war.
- 6) After the war hide among the slave population. Support racial animosity to motivate the haremi slaves.

Edgar Allen Poe, Ligeia

"And the will therein lieth, which dieth not. Who knoweth the mysteries of the will, with its vigor? For God is but a great will pervading all things by nature of its intentness. Man doth not yield him to the angels, nor unto death utterly, but only through the weakness of his feeble will."

The brilliant general Robert E. Lee

Maybe all the talk of this man's brilliance was to cover up how the much stronger Union side was sabotaged by the Brothers to keep the hugely profitable war going as long as possible. Also, the name sounds like Our•ob•art Ali.

Was Lincoln great?

In the best of all possible worlds we would have had both free slaves and no civil war. Instead, we had both hugely deadly civil war and no freedom of slaves until 2 years into the war.

Code of Justinian, Institutes, 533 AD

[This law code was written by the Arabs just before they instituted the European dark ages. In fact this was written in the last century of its slaughter of most of the people of Europe. Here we see the Arabs angling and setting up the world for after the dark ages. Here they try to write the legal code just the way they want it — full of slaves to lord over.]

"**Title 3** The chief division in the rights of men is this: All men are all either free or slaves.

1. Freedom, from which is derived the term free as applied to men, is the natural power of doing each what we please, unless prevented either by force or by law.

2. Slavery is an institution of the law of nations, by which one man is made the property of another, contrary to natural right.

3. Slaves are officially renamed slaves [L. servis] because generals have ordered their war prisoners to be sold, thus sparing their lives rather than killing them. Slaves are also called mancipa, because they are taken from the enemy by the strong hand. [This selling of the people captured in war was such a huge incentive to wage war and it was so destructive for humanity over the millennia. Also, my translation oddly gives etymology for the MAN- prefix twice. Something seems hidden there]

4. Slaves are either as born [as slaves] or become so. They are born into slavery when their mother is a slave; they become so either by the law of nations [2nd mention], that is, by capture [in war, 2nd mention], or by the civil law, as when a free person, above the age of twenty, allows himself to be sold, for his share of the money given for him.

[1] Note how slaves follow their mother's birth as is the Arab/ Semitic practice. 2) They keep repeating how slavery is international law and that the selling of war prisoners as slaves is legitimate. 3) In good times people weren't so much selling themselves into slavery as getting duped and doing things like borrowing money from unregulated Arab lenders with their own body serving as collateral. Also, economic conditions were so bad in Byzantine Rome at this time (only 37 years before Mohammed's birth) that free men were supposedly selling themselves and their pro•geni into slavery/serfdom because it seemed to offer a better life]

5. In the condition of slaves there is no distinction; but there are many distinctions among free persons; for they are either born free, or have been set free.

Title 4 A person is **INGENUUS** [in•G'n•us = not•Ghasan•us] who is free from the moment of his birth, by being born in matrimony to parents who were either both born free, or both made free, or one of whom has been born free and the other made free.

And when the mother is free, and the father a slave, the child is born free. It is just the same as when the mother is free and the child has been conceived promiscuously, and the father is uncertain. And it is sufficient if the mother is free at the moment of birth, although a slave when she conceived the child. But on the other hand, if she was free when she conceived, and became a slave when she gave birth to her child, the child is still held to be born free. The misfortune of the mother ought no to pre-judge [the life of] her unborn infant.

The question consequently arises: What if a pregnant female slave is made free, but again becomes a slave before the child is born. Is the child born free or a slave? Marcellus think it is born free, for it is sufficient for the unborn child, if the mother has been free, although only in the intermediate time; and this also is true. [What a backdoor this is. Imagine that the Brothers control the records office and can insert back-dated documents for a fee. Romans having children with their female slaves have to free them to have legitimate heirs. But Haremi Brothers don't have to do this. They can keep the woman a slave and the son a slave and years later when the son is almost grown, they can go and dig up proof that he is not a slave.]

1. When a man has been born free, he does not cease to be ingenuus because he has been in the position of a slave, and he subsequently been freed. Or as it has been often determined that enfranchisement [being made free] does not prejudice the rights of birth. [This is another back door. All the Brothers have to do is forge an old-looking birth certificate and insert it into the records. Somebody probably always kept lots of old paper/parchment around for this purpose.]

Title 5 Freedmen are those who have been manumitted from legal servitude. Manumission is the giving of liberty [L. liberti]. For while anyone is enslaved, he is under "the hand" and power of another, but by manumission he is freed from this domination. [2nd mention of MAN- as being linguistically from hand] This institution took its rise from the law of nations [3rd mention]; for by the law of nature, all men were born free; and manumission was not heard of, as slavery was unknown. But when slavery came to be under the law of nations [4th mention], the blessing of manumission followed. And whereas we were all called by the one natural name of "men," the law of nations [5th mention] introduced a division into three kinds of men, namely free men, and in opposition to them, slaves; and thirdly, freedmen who were no longer slaves." [note how "law of nations" is mentioned 5 times in this code of slavery laws.]

Also see

- 1) George Fitzhugh's Cannibal's All (1854) and Harrison Berry's Slavery and Abolitionism, as Viewed by a Georgia Slave.
- 2) How one year into the US Civil War, John D. Rockefeller began the world's first oil refinery in Cleveland.
- 3) Also of note is how the east-west railroads saw their stock prices fall greatly in the panic of 1857, while the north-south ones did not really sell off.

16— EARLY US ECONOMIC WOES

Some early US "whaling" scams

One of our parasite's first great "whaling" scams in the US had to do Revolutionary War debt of about \$100 million. At first this debt was mostly owned by Americans. Our parasite owned some, but right after the war it sold most of its US war debt. Then we imagine, our parasite used the media of the day to say that this debt would never be paid back and that it should not be paid back. At the same time, our parasite started unloading the remainder of its debt at any price, quickly driving bond prices to around 10% of face value. Then our parasite slowly bought up the bonds for 10 cents on the dollar over a couple years. Then once prices started to rise again, it made sure that "public opinion" would change and say that we had to pay back our public debt. Then Brother Alexander Hamilton, as Treasury Secretary under George Washington, got the new US government to pay off the debt at face value. You know, "full faith and credit of the United States." Anyway, this basically gave our parasite around a 900% profit on its bond investments in US revolutionary war debt.

Now this first federal bailout was wildly unpopular at the time, because most of this debt was not owned by ordinary Americans or even people who had financed the war. It was owned by "international investors" fronting for the parasite, people that had come in and bought the debt for 10 cents on the dollar speculating (or pretty much knowing) that it would be paid back at face value, even after it was widely regarded as written off.

Most Americans were probably too ignorant to understand what their government had done. They didn't understand how their new nation simply gave away a couple years of its GDP to foreign "investors" or rather scammers or s•chem•ers practicing financial al•chem•i.

This sort of debt scam is an evergreen trick of our parasite. During the recent Subprime Crisis, our parasite did much the same thing, buying up lots of our bad debt at extreme discounts. Later in 2008, when it got our banks declared too big to fail, our parasite (through its numerous fronts) made great profits when the loan discounts mostly evaporated.

Another one of our parasite's scams can be seen in the first and second national Bank of United States and the widespread allegations of foreign control. Basically, the War of 1812 almost tripled US government debt (to the parasite mostly). It also substantially increased US taxation, while bringing the arch enemies of humanity's parasite (Britain and America) to a second transatlantic war. After the War, the central bank of the US bizarrely pursued a tight money policy that resulted in an deep economic depression, a nationwide wave of bank foreclosures, and even a substantial reduction in industrial output. You see, the US democracy was almost as narrow and corrupt then as it is today.

Alexander Hamilton, 1781.04.30

"A national debt, if it is not excessive, will be to us a national blessing."

Thomas Jefferson, 1816.07.12

"We must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt."

James Madison

"War should only be declared by the authority of the people, whose tolls and treasuries will support its burdens, instead of

[the government which is to reap its fruits."](#)

The many woes of the US 1783-1789

1) Even before the British defeat at Yorktown in 1781, there was this wave of cheap and easy credit fanning a US economy. This lasted until about 1783 when the bubble popped, leaving many people deeply in debt to the parasite.

2) There was the war bond scam explained above.

3) The peace treaty between America and Britain (Treaty of Paris 1783), called for the US to repay British interests for what turned out to be vast amounts of "British" property lost in the war. We can thank the ever agreeable Benjamin Franklin and the swarthy John Jay and John Adams for allowing this idiotic treaty term. If the US won its war of independence, why did it agree to pay the British back for their losses?

4) Once the war ended, the schedule for the repayment of the above debts was the main reason that the state legislatures refused to pay their share of the congressional funds requisition. Many state legislatures did not agree with the Treaty of Paris, nor did they want the revolutionary debt repaid at face value as this was mostly foreign/British owned and purchased at a fraction of its true value.

5) Recall how some states refused to pay their share of national money "requisition", and this was about the biggest problem under the 1st US constitution of 1777. It was the repayment of the war debt, and not the operating expenses of the nation that was the main problem.

6) The repayment of the war debt caused higher taxes which increased the severity of the post revolutionary war recession and caused a wave of foreclosures. In fact, something like 1/3 of the landowners in some regions of the US were involved in a foreclosure proceeding around this time. Sound familiar?

7) Widespread foreclosures led to a number of DEBT MUTINIES. All over the US, bands of farmers set fire to the houses of public records. Shays Rebellion (1786, named after Daniel Shays) is the most famous of these. Here, the Massachusetts legislature actually raised taxes during and economic crisis, thus making the debt crisis more severe. This led to a wave of foreclosures that was threatening to evict most of the state's farmers from their land. (search Shaysites and Edward Carrington). This money was to repay British and foreign investors and pay face value on all the revolutionary war debt, debt written off by most Americans — out of patriotism mostly — years before.

8) In this period, we see harsher debt laws passed that allowed the 'Sharif' to not only lay claim to property, but also to tools, even to jail debtors in some states.

9) There was not enough currency in circulation. This was firstly a brake on the local economy. But secondly it was much harder for American debtors to obtain the cash to pay back their debts and their taxes.

10) In 1784, the Spanish closed most of the Mississippi river to American trade. This was the only way in or out of a huge part of the American continent at the time. The result was that about 8% of the nation suddenly found itself unable to trade with the outside world. The "Spanish" were also inducing the Creek Indians to attack Americans (search James Wilkinson).

11) Because America did not make good on its treaty obligations, and re-compensate British interests for losses incurred during the revolutionary war, Britain used this as an excuse not to give up its military bases in the Great Lakes

region. Britain closed the Great lakes to American ships, and even established a customs house at the mouth of Lake Ontario (the most easterly lake). This did much the same thing as the Spanish closing of the Mississippi, although less effectively. It was just too easy to smuggle goods from Rochester (rock•easter) or Os•we•go (on lake Ontario) to the Mohawk river, and then down the Hud•son river to that well washed rock at the mouth of the river Manhattan. Thus the British closing of the Hud•son helped New York, or New Amsterdam to rise in popularity if not in sea level.

12) A "half-breed" Mohawk chief (and British Captain) Joseph Br•an't were organizing barbarians from the north (and west) to terrorize American settlers with hit and run raids and savage massacres. As well Alexander McGillivray was doing much the same thing. So there really were 3 parties on the American frontier, just like during Roman times. We had 1) the European settlers, 2) the Natives, and 3) the super aggressive hook-nosed "half breed" Brothers that were ruling the natives in pursuit of a global economic agenda few settlers would have believed even if it was written out for them.

13) There were also the Barbary (bar•bary) pirates from Morocco, along with Algerian pirates attacking American ships entering the Mediterranean. These were ransoming their American crews, or selling them in to slavery.

Royall Tyler, 1787, The contrast, Scene 1

"**CHARLOTTE:** And so, brother, you have come to the city to exchange some of your commutation [exchange] notes [war bonds] for a little pleasure?

MANLY: Indeed you are mistaken. My errand is not of amusement, but business. And as I neither drink nor game, my expenses will be so trivial. I shall have not occasion to sell my notes.

CHARLOTTE: Then you won't have occasion to do a very good thing. Why, there was the Vermont General— he came down some time since, sold all his musty notes at one stroke, and then laid the cash out in trinkets for his dear Fanny. I want a dozen pretty things myself. Have you got the notes with you?

MANLY: I shall be ever willing to contribute, as far as it is in my power, to adorn or in any way to please my sister. Yet I hope, I shall never be obliged for this to sell my notes. I may be romantic, but I preserve them as a sacred deposit. Their full amount is justly due to me, but as embarrassments, the natural consequences of a long war, disable my country from supporting its credit. I shall wait with patience until it is rich enough to discharge them. If that is not in my day, they shall be transmitted as an honorable certificate to posterity, what I have humbly initiated our illustrious Washington,"

[Here the Arabs explain to all the innies how the revolutionary war debt will be good.]

Decision in Philadelphia, CH. 18

"The most extreme example of what troubled Madison and the others was the case of Rhode Island, a state that flatly refused to send anybody to the [Philadelphia] Convention [The US "constitutional convention"] and did not join the union until after Washington became president. In Rhode Island, a legislature dominated by small farmers, who were invariably in the debtor class, had instituted paper money [due to our parasite's intentionally induced shortage of gold and silver. Our parasite's frontmen] Creditors, recognizing that it would depreciate quickly, refused to take it in payment for debts, whereupon the legislature made acceptance of it mandatory. To avoid taking paper money, many creditors fled Rhode Island

into neighboring states. In response, the legislature passed laws allowing the debtors to pay money into courts, which would hold it for the creditors, legally canceling [or paying down] the debt. However, many judges, who tended to side with the creditors anyway, refused to enforce the [new] law; so the legislature turned them out of office." [1] Here we see one reason why influence in the judiciary is so important to our parasite. Without "strict" judges, and "strict" bankruptcy laws during a debt/bubble crisis, our parasite would make much less money from its economic mecca-nations. 2) Many of the people writing the 2nd US constitution were from the nation's creditor minority, its Arab front-man creditor minority. These were caught in the middle and threatened with economic ruin by Rhode Island type debtor revolts. These all opposed the stay and tender laws of the various states — the STAY of eviction and pay in state issued paper money as legal TENDER.]

Alexander Hamilton, Report on Manufactures, 1791.12.05
"Measures which serve to abridge the free competition of foreign Articles, have a tendency to occasion an enhancement of prices." [To simplify: tariffs increase prices.]

Thomas Paine, American Crisis, 10

[This is history modifying essay disowned by Paine.]
"Now had the exchange stood at 20:1 [\$20 to a Pound Sterling] which was the rate Congress calculated upon when they arranged the quota [for tax contributions] of the several states, [at] the latter end of last year, trade would have been carried on for nearly four times less money than it is now, and consequently the 20 millions [in state contributions] would have been spared with much greater ease, and when collected would have been of almost 4 times the value that they now are. ...

It is not the want of property, but the scarcity of the medium by which the proportion of property for taxation is to be measured out, that makes the embarrassment [inability to move, trade or pay] which we lie under. There is not money [cash/ gold] enough, and, what is equally as true, the people will not let there be money enough [they are hoarding money because it is scarce].

While I am on the subject of the currency, I shall offer one remark which will appear true to every body, and can be accounted for by nobody, which is, that the better times were, the worse the money [the US dollar] grew [thanks to high interest rates]; and the worse the times were, the better the money stood [thanks to low interest rates]. It never depreciated [depreciated] by any advantage obtained by the enemy. The troubles of 1776, and the loss of Philadelphia in 1777, made no sensible impression on it, and every one knows that the surrender of Charleston did not produce the least alteration in the rate of exchange, which, for long before, and for more than three months after, stood at 60:1 ... In short, our good luck seems to break us, and our bad makes us whole." [Here it seems that the value of the dollar was being manipulated from the start in the US.]

Thomas Paine, Common sense, p.30

"Britain is oppressed with a debt of upwards of 140 millions sterling, for which she pays upwards of four millions interest [2.85% per year? per month?] And as a compensation for her debt, she has a large navy. America is without a debt, and without a navy; yet for 1/20th part of the English national debt, could have a navy as large again. The navy of England is not worth, at the time, more than 3.5 million sterling." [Here we

understand America's national debt in simpler terms. Here we understand our billion dollar fighter planes. It is just so money can leak money back to the parasite in the form of debt payments.

And if Britain was so wealthy, why was it in debt? It seems unbelievable that the greatest and wealthiest nation of the day was in debt to its citizens. Why not sell off some of the commons or impose a slightly higher taxes? Also the idea of the greatest and wealthiest nation of the day being in debt to foreigners seems even stranger — even fishy.

Today the US, EU and Japan owe over \$35 trillion, while China owns less than \$3 trillion in foreign debt. Who is holding the other \$32 trillion? Who else but the people selling the world \$1 trillion a year in oil for the past 43 years.

Plutarch, Julius Caesar, 12

He [Caesar] then marched against the Callaici [Galacians, northwest Spain, or the Gauls of France] and the Lusitani [Portuguese] and, after conquering them, went on as far as the outer sea [Atlantic Ocean], subduing the tribes... One of his most notable achievements was to solve the problem of the existing ill-feeling between debtors and creditors. He ordered that the creditors should take two-thirds annually of the debtor's income, and that the owner of the property should retain the use of the rest and so go on in this way until the whole debt was paid off. By these measures he had acquired a great reputation by the time he left the province. He had become rich himself and he had made his soldiers rich as a result of his campaigns, and he had been saluted by them as 'Imperator'. [Is it nothing short of remarkable how we, the people with everything, always wind up in debt to the people with nothing. And apparently, from this paragraph, it seems that people first started calling Caesar 'emperor' when he used the Roman army to help the Middle East enforce its debts upon free men.]

William Jennings Bryan, 1896.07.09

"There are two ideas of government. There are those who believe that if you just legislate to make the well-to-do prosperous, that their prosperity will leak through on those below [trickle down economics 1.0] The Democratic [party] idea has been that if you legislate to make the masses prosperous, their prosperity will find its way up and through every class that rests upon it. [Pardon the off-topic tangent. The idea was too valuable to edit out.]

[New subject, the on-topic subject:] You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard. ... If they dare to come out in the open field and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we shall fight them to the utmost, having behind us the producing masses of the nation and the world." [Our parasite has always pushed to increase demand for its useless gold metal. It has also struggled to impoverish the poor. We must go in the opposite direction and shun this useless metal valued only because it is scarce]

The invisible hand

For thousands of years, the parasite has run the world, and people have frequently sensed or been aware of its presence. It has been given various names: the military industrial complex, the ghost in the machine, corporate plutocracy, the aristocracy, the East India Company, robber barons, crony capitalism, etc. Whatever name we use, it is our parasite at work in our nations, employing its machinations (=Mecca-nations) trying to steal from us no matter how much "collateral damage" they cause to the collateral guaranteeing

our debt to them.

Also, it is just a hunch, but I would bet that the term INVISIBLE HAND can be found in the media just before Adam Smith wrote about it.

Thomas Paine, American Crisis, 10

[This is one of at least 3 essays disowned by Paine. In reading the following, keep in mind that coffee is a substitute good for the Arab tea traded by Arab Inc.'s frontman East India Company trading monopoly] "Coffee, which is so considerable an article of consumption and support here, is loaded with a duty, which makes the price between 5 and 6 shillings sterling per pound, [In the same essay, Paine puts per capita British tax revenue at 2.75 shillings/month.] and a penalty of 50 pounds sterling on any person detected in roasting it in his own house. There is scarcely a necessary of life that you can eat, drink, wear, or enjoy, that is not there loaded with a tax; even the light from heaven is only permitted to shine into their dwellings by paying eighteen pence sterling per window annually [This taxed northern industry like salt, the main preservative, taxed agriculture for centuries.] ... In short, the condition of that country, in point of taxation, is so oppressive, the number of her poor so great, and the extravagance and rapaciousness of the [King's Arab front-man] court so enormous, that, were they to effect a conquest of America, it is then only that the distress of America would begin." [And all of this was just another matrix that allowed the parasite to feed more effectively on its British host.]

Thomas Paine, American Crisis, 10

[This is history modifying essay disowned by Paine.] "Britain [as front empire for the Arabs] did not go to war with America for the sake of dominion, because she was then in possession [of the America]. Neither was it for the extension of trade and commerce, because she had monopolized the whole [world], and the country [America] had yielded to it. Neither was it to extinguish what she might call rebellion, because before she began, no resistance existed. It could then be for no other motive than avarice [greed], or a design of establishing, in the first instance, [that] the same taxes in America as are paid in England (which, as I shall presently show, are above 11 times heavier than the taxes we now pay for the present year, 1780) or, in the second instance, to confiscate the whole property of America..."

-- May be skipped ---

Thomas Paine, American Crisis, 10

[This is history modifying essay disowned by Paine. Here is an Arab intelligence and strategy broadcast. At this time, the American people are finally getting it together with respect to the most basic thing a government can do, raise money for the war effort — this despite the ineffective meta-democracy they used at the time. Also, the divergence in Paine's written style is notable.]

"That the people generally do not understand the insufficiency of the taxes to carry on the war, is evident, not only from common observation, but from the construction of several petitions. ...

Before I proceed to propose methods by which a sufficiency of money may be raised, I shall take a short view of the general state of the country. Notwithstanding the weight of the war, the ravages of the enemy, and the obstructions she has thrown in the way of trade and commerce, so soon does a young country outgrow misfortune, that America has already surmounted many that heavily oppressed her. For the first

year or two of the war, we were shut up within our ports, scarce[ly] venturing to look towards the ocean. Now our rivers are beautified with large and valuable vessels, our stores filled with merchandise, and the produce of the country has a ready market, at an advantageous price. Gold and silver, that for a while seemed to have retreated again within the bowels of the earth, have once more risen into circulation, and every day adds new strength to trade, commerce and agriculture. ...

While under the [Arab fronting imperial] government of Britain, the trade of this country was loaded with [Arab-style trade] restrictions. It was only a few foreign ports which we were allowed to sail to. Now it is otherwise; and allowing that the quantity of trade is but half what it was before the war, the case must show [We are shown] the vast [profit] advantage of an open trade [free trade]. Because the present quantity [of trade, had it been] under her [British] restrictions could not [have] support[ed] itself [profit-wise]; from which I infer, that if half the quantity without restrictions can bear itself up nearly, if not quite as well, as the whole when subject to them, how [much more] prosperous must the condition of America be when the whole shall return [trade recovers to previous levels and is] open with all the world. By the trade I do not mean the employment of a merchant [one merchant class] only, but the whole interest and business of the country taken collectively [the national economy].

It is not so much my intention, by this publication, to propose particular plans for raising money, as it is to show the necessity and the advantages to be derived from it. My principle design is [main plan comes] from the [pre]disposition of the people to the measures which I am fully persuaded [convinced] it is their interest and duty to adopt, and which need no other force to accomplish them than the force of [what is already] being felt. But as every hint [of a solution] may be useful [to the American people], I shall throw out [only] a [rough] sketch, and leave others to make such [Brotherly] improvements upon it as to them may appear reasonable."

[Translation: My main plan comes from the predisposition of the people to the measures which I am fully convinced are in their interest and duty to adopt. These need no other force to accomplish than the force of what is already being felt. But as every hint of a solution may be useful to the American people, I shall throw out only a rough sketch and leave others to make such Brotherly improvements they feel reasonable.]

The Adams-Onis treaty

This treaty from 1819 agreed that:

- 1) Spanish Texas was not part of the Louisiana Purchase, as many American thought, and as was called for in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803.
- 2) The US was to pay Spain \$5 million for Florida, which should have been included in the Louisiana Purchase.
- 3) Spain would give up all its absurd and impossible to enforce claims to the Pacific Northwest.

However, the treaty's name also seems to be a BLURD (blurring word) for the Revolutionary War peace treaty between America and Britain (the Treaty of Paris 1783), which called for the US to repay British interests for what turned out to be vast amounts of British property lost in the war. We can thank the the ever agreeable Benjamin Franklin and the swarthy John Jay and John Adams for allowing this term. If the US won its war of independence, why did it agree to pay the British back for their losses?

It is easy to imagine that the first treaty was called the "Adams-onus treaty", and that was a problem for the parasite,

so it created or elevated this man named Onis to sign a 2nd treaty with a 2nd John Adams, a John Quincy Adams. Also note how much money the parasite made on the Treaty of Paris of 1783. Note what a hugely costly back door it can be for presidential appointees to negotiate treaty terms.

17—JUDICIAL DEMOCRACY

Good laws must be:

- 1) Needed
- 2) Fair
- 3) Hard to outsmart
- 4) Easy to understand
- 5) Easy to implement

ORDEAL in the Apple dictionary

"a painful or horrific experience, esp. a protracted one: the ordeal of having to give evidence". [When we make it an ordeal to give evidence, does this help or hinder our justice system?]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"The whole capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs] pushed aside law whenever law conflicted with its aims and interests."

Plutarch, d. 120AD, Pompey, 55

"When his [Pompey's] father-in-law Scipio was put on trial, he summoned the 360 jurors to his own house and asked them to acquit the defendant" [What a waste of time it was to use 360 jurors to decide on a man's fate. What about using 9 jurors and a judge and two lawyers to decide about some minor matter?]

Alexander Hamilton, 1788, Federalist #62

"It will be of little avail [benefit] to the people, that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated [put into effect], or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is today, can guess what it will be tomorrow." [Some of our parasite's strategy with respect to the a host's judiciary. Also, note who said this, and how much of it has come true under America's byzantine court system.]

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 9.2

"because his [Solon's] laws were not written simply and clearly, but were like the law on heirs and inheritances, may disputes inevitably arose. Hence the courts were left deciding on all matters public and private. Some people [like the Arabs] think that he deliberately made his laws unclear, so the people would have the power to decide." [On one side, we don't want to tie our judge's hands completely, and on the other side, we don't want to give them total leeway in making decisions. With regard to making laws, the middle path is best. Apparently Solon and many supposedly free states make their laws too lax and leave much up to the court to decide. Apparently this is a strategy of the Arabs.]

Sophocles

"If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shall not ration justice." "

[Here the parasite is offering a strategy for its G•oo•dic•ouri of its host. As with so many other situations, we should use the parasite's compass but 180° backwards. We must ration justice, because it is better for society to decide on 1000 cases with 85% accuracy than 100 cases with 90% accuracy.

Ration justice, but not with respect to the number of cases you hear. Ration how much information each side may present so that the number of cases fits the amount of Senator time that the Over-Senate allots for the various sorts of judicial cases. And please use my case levels as only a starting point. They will certainly need to be changed.

James Madison, 1788.02.08, Federalist #51

"Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever [always] has been, and ever [always] will be pursued until it is obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit." [Here James Madison was speaking for our parasite.]

Thomas Jefferson, 1823.06.12

Read these words 5 times

"Laws are made for men of ordinary understanding and should, therefore, be construed by the ordinary rules of common sense." [1) Use ordinary words. Use, except when a legal term is clearly called for. Make sure the legal word is a cognate for what it is so most people can remember it the first time they hear it. 2) Ordinary men should be your judges and everyone should pretty much be expected to argue their own case. 3) This will favor the smart over the dumb, but so what — this is better than favoring the rich and haremi over the poor and native (an•A•t•ive). 4) Professional arguers cause an arms race situation and should be drive out of the court system.]

Decision precision is only one aspect of justice

In the legal system, accuracy certainly matters, but so too does cost, speed and inclusiveness. Under America's legal system today, we are far beyond the point of diminishing returns with respect to decision accuracy — much to the detriment of the other key aspects of the legal system. A slight backing off on legal accuracy, hypothetically from 88% accuracy to 80% accuracy will make the system operate much better. It will be several times faster and cheaper, and be thus several times more inclusive and realistic as a mechanism for enforcing justice in society. No longer will people be able to say, "so sue me", and reasonably expect nothing to happen.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.5

[Translation: Theoretically, all men have an equal chance in the courts. However we struggle to make litigation so expensive that justice really becomes a one-sided thing. Thus the rich [Arab front]man can easily wear out the poor [Rumi] litigant. This, however, is not the proper place to discuss that most remarkable of Arab sorcerer's arts: How to make justice into an expensive luxury, while still deluding the people with notions that the law is impartial.]

"Even where, in civil cases, all men, theoretically, had an equal chance in courts of equity, litigation was made so expensive, whether purposely or not, that justice was really a one-sided pastime, in which the rich man could easily wear out the poor contestant. This, however, is not the place for a dissertation on that most remarkable of noteworthy sorcerer's arts, the making of justice an expensive luxury, while still deluding the people with the notion that the law knows no preferences."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes,

3.5

"Society had made money its god and property its yardstick. Even in its administration of justice, theoretically supposed to be equal, it had made 'justice' an expensive luxury available, in actual practice, to the rich only. The defrauder of large sums could, if prosecuted use part of that plunder, easily engage a corps of shrewd, experienced lawyers, get evidence manufactured, fight out the case on technicalities, drag it along for years, call in political and social influence, and almost invariable escape in the end.

But beyond the power of money to make a mockery of justice was a still greater, though more subtle factor, which was ever an invaluable aid to the great thief [Arabs Inc.]. Every section of the trading class was permeated with a profound admiration, often tangibly expressed, for the craft that got away with an impressive pile of loot. The contempt felt for the pickpocket was the antithesis of the general mercantile admiring view of the man who stole in grand style, especially when he was one of their own class. In speaking of the piratical operations of this or that magnate, it was common to hear many business men interject, even while denouncing him, 'Well, I wish I were as smart as he'. These same men, when serving on juries, were harsh in their verdicts on the poor criminals, and unctuously flattered themselves with being, and were represented as, the upholders and conservers of law and moral conduct."

Philostratus, Lives of the sophists, Preface

"When the Athenians saw how the extreme cleverness of the sophists [lawyers], they shut them out of the law courts on the grounds that they could defeat a just argument by and unjust one, and than they used that power to warp men's judgments [as jurors]. This is the reason why Aeschines and Demosthenes branded each other with the title of sophist [Lawyer]. Not because it was a disgrace, but because the very word was suspect in the eyes of the jury. For in their career outside the courts, they claimed consideration and applause on the very ground that they were sophists. ...

The men of former times applied the name 'sophist', not only to orators whose surpassing eloquence won them brilliant reputation, but also to philosophers who expounded their theories with ease and fluency."

Philostratus, Lives of the sophists, Ch.1

"Leon of Byzantium was a pupil of Plato in his youth. But when he grew up, they called him a sophist, because he employed so man different styles of oratory, and also because he repartees [logical divisions] were so convincing."

Which city runs better?

Today the US legal system is far beyond the point of diminishing returns with respect to legal accuracy. Which town runs better?

- A) The city where the legal system produces 20 rulings at 88% accuracy that on average cost \$50,000 and take 2 years to decide. or,
- B) The city where the legal system produces 1,000 rulings at 80% accuracy that cost an average of \$400 each and take an average of 3 days to get a final ruling on.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.7

"In penetrating into the origin and growth of the great fortunes [of Arab frontmen], this vital fact is constantly forced upon the investigator: That Law has been the most valuable asset

possessed by the capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs]. Without it, this class would have been as helpless as a babe [baby]. What would the medieval baron have been without [his] armed force? But note how conditions have changed. The capitalist class, far shrewder than the feudalistic rulers, dispenses with personally equipped armed force. It becomes superfluous. All that is necessary to do is to make the laws, as so guide things that the officials who enforce the laws are responsive to the interests of the propertied class. Back of the laws [FE] police forces and sheriffs and militia, all kept at the expense of the city, county and State—at public expense. Clearly, then, having control of the laws and of the officials, then propertied classes have the full benefit of armed forces the expense of which, however, they do not have to defray. It has unfolded itself [FE] as a vast improvement over the crude feudal system.

In complete control of the laws, the great propertied classes [fronting for the Arabs] have been able either to profit by the enforcement, or by the violation, of them."

How court should work

It should be as easy as going to the teacher in charge of monitoring the playground and explaining the justice of why the old nickel is yours, even though you let the other kid hold it and look at it. That is all the courts need to do. They need to impartially hear and decide on the claims. We don't need experts for that. We also don't need these lengthy, plodding trials. And without these things, the cost of our legal system will plummet and the capacity increase many fold.

The great rise in inclusion is worth the minor drop in legal accuracy.

IMPARTIAL

Dictionary meaning: treating everyone equally.

Literal meaning: hearing all the evidence – not just part.

LEVELHEADED

Dictionary meaning: calm under trying circumstances.

Literal meaning: an impartial judge.

CONSTRUE = con•s•true = with•un•truths

JUSTICE, JUSTEST, and MOST JUST

Funny how we lack a simple way of communicating JUSTNESS in a relative way. Funny how the logical words are blocked.

AD•JUST = towards•justice

The adjuster should adjust the dispensation for fairness.

Funny how adjusters are private insurance claims magistrates today. To adjust is really to change a former ruling so it is more just.

JURY-RIGGED

Supposedly, this is temporary, improvised or makeshift ship's rigging. Supposedly the word has nothing to do with rigged juries and corrupted legal systems.

JURY = j•ouri

JUDGE = j•oo•de•j

JUDAISM = j•oo•de•ism

COURT MARTIAL = ak•our•te Bar•shall

LAW = al•augh

LAUDNUM = al•au•de'n•um

INJURY once mean action without jury or justice.

Sub-Senator Juries

The people not elected to another office during their time in the Sub-Senate all cycle in for some amount of jury duty, either 2 days or 2 months. Whatever the demand calls for.

Which bias is best to have?

All legal systems have biases, and some bias is unavoidable. However we do have a good deal of choice in which biases we will have.

Today the system is generally operated by super-expensive expert lawyers and law firms. It is thus biased in favor of the people who can afford to hire these super-expensive law firms. This favors the rich of course, but by favoring the rich it also favors the well-connected haremi Brothers and their front men.

By contrast, many ordinary men can't afford to hire a real expert to file his case no matter how clear cut. And if the opposing side has neither money nor insurance, then the contingency fee lawyers are not interested. Thus we have a system that is in many cases not working for the common man.

A better approach is to institute a legal system where everyone represents himself, a system that favors the smart instead of the rich. This is not only fairer for the common man, it also eliminates much of the advantage the haremi Bros have had over us.

Disfavor the common man for his legal ignorance, not his ability to hire a good lawyer.

Thomas Jefferson, 1823.06.12.

"Laws are made for men of ordinary understanding and should, therefore, be construed by the ordinary rules of common sense."

Hesiod, Works and Days, 25

[Hesiod supposedly lived around 700 BC, yet this tract seems to have been written after the siege and surrender of Athens c. 400BC. Athens surrendered because it only had a few month's food supply like the world today.]

"Do not let the Strife that delights in mischief keep you from working, while you watch the drawn-out court disputes. People without a year's supply of food have little concern for quarrels and courts. When you have plenty of that [food], you can raise disputes and strive to get another's property [in lawsuits]. And you should have no second chance to do so again [there should be no appeals, like in Athens and now America.] No, let us settle our disputes here with the perfect judgement of the god's. For we have already divided our inheritance, but you seized the greater share and carried it off, greatly swelling the glory of our bribe-hungry lords who love to judge such a cause as this. Fools!"

All things being equal

- A) The concise and clear should win — so the court remains fast.
- B) Common sense should win — so legal experts don't hold sway.
- C) Emotional arguments should lose — so the court remains rational.
- D) The frequently plaintiff should lose —so the courts don't become part of anyone's revenue model or business plan.
- E) Those arguing the facts should win — so the courts are fact

based.

F) Those arguing for themselves — so the courts are for the people and not their legal experts.

Disfavor the parasite

In the struggle against Arab parasitism, it is important that the legal system be designed to disfavor the parasite's side.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

[Translation: "Far from being against the law, their methods were actually legal... This is because the Arab-fronting ultra-rich of past generations had actually written the laws. Thus the laws have always helped their interests. If you doubt this, just compare the laws of different periods with the profitable methods of the ruling class. You will find their methods, however awful, were not only not considered crimes, but were frequently praised in the media as great virtues.]

"Far from being under the inhibition of law, their methods were duly legalized... These same propertied classes had made the code of laws as it stood. And if any doubter denies that laws at all times have exactly corresponded with the interests and aims of the ruling class, all that is necessary is to compare the laws of the different periods with the profitable methods of that class, and he will find that these methods, however despicable, vile and cruel, were not only indulgently omitted from the recognized category of crimes, but were elevated by prevalent teaching to be commercial virtues and ability of a high order."

More gradations?

There should be no fewer than 8 classes each of murder, robbery and sexual attack, etc. Having more gradations will help the legal system see with much greater precision.

Protection against search and seizure

James Otis, 1761.02.24, A man's house is his castle

"Your honors will find in the old books concerning the office of justice of the peace precedents of general warrants to search suspected houses. But in more modern books you will find only special warrants to search such and such houses, specially named, in which the complainant has been sworn that he suspects his goods are concealed; and will find it adjudged that special warrants only are legal. ... It is a power that places the liberty of every man in the hands of every petty officer."

Juvenile crime penalties

Lax penalties for young criminals incentivize some people to begin a life of violent crime while still young. With this in mind, why do we have this crazy black and white way of treating violent criminals as either adults or minors. Let's instead have a penalty gradient.

Decisions in protest

All judges and juries will be free to protest the laws they rule on. The Senate should take note of the laws most protested and take appropriate action, including the overturning of past decisions involving that law in question.

Plato, Laws, 954

"Prevention of Attendance at Court: Sometimes a man may forcibly prevent a litigant or witness from appearing at a trial. If he prevents a slave, his own or another's, the suit should be null and void. If he prevents a free man, he must be imprisoned for a year and be liable to a suit for kidnapping at

the hands of anyone who cares to prosecute, and the suit will be null and void in any case." [Here is a single law that goes a long way towards gutting the effectiveness of the entire legal system. But in pretty much only works for cohesive groups of criminals. And when we hear of witness intimidation today, it is normally in the context of organized crime. So it would appear that the people spreading this propaganda were organized criminals. See, we want fair trials, and our Arab parasite wants to be able to intimidate witnesses and have a year in jail as the maximum penalty. Clearly this is not philosophy, this is rather transparent propaganda disguised as philosophy.]

Death for legal system tampering

Threatening or harming witnesses or judges being the most serious of crimes, those convicted may be sentenced to decades in prison.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

"Gould seldom went to court without owning his judge."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"In New York City, with their bought judges on hand, they could arrange for decisions in advance, but in Rochester they were in a territory where the power of competitive magnates was strongly entrenched [entrenched]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"so long as the legal contest was confine to the New York City courts, Gould and Fisk had the surety [were certain] of victory. The reason was that such Supreme Court judges as Barnard and Cardozo, formerly Vanderbilt's tools, were now Gould's chattels and did whatever he ordered."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.16

"In a series of articles written by Judge Ben B. Lindsey, a public-spirited jurist who had the most intimate knowledge of Colorado affairs, Judge Lindsey revealed in detail some extent of the corruption in that State. He told how nearly all of the officials and judges were corporation tools; how vast numbers of fraudulent votes were counted at elections; and how the corporations dictated the election or appointment of many of the judges."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

With the law end of them, he did not have to concern himself. At call he could always hire a corps of the most dexterous [skilled] attorneys, none of whom scrupled to take as payment a fraction of his booty. Lawyers, some of who became judges in the highest courts in the country, and other lawyers who had been judges and had resigned to draw large retainers from the very corporations in whose favor they had handed down decisions, pleaded and plotted for Gould. An excellent client he was; the litigation in which he was involved were extensive."

Heresy meant using hearsay evidence

Until the electronic age, the real problem with HERESY is that the evidence was mostly HEARSAY, HEARD-YOU-SAY, and gossip. And if the courts allow this, then the parasite will be able to get rid of people, for what people heard them say. Anyway, this is the reason why hearsay evidence is

inadmissible in court. This is also why the words sound alike. They once were the same word.

LITANY RATIO = the % of someone's transactions that wind up in court.

LITANY RECORD = all court transactions of someone.

a LITIGIOUS INDUSTRY = an industry that suffers much litigation

Government shall record (scoremeasure) all citizens real and fictional with respect to how much they use adjudication. This shall be public knowledge, along with the nature of all cases. This happens whether or not they prevail. In some industries this will not matter, in some it will. This will be judged by novices by looking at the industry's LITANY LEVEL.

supreme court

c. 1400 Nicholas of Clemanges, 'On the Ruin and Repair of the Church'

[This is about the Pope's court, the "Roman Curia"]

"...So much deceit and defamation. So many treacherous attacks on the rights of innocents, performed by those who have been bribed to stir up cases. [like the Roman era deletores]. So many judgments can be had there for a price. So powerful is gold in upsetting justice. So rarely does a poor man prevail if he had a wealthy opponent."

Theodosian Codex, 331AD, 1.16.7

"The rapacious hands of government officials shall stop. They shall stop I say, because if after due warning, they do not stop, they shall be cut off with the sword. The curtain of the judge[s chamber] shall not be bribable. Entrance shall not be purchased. His private chamber shall not be notorious for its bids. The very sight of the governor shall not be at a price. The ears of the judges shall be open equally to the poor and the rich. The introduction of persons inside shall be free from plundering by the one who is called to the office head. The assistants of the said office shall employ no extortion on litigants. The intolerable onslaught of the centurions and other officials who demand small and large sums shall be crushed. And the insatiable greed of those who deliver records to litigants shall be restrained."

A corrupt US supreme court

One third of the US system of checks and balances rests on the shoulders of 9 appointees. How can we allow this if we believe in democracy? Do we honestly believe that these 9 men deserve so much power due to their careers as appointees?

To see the corruption of the US judiciary, simply look at how Roe vs. Wade happened in 1973, just before the Arab Oil embargo hit. Roe vs. Wade suddenly made many more women available for sex, and this was a huge distraction for the men of the time. The timing is simply too much of a coincidence. The only possible conclusion is that the US supreme court is completely corrupt.

Judicial review: Yet another backdoor to our democracy

Today the 9 "experts" appointed by our various presidential monarchs have the power to veto the laws of our democratic legislature based on any reasonable interpretation of our constitutionality.

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.05.28

"There is not a syllable in the plan under consideration which directly empowers the national courts to construe [judge] the laws [of Congress] according to the spirit of the Constitution." [Nonetheless that is clearly what happened. Today our democracy is subject to any reasonable interpretation that 9 appointees care to make. And yes, all are very highly distinguished priests in our parasite's church of law.]

Alexander Hamilton, 1788.05.28, Federalist 78

"The judiciary... has no influence over either the sword or the purse; no direction either of the strength or of the wealth of the society, and can take no active resolution whatever. It may truly be said to have neither force or will." [Obviously the courts have usurped the power of the legislature, I mean, look at Roe v. Wade. And while this decision to grant women the right to kill their unborn children is a good one, the power-grab/over-reach by the court is absolutely unforgivable. And when we consider the timing of Roe v. Wade, just before the Arab oil embargo, we see how utterly corrupt our current 1789 democracy really is.]

James Madison, 1789.06.18, House of Representatives Speech

"Nothing has yet been offered to invalidate the doctrine that the meaning of the Constitution may as well be ascertained by the legislative as the judicial authority." [Until the new 2.0 constitution was ratified, the parasite's Federalist party was denying that the constitution would allow for judicial review. But once the new constitution came into effect, the parasite immediately set in motion its scheme to sap some power from our nation's only democratic branch, its legislature — and hand it to the 9 appointees running the nation's supreme court. And of course, pretty much every one of these supreme court appointee judges was an illustrious priest in the parasite's church of law.]

Thomas Jefferson, 1804.09.11, to Abigail Adams

"The opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional and what are not, not only for themselves, in their own sphere of action, but for the Legislature and Executive also in their spheres, would make the [9-appointee] Judiciary a despotic branch."

Thomas Jefferson, 1820.12.25, to Thomas Ritchie

"The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working under ground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric."

Thomas Jefferson, 1821.08.18, to Charles Hammond

"The germ of dissolution of our federal government is in the constitution of the federal judiciary working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped."

Thomas Jefferson, 1823.10.31, to Monsieur A. Coray

"At the establishment of our constitution, the judiciary bodies were supposed to be the most helpless and harmless members of the government. Experience, however, soon showed in what way they were to become the most dangerous. that The insufficiency of the means provided for their removal [lifetime appointments] gave them a freehold and irresponsibility in office. that Their decisions, seeming to

concern individual suitors only, pass silent and unheeded by the public at large. that These decisions, nevertheless, become law by precedent, sapping, by little and little, the foundations of the constitution, and working its change by construction. Before any one has perceived that the invisible and helpless [parasitic] worm has been busily employed in consuming its substance"

Thomas Jefferson, 1825.03.25, to Edward Livingston

"One single object[ive]... [deserves] the endless gratitude of the society: that of restraining the judges from usurping legislation [the legislative role of government]."

Thomas Jefferson, 1820.12.25, to Thomas Ritchie

"A judiciary independent of a king or executive alone, is a good thing. But independence of the will of the nation is a solecism, at least in a republican government."

[To simplify for the sake of comprehension:

Courts grow more just when independent from monarchies.
Courts grow less just when independent from democracies.

Ammianus Marcellinus, 22.10

"among other things he [Roman emperor Julian] reformed certain laws by pruning them of ambiguities and making it perfectly clear what they required or forbade" [This is probably part of why Julian only ruled for 3 years from 360 to 363 AD. It is easy to imagine that the parasite likes legal ambiguity.]

The US constitution is so terse it is ambiguous

The Arab-run Oracle of Delphi would give ultra-brief answers to questions. These were generally quite ambiguous and needed 'expert' interpretation. Clearly the 1789, 2.0 version of the US constitution is also ultra-brief, quite ambiguous and in need of 'expert' interpretation.

Document ambiguity is surely one of our parasite's oldest tricks. The ambiguity justifies having Brotherly priests to interpret the ambiguous document — In the case case of the US constitution, we have 9 supreme court judges acting as interpreter priests.

Ulpian, d.228AD, Digest of Laws, 1.1.1

"We jurists, who may deservedly be called priests of the law, cherish justice and profess knowledge of the good and fair, separating the fair from the unfair, discriminating between what is permitted and what is not permitted, striving to make men honest, not only through fear of punishments but also through the encouragement of rewards."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"At all times, when the Constitution has stood in the way of commercial aims it has been abrogated [repealed, evaded], not by repeal, nor by violent overthrow, but by the effective expedient of judicial interpretation. [Read that a couple times and let it sink in. This is called judicial review. It is when some appointee, some celebrated priest from the openly-corrupt paid judicial system vetoes the pronouncement of our democratic legislatures. Here we see why we allow this.]

The trading class [fronting for the Arabs] demanded State created banks with the power of issuing money. And, as the courts have invariably in the long run responded to the interests and decrees of the dominant class, a decision was quickly forthcoming in this case to the effect that 'bills of credit' were not meant to cover banknotes. This was a new and surprising construction; but judicial decision and precedent

made it virtually law, and law a thousandfold more binding than any Constitutional insertion.

The trading class had already learned the importance of the principle that while it was essential to control law-making bodies, it was imperative to have as their auxiliary the bodies that interpreted [the] law [as well]. To a large extent the United States since then has lived not under legislative-made law, but under a purely separate and extraneous form of law which has superseded the legislature product, namely, court law. Although nowhere in the United States Constitution is there even the suggestion that courts shall make law, yet this past century and more they have been gradually building up a formidable code of interpretations which substantially ranks at the most commanding kind of law. And these interpretations have, on the whole, consistently followed, and kept pace with, the changing interests of the dominant class [fronting for the Arabs], whether traders, slaveholders or the present trusts."

This decision of the august [respected and impressive] courts opened the way for the greatest orgy of corruption and the most stupendous frauds. In New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and other States, a continuous rush to get bank charters ensued."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"One of the most scandalous land-company transactions was that involving a group of Southern and Boston capitalists. In January, 1795, the Georgia Legislature, by special act, sold millions of acres in different parts of the State of Georgia to four land companies. The people of the State were convinced that this purchase had been obtained by bribery. It was made an election issue, and a Legislature, comprising almost wholly new members, was elected. In February, 1796, this Legislature passed a rescinding act, declaring the act of the preceding year void, on the ground of it having been obtained by 'improper influence' [bribery]. In 1803 the tracts in question were transferred by the Georgia Legislature to the United States Government.

The Georgia Mississippi Land Company was one of the four companies. In the mean time, this company had sold its tract, for ten cents an acre, to the New England Mississippi Land Company. Although committee after committee of Congress reported that the New England Mississippi Land Company had paid little or no actual part of the purchase price, yet that company, headed by some of the foremost Boston capitalists, lobbied in Congress for eleven years for an act giving it a large indemnity. Finally, in 1814, Congress passed an indemnification act, under which the eminent Bostonians, after ten years more lobbying, succeeded in getting an award from the United States Treasury of \$1,077,561. The total amount appropriated by Congress on the pretense of settling the claims of the various capitalists in the 'Yazoo Claims' was \$1,500,000. The ground upon which this appropriation was made by Congress was that the Supreme Court of the United States had decided that, irrespective of the methods used to obtain the grant from the Georgia Legislature, the grant, once made [to the Arabs], was in the nature of a contract which could not be revoked or impaired by subsequent legislation. This was the first of a long line of [totally corrupt US Supreme] court decisions validating grants and franchises of all kinds secured by bribery and fraud."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"Attempts to foreclose mortgages [foreigner English] during the

depression after 1930 caused agitations, and in several States local protests or uprisings of farmers. To afford relief, Congress enacted a Farm Mortgage Moratorium law, but, in 1935 this was declared unconstitutional by the [corrupt appointees of] the Supreme Court of the United States."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.25

"Piles upon piles of proofs that the grossest frauds had been committed could not convince the [corrupt] Supreme Court of the United States. In its decision of April 18, 1887, it held that the act of June 21, 1860, was virtually a new grant, and that it confirmed the grant to the full extent of the 1.7-million acres claimed—a decision received with the utmost amazement by the whole country."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.26

[in] "the lower courts, many of the judges of which had been railroad attorneys, or who had been elevated to the bench by railroad influence, gave decision after decision in favor of the Northern Pacific Railroad..."

The Supreme Court could only affirm the numerous decisions already rendered in favor of the railway company. The property rights of the corporation were beyond the reach of legislation."

Church of law

How the 1789 US constitution is like the Bible and Koran

All three documents are quite ambiguous, and this ambiguity gives a body of expert interpreters a great deal of power to veto the will of the people. The process is the same whether these officials are Supreme Court justices, the Catholic College of Cardinals, or the money system that steers the Islam's Umma.

Decision in Philadelphia, CH.23

"it is our belief that the ["Constitutional"] Convention failed adequately to deal with the question of judicial review. The delegates recognized that somebody would have to settle disputes between the states, and that somebody would have to decide when laws were in conflict with the Constitution. They assumed it would be the courts. But the idea of specifically giving any one body the last word troubled a good many of them, and in the end they deliberately left the matter vague.

The result was that the Supreme Court arrogated [claimed without justification] these functions to itself. In general, this was a good thing. If the Convention had dealt with the problem of judicial review, it would almost certainly have limited the power of the Court [a court of non-elected appointees] to interpret the Constitution as broadly as it has done in, for example, ending segregation, reapportioning state legislatures, or defining the powers of Congress and the president. [We have 9 appointees defining the powers of our elected legislature]

The power of the Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution is what has given the document the flexibility necessary to deal with changing conditions. Yet it is certain that the delegates would be horrified to see how broadly the Court has used its interpreting power. They believed, at bottom, that if final power had to lie anywhere, it ought to be in the legislature, which they [rightly] saw as the primary voice of the people. They certainly did not expect the [non-elected] judiciary to be dealing with day-to-day details of school

[systems, prisons, and fire departments as they do today.](#)

We are inclined to agree. It seems to us that [the \[non-elected\] Supreme Court is setting national policy on a wide variety of issues that ought properly to be decided by Congress](#) — issues like abortion, women's rights, pornography, and others. In general, the Supreme Court has over the years reflected public opinion fairly well, but that is no guarantee that it will continue to do so. A president who by chance is able to make a number of [appointments](#) to the Court may well leave a Court with a social philosophy which a decade later may be wholly out of tune with the wishes of the people."

Supreme Court powers

The Judiciary Act of 1789 (written by Oliver Ellsworth) gave the Supreme Court the power to declare state laws unconstitutional. It also gave the court the power to interpret the Constitution. However the power to actually overturn Congressional laws was assumed by the Supreme Court in 1803; in the famous Supreme Court case of Marbury vs. Madison. Prior to that time, the US Supreme court (run by appointees) was rightly lower than the elected legislative branch.

Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes

["The Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is."](#)

[The supreme court is appointed by America's lone presidential monarchs. It is not a democratic body. Are we fools to allow a bunch of appointees to say to our legislature, "your laws are unconstitutional?" Surely this hugely powerful role must be entrusted to another legislature.]

Thurgood Marshal

This man was the first black supreme court justice. But judging from his name, he was probably a Mideast Brother: Thur•good Bar•shall, or Sacrifice•good Bro•shall. This name compares with Strom Thur•man= Storm Thur•man = Storm Sacrifice•man, who served a 49-year tenure in the US Senate.

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

["Executive, n. An officer of the Government, whose duty it is to enforce the wishes of the legislative power until such time as the judicial department shall be pleased to pronounce them invalid and of no effect. Following is an extract from an old book entitled, the Lunarian Astonished—Pfeiffer & Co., Boston, 1803:](#)

[Lunarian:](#) Then when your Congress has passed a law, it goes directly to the Supreme Court in order that it may at once be know whether it is constitutional [or not]?

[Terrestrial:](#) O no; it does not require the approval of the Supreme Court until having perhaps been enforced for many years, and somebody objects to its operation against himself—I mean, his client. The President, if he approves it, begins to execute it at once.

[Lunarian:](#) Ah, the executive power is a part of the legislative. Do your policemen also have to approve the local ordinances that they enforce?

[Terrestrial:](#) Not yet—at least not in their character of constables. Generally speaking, though, all laws require the approval of those whom they are intended to restrain.

[Lunarian:](#) I see. The death warrant is not valid until signed by the murderer.

[Terrestrial:](#) My fiend, you put it too strongly; we are not so consistent.

[Lunarian:](#) But this system of maintaining and expensive judicial machinery to pass upon the validity of laws only after

[they have long been executed, and then only when brought before the court by some private person—does it not cause great confusion?](#)

[Terrestrial:](#) It does.

[Lunarian:](#) Why then should not your laws, previously to being executed, be validated, not by the signature of your President, but by that Chief Justice of the Supreme Court?

[Terrestrial:](#) There is no precedent for any such course.

[Lunarian:](#) Precedent. What is that?

[Terrestrial:](#) It has been defined by 500 lawyers in three volumes each."

Judicial sway

The Arabs desperately needs judicial sway

How do you know how far you can go unless you risk going to far? Basically, our parasite is constantly going too far, or rather, its dumb human tentacles are constantly going to far. These need protection from the Rumi they are stealing from, and here is why the legal sway is so critical to the parasite. It MUST protect its own, or its tentacles will become risk averse and unwilling to each take that extra bite. Here is yet another reason why we must eliminate all of our parasite's legal sway if we are going to kill the awful group spirit of the land of no resources.

District attorney, public prosecutor

Currently in America, the decision to prosecute is decided by the office of these lone monarchs, or tzars running administrations of appointees, frequently Brotherly appointees. How can you give one person so much power in our criminal justice system? What a huge source of corruption this is. A far less corruptible (if not slightly less expert and accurate) approach is to leave the decision to prosecute up to Sub-Senators randomly drawn for Senate 'jury duty'.

The Attorney General is a back door

It is absurd how the United States, the paragon of democracy has this office of attorney general — a lone appointee of a lone presidential monarch. This one man (Recently the Harem Brother Eric Holder) gets to say which industries, businesses and men get destroyed by the legal arm of the US national government. What a great way for our parasite to set upon the industries it wants to curtail. What a great way to eliminate people it finds troublesome.

What a lousy bunged justice system we have in the US. I mean, look how the decision about government prosecution takes place outside the democratic process. What a huge backdoor to ruling America.

But wait. Eric Holder also sits/sat on the UN security council, he sits in one of 5 seats that make up the secondary house of the UN. What immense power this one Brotherly appointee has over the future of humanity. How can we give this one Arab mole so much power?

The biggest law firm in town

It is hard to imagine that the biggest law firm in town is not normally in the hands of the parasite. And surely, this must help our parasite — the richest man in the world — to buy power in our court system? Therefore, we shall level the playing field, and say that no more than one lawyer at a time will be permitted per side per case. And all the law firms will have to disband. And all lawyers will be required to be independent physically, financially, and with respect to the discussion of pending cases. To do otherwise is to favor our Arab parasite.

CAVITATION = When an industry is made to die off from externality that was intentionally caused for the sake of economic parasitism.

LEGISLATIVE CAVITATION = When one of the parasite's laws causes an industry to die off.

ENVIRONMENTAL CAVITATION = When one of our parasite's environmental regulations causes an industry to die off.

JUDICIAL CAVITATION = When a court ruling causes a nation's lawyers to go after an industry and kill it off. This is a big part of why judicial power is so important to our parasite — and why we need to guard against this sort of abuse.

TORT CAVITATION = The hostile legal environment created by the absurdly large payouts of the court system. This is often reflected (and hidden) in absurdly large insurance charges.

Jail house lawyers

The concept of Jailhouse lawyers needs some careful scrutiny, particularly with respect to haremi and organized crime.

Corrupt appointed judges — corrupt appointee pardons

The Haremi are ancient experts at using people for their ends. One of their main tricks is to gain power by shielding bad people from prosecution. Here is the real reason why the giant non-elected administration of our lone monarchs has the power to:

- A) Appoint a top federal prosecutor.
- B) Run an appointed federal prosecution administration under this appointee.
- C) Appoint judges.
- D) Pardon anyone convicted of any crime, thus gutting the power of A, B and C if they so elect.

Now of course, our lone and immensely overworked president has final say here... if he has time to read and study all the things he is voting on. But over 99% of everything going on in his administration is the work of his appointees and the people they hire.

We might call it justice theatre, or puppet theatre. For on one hand we have a bunch of appointees that have the power to prosecute. On another hand are the appointees with the power to judge, and finally, to top it all off, we have these appointees that may cancel (or rather pardon) the decisions of the other appointees they themselves picked. Can't you all see, this is a judiciary maximized for control by the President's massive appointed administration.

John Adams, 1776, Thoughts on Government

"Judges, therefore, should be always men of learning and experience in the laws, of exemplary morals, great patience, calmness, coolness, and attention. Their minds should not be distracted with jarring interests; they should not be dependent upon any man, or body of men." [The Arabs made up this endless stream of details about the life of Hellen of Hellenic Greece — so we would think their impersonization of Hellenic Greece was a real person. Here in a similar way, John Adams (the 2nd US president) is telling us about how our judges should be — to make them more real and believable.]

Plutarch, Alexander, 42

"so many accusations were laid before him [Alexander] that he grew harsh and was inclined to believe even the false charges, because so much that he was told was true." [Here the Plutarch gazette is attempting to normalize a certain state of judicial affairs for Rome. They want the Romans to think that over time, it is normal for leaders to convict everyone accused

of a crime.]

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Precedent, n. In Law, a previous decision, rule or practice which, in the absence of a definite statute, has whatever force and authority a Judge may choose to give it, thereby greatly simplifying his task of doing as he pleases. As there are precedents for everything, he has only to ignore those that make against his interest and accentuate those in the line of his desire. Invention of the precedent elevates the trial-at-law from the low estate of a fortuitous ordeal to the noble attitude of a dirigible arbitrament." [a steerable decision]

Elect your court officials

The decision to prosecute, appoint judges and pardon must not be in the hands of appointees or we grant our parasite a back door to our judiciary.

Government sting operations

OUTBOUND CORRUPTION is when the government official suggests a bribe. INBOUND CORRUPTION is when private people suggests a bribe. When a government occasionally conducts sting operations, testing the honesty of government people by attempting to entrap or sting them, it mostly closes the door to inbound corruption. All that is left is outbound corruption, and this is much harder to do — especially where sting operations are being conducted. For this reason, stings shall not only be allowed by our government, but they shall be required. However in all cases, the stings shall be fully recorded and administered in a completely unbiased way by our Sub-Senators. They shall also be conducted randomly, and nobody shall benefit personally in any way from their service in the STING POLICE.

And incidentally the intersection of the singer Sting with the band the Police and that song, "Don't walk so close to me": None of that was real. That was a command broadcast to ease up on the stings. Again, we want to go in the opposite direction and regularly test the honesty of our government officials.

How to ruin a nation's laws

It is just not possible for the parasite to alter a legal system by changing common sense laws for stupid ones. People instinctively react against this. So what the parasite does is silt up the stream. It adds details, and dumb laws, and wasteful terminology. It fills the legal system with all the worthless garbage information it can think of. This then creates a place for lawyers which can be turned into the arena of Brothers, particularly if all the decent law schools are brotherly run.

The 3 ways to have no laws

- 1) Total anarchy with no ostensible government.
- 2) Totalitarianism = totali•terri'n•ism where there are no laws for Big Brother.
- 3) A legal code too long to be comprehended, or too contradictory to be mean anything with certainty.

Simplify laws—1

Perhaps we should take a lesson from the Gulliver gazette and limit the number of words in our laws. Here we might say that:

- a) Matters under 300 words long pass with a 50% vote.
- b) Matters over 300 words long require a 55% vote.
- c) Constitutional amendments may not exceed say 100 words each.

Simplify laws—2

Apparently, there are 30 exceptions to the use of hearsay evidence in US courts. Was someone trying to make law something difficult that requires experts and the corruption they introduce? Make the law simple, and intuitive to understand. Index and hyperlink it with great detail. If a new law can't be made so that it readily explains itself in full, then this is reason alone to dis-allow it as written.

Democratic precedent publishing

We must prevent appointee judges from acquiring any legislative power whatsoever. We must also be suspicious of what our rock-star legal professors and legal textbook authors say.

We must also keep the case law from growing hypertrophic. So to this end, the Judicial-Sluice shall decide which cases, aspects of cases, summaries and clarifications of the law will be published as precedent and which will not. Unpublished decisions shall be inadmissible in court, and shall establish no precedent. We will do this as a check on the legislative power of our judges.

Condensing case law into code

The Judicial Sluice shall regularly aggregate, codify and supersede bodies of case law so as to simplify, condense and open-up the legal system for all to use. In other words, the Judicial sluice will dredge-up and eliminate the incremental case-law sediments that build-up in a poorly dredged legal channel.

Thomas Jefferson, 1823.06.12

"Laws are made for men of ordinary understanding and should, therefore, be construed by the ordinary rules of common sense."

Byzantine

Spot the pattern and see our parasite's ghost in the machine

1) Exxon gave huge sums of money to environmental groups that lobbied for the incredibly strict and costly environmental standards applied to the oil industry today. Today, the bureaucratic compliance needed to drill an oil well is an immense headache for oil drillers around the world. Today, oil wells are so costly (especially considering the unlimited liability) that few people drill them in the United States.

2) McDonalds lobbied for the incredibly strict and costly health standards applied to the restaurant industry today. Now the bureaucratic compliance needed to open an independent restaurant is a huge headache. Now independent restaurants are so costly, that few people open new ones in the United States.

3) Somehow the health care industry, the construction industry, US manufacturers, and just about everyone else started being held to the strictest standards. Somehow, if there is an accident, it is always someone's fault. Somehow if someone walks into your business and does something stupid, and has an accident, you must pay for the highest possible level of health care treatments anyone can think of.

Is this our own doing, or our parasite's? Our parasite's goal here is very simple. It is the same scheme that destroyed Rome and Athens. It is the scheme described in Procopius herein. A) destroy the old host's industries and replace them with overpriced imported goods. B) Use credit to keep the old host's economy going while this happens. C)

Destroy the old host in a series of horrible wars that it will not be able to fight due to a compromised industrial sector. D) Eventually bring about another dark ages in his land so the Harem Brothers may once again rule the entire world, like the glory years of the 600s -900s AD, coincidentally the Western Dark Ages.

Under the above scenario, an allergic legal system is key to the autoimmune disease the parasite induces in its old and no longer useful hosts.

America's Byzantine business environment

We Americans have a totally byzantine business environment. But it is not in the approval or licensing part of government, although it is that too. It is a bro•cracy of the courts, the money damages courts. And it has already taken our nation down a path to the brink of economic and soon military ruin.

Thousands of years of Byzantining

The term 'Byzantine bar•ocracy' = Biz•anti bro•rule = anti-business rule-by-bros. Basically, the Mideast gets a younger (and cheaper) "girlfriend" and then runs the old girlfriend into the ground fetching metaphorical water=money for it. China is now the new girlfriend/wife/bitch of Arabs Inc. and America and Europe are the old bitch being run into the ground getting water until they die from exhaustion. Eventually the plan is a world that looks like the end of the Cloud Atlas film — where Arab brothers (played by Ali Bari) riding in "space ships" have their pick of white breed mares (played by Tom Hanks) and live happily ever after.

Regulation: Start anew from the ground up

Our parasite's byzantine regulation is so pervasive in most government systems that we would generally be better off scrapping all rules and starting over from the ground up. Basically we will create a new simplified, streamlined, and efficient regulatory system and then toss out the old system as soon as possible. I cannot stress strongly enough that we must discard 100% of our existing regulation system and start over anew without the involvement of our parasite's lobbyists.

With 100,000 Main-Senators in 10 sluices, and 10,000 Centi-Nomes, we can start everywhere all at once here. Here we see again the immense benefit of having a more realistic representation ratio.

Jonathan Swift, Gulliver's Travels, Pt. 2, Ch. 7

"No law of that country must [may] exceed in words the number of letters in their alphabet; which consists only of two and twenty. But indeed, few of them extend even to that length. They are expressed in the most plain and simple terms, wherein those people are not mercurial enough to discover above one interpretation. And, to write a comment upon any law, is a capital crime. As to the decision of civil causes, or proceedings against criminals, their precedents are so few, that they have little reason to boast of any extraordinary skill in either." [Here we see the Brothers portraying short plain and simple laws as the work of simple minded people. These are the same people that helped develop the code of Justinian. Some centuries later they created a Byzantine bureaucracy in the same place. They are the same people who helped America create a web of bureaucracies to regulate oil drilling, many of which have never granted permission to drill a single oil well. Clearly this is a major force behind the regulation that is stifling the economy of America and many other nations.

Centuries ago, the English sensibly rebelled against

the Roman Law, also known as the Code of Justinian — a legal code that remains in force in so much of the world today. Instead, they developed their own easy-to-change and easy-to-evolve system of 'common law,' based on common sense. Instead of the encyclopedic-code designed by the Brothers, to create a need for specialist lawyers — which are all too often Brothers. Next to not paying money to the church of Rome, this legal system may have been the biggest reason for England's economic success. Here however, the minds of young Englishmen are being taunted that "their precedents are so few... they have little reason to boast of any...skill."

Yet again, we see a place where we must go in the opposite direction from that stated by the Brothers. We must have short laws, and short law codes — for these universal rules must be tersely stated so we can eliminate the specialist lawyers. And whenever we consider enlarging our laws, we must bear in mind that inducing gordian complexity is a primary strategy of our parasite.]

Thomas Jefferson, 1821, Autobiography

"If the present Congress errs in to much talking, how can it be otherwise in a body to which the people send 150 lawyers, whose trade is to question everything, yield nothing, and talk by the hour? That 150 lawyers should do business together ought not to be expected."

Byzantine law

Law based on the law of Justinian, sometimes called 'civil law' shall be called BYZANTINE LAW in every language. This so that its true nature will be easily understood. Laws based on the English 'common law' shall be called COMMON LAW which should be perceived as being codified COMMON SENSE. Law concerning personal injury or property shall not be called 'civil law' but shall be called DAMAGE LAW.

Formula 409 – cleaning up Rumi knowledge

Ok, so the Vatican of the Roman Catholic Church is the 2nd holiest place for Muslims. And to them, it is holier than even the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, the 3rd holiest place for Muslims.

Keep this in mind, we must remember how in 409AD, the Vatican ordered the rounding up all the books, saying "...any person...convicted of having hidden any [pre-Christian] books under any pretext...[or] having failed to deliver them [for burning], he shall know that he himself shall suffer capital punishment, for possession of noxious books and writings and as guilty of the [capital] crime of maleficium."

Listed below are 13 new and different legal codes dating from the 229 year period between the first sacking of Rome in 407 and the beginning of the Islamic conquest in 636:

- 1) The Theodosian Codex begun in 429 - came into effect in 438 for both halves of Rome.
- 2) The Lex Romana Burgundiorum from the early 400s
- 3) The code of Euric (customs of the Visigoths) first codified by Euric around 471, and then updated by Liuvigild a century later, although these may be palimpsests of false antiquity.
- 4) The Edict of Theodoric or the Ostrogoth king Theodoric the Great (r. 471-526) ruler of Italy, Germany and Yugoslavia.
- 5) The Breviary of Alaric in 506, a simplification of the Theodosian Code of 438

6) The Pactus Legis Salicae or Salic Law implemented under Clovis, king of the Franks from c.510. He extended Merovingian rule to Gaul and Germany making Paris his capital. This code is heavily altered.

7) The Lex Gundobada under Gundobad king of the Burgundians c. 516 (bar•gon•di's)

8) The earliest Anglo Saxon (Ang•low S•ak•son) laws date from c 600.

9) The 'German code' the Pactus Alamannorum is from c.500 and a Lex Alamannorum from the 700s.

10) The Edict of Rothari (the Brotheri?), begun by the Lombards (Al umb•ards?) around 643.

11) The Lex Baiuvariorum of the Bavarians dating from the mid 700s.

12) Around this time, in Persia, the Hebrew Mishna and Gemara (other codes) were incorporated into the apodictic Babylonian Talmud. Apo•dic•te•ak = away-from•say•you•point

13) The most encyclopedic, and most influential of all the new laws in this period was the Corpus Juris Civilis, the so called Code of Justinian dating to around 529. This was assembled just two short years after Justinian came to power in 527, The Justinian administration also brought out the Codex Constructionum and the 50 volume Digest or Pandects. The legal systems of many country are today based on this law of Justinian, a system little doubt written by Mideast Inc. The new code of Justinian (according to the Justinian administration) reduced 3 million lines of Roman law to just 150,000. That is an unbelievable 130,000 pages reduced to 6,500 pages, if we assume 13 words per line and 300 words per page. Here our parasite is obviously struggling to distort and lengthen our perception of how long a LEGIS should be. Clearly we need to go in the opposite direction.

Justinian, c. 530AD, Digest 1.1.3

"Whatever the emperor decides shall have the force of law. This seeing as how the people passed a law that transferred all their power and authority to him and made him their dictator. Therefore, whatever the emperor has laid down in writing and signed, or decreed in court, or pronounced extrajudicially, or ordained by edict, constitutes a law beyond any question. And clearly, some of these will only be applied to individuals, and are not intended to be used as a precedent. Whatever penalties or extraordinary aid he calls for, it applies only to that individual." [If your nation follows the Roman law, or the law of Justinian, it is following a legal system written by our parasite. It is high time that our nations create their own legal codes, codes simple enough that people don't need lawyers.]

Ending quotes

Gulliver's Travels, 2.6

"he asked, what time was usually spent in determining between right and wrong; and what degree of expense. Whether advocates and orators had liberty to plead in causes manifestly known to be unjust, vexatious, or oppressive. Whether party in religion or politicks were observed to be of any weight in the scale of justice. Whether those pleading

orators were persons educated in the general knowledge of equity; or only in provincial national, and other local customs. Whether they, or their judges, had any part in penning those laws, which they assumed the liberty of interpreting and glossing upon [talking about, defining] at their pleasure. Whether they had ever at different times pleaded for and against the same cause, and cited precedents to prove contrary opinions. Whether they were a rich or poor corporation [rich or poor on the whole]. Whether they [lawyers] received any pecuniary [money] reward for pleading or delivering their opinions. And particularly, whether they were ever admitted as members in the lower senate." [Here we see a list of things our parasite seem to be striving for in our court systems. Clearly our parasite wants us wasting as much time and expense as possible in court. The law of diminishing returns does apply to trial length, and the parasite wants us exceeding that point. It also seem to want contingency based compensation for lawyers and lawyers as legislators.]

Lawmakers, not Lawyers

In that last underlined sentence from Gulliver above, our parasite was talking about the features of its host's primary legislature. Here the Brothers seem "particularly" concerned with whether our legislatures admits lawyers. Here it seems a pretty safe bet that we need to go in the opposite direction once again. Here it seems we should in fact bar lawyers from our legislatures.

Firstly, law-yers (especially the most successful ones) are quite likely to be Brothers. A secondary reason is that the nature of this profession (as it stands) demands that lawyers deny what they believe in, deny their own integrity, and take the side of the person who is paying them. This is deemed ethical by the legal profession. The problem is, that this is exactly the opposite of what we want from our law makers. Ideally, we want our law makers to have the strongest and most unwavering of internal compasses.

So, thanks to their work experience, Lawyers may be well QUALIFIED to write arguments and contracts. But that doesn't matter because thanks to their work experience, lawyers are also well DISQUALIFIED to act as a legislator.

So I ask you all to resolve that lawyers are in general the worst people to become lawmakers and elected officials. If the lawyer is overwhelmingly brilliant, then maybe you can overlook this deep character flaw — namely a professional track record of selling his integrity to the highest bidder. Maybe if the lawyer or former lawyer is completely brilliant, you can say, "even though he has worked as a lawyer in the past, he is brilliant and can contribute to society by the strength of his ideas." Don't completely exclude lawyers as lawmakers, but please regard them with deep mistrust as leaders. Regard them as people who, like convicts, have already sold their integrity — people who might easily slip back into old habits.

Also, lawyers may have lots of experience interpreting words and stringing them together. However, that is an unimportant aspect of being a law maker. Lots of people can do that well enough. What is harder to find in lawmakers are people dedicated to doing what is right and capable of discerning what is right. Here lawyers very often fail miserably.

As the Romans Did — P.12 #4

Discrimination in Assigning Penalties

[In reading the following, realize that the rich and old families normally got that way by doing the bidding of the parasite, knowingly or not.]

"Penalties differed for Roman citizens and non-citizens, for

slaves and free men, and even, among free men, for rich and poor. In the early 200s AD, about the same time that Roman citizenship was extended to all free people in the Empire [2nd mention of this in 10 pages, its probably propaganda], the citizen body was formally divided, for purposes of criminal jurisdiction, into two classes: the honestiores, which included members of the senatorial and equestrian orders, local officials, and army officers; and the humiliores, every other free citizen. Punishments for humiliores were much more severe [humiliating mouths] than for honestiores [honest mouths]. The [Arab friendly] upper classes, which made and enforced the laws, justified this differentiation by arguing that the rich did more for the state — since they supplied it with magistrates, jurists, army officers, provincial administrators, and so on, and since they risked their money undertaking state contracts—and that that rich [Mideast font-men] therefore deserved a separate scale of punishments. This attitude of superiority explains the apparent discrepancy between Roman theories of justice and the actual laws."

Aristotle, 400.14

"The law of a city orders all life in that place, and is permanently fixed in the souls of those who live under it. For in obedience to it, it is plain, the magistrates go forth to their duties, the judges to their several courts of justice, the councillors and members of the assembly go to their appointed meeting places, and one man dines in the pyrtaneum. Another makes his defense before a jury, and another dies in prison. As well, the customary public sacrifices and annual festivals/holidays take place [each with their own costly sacramental products]. And sacrifices to the gods, and worship of heroes and libations in honor of the dead. The various activities of the citizens in obedience to lawful authority are well expressed in the words of the poet: 'The whole town if full of incense smoke'." [This Arabian incense frequently cost more than gold by weight. The Athenians had a council of 500. This was supposedly divided into 10 divisions of 50, each called a prytany. A pyrtaneum is apparently like a White House.]

Hesiod, Works and Days, c. 700BC, 212

[The parasite has carefully shaped the belief systems of the host so the host is easier to feed on. If we don't obey our Arab-created religions, our Arab-selected leaders, or our Arab-created justice system, the Arabs have a much harder time feeding on us. Here is an ancient text telling us to obey our Arab-created legal system — a text that is blatantly self-serving for the Arabs.]

"Listen to right and do not promote [extra-judicial] violence [against immigrants]. Violence is bad for poor men. But even rich men cannot easily bear its burden and are weighed down under it when they have fallen into [group] delusion. [Think lynching of Arab neg-ards accused of sabotage. Think of all the anti-lynching scenes in so much media.] The best path is to always err on the other side towards justice. For Justice beats rage/outrage [at Arab kleptēs=stealing] when she comes at last to the end of the race. But only when he has suffered, does the fool learn this. For Oath [the god Horkos] keeps pace with wrong judgements [troubling the foresworn. In other words, obey the law, the Arab given law that helps the Arabs with their stealing.]

When Justice is being dragged by those who take bribes for crooked judgements, it makes a sound. And [then] she wrapped in mist [Ishtar, Astarte] goes to the city and haunts of the weeping people — bringing misfortune to men, especially to those who have driven her forth, they who did not

deal straightly with her [and here people, her immigrants.]

Those who give straight judgements to both foreigners and countrymen alike, and never depart from what is just — Their city flourishes, and the people in it prosper. Peace, the nursemaid of children, is everywhere in their land, and all seeing Zeus never decrees cruel war against them. Neither famine nor disaster ever haunt men truly of justice [to Arab immigrants]. But light-hearted they tend the fields [and businesses] which are their only care. [At least that was the Arab propaganda.] The Earth bears them food a plenty, and on the mountains [the Arab high ground], the [Harem] oak bears acorns [fresh smart chosen ones] upon its top, and bees [worker-bees, unchosen dumb Arabs] in the middle. Their wooly sheep are laden with fleeces. Their women bear children like their parents [they were not raped by an invaders.] They do not travel on ships, [and compete with the Arabs] because the grain-giving earth bears fruit for them, so they continually flourish with good things. [and do not suffer famine from Arab-introduced crop plagues.] But for those who practice violence and cruel deeds, far-seeing Zeus, the son of Chronos, ordains a punishment. Often even an entire city suffers for [the acts of] one bad man who sins by devising arrogant deeds [like attacking the Arabs, or sea exploration, or devising a new technology, or not sacrificing enough incense.] Then Zeus lays great trouble upon the people, plague and famine together, so that the men perish, and their women do not bear children, and their houses become few. And again, at another time, Zeus may either destroys their great army, or their walls, or else makes an end of their ships on the sea. [epi•demic = on-the•people, just like the words "upon the people" above. This points to most epidemics being Arab induced. The rest of the paragraph points to Arabs using pre-natal poison, sabotaging fleets, and armies and killing entire cities.]

You princes should also carefully note this punishment. For the immortal gods are always among men and mark [stigmatize] all those who oppress their fellow men with crooked judgements, and do not heed the will of the gods. For upon the bountiful Earth, Zeus has 30,000, [Harem Brothers] spirits, watchers of mortal men, and these keep watch on judgements and evil deeds as they roam, clothed in mist [disguised invisible], all over the Earth. And there is the virgin Justice [Dike], daughter of Zeus, who is honored and revered among the gods who dwell on Mr. Olympus, and whenever anyone hurts her with lying slander, she sits beside her father, Zeus and tells him of that men's wicked heart, until the people [the entire community] pay for the mad folly of their evil-minded princes who pervert justice by giving crooked sentences. Keep watch against this, you princes, and make straight your judgements, you who take bribes. Put crooked judgements altogether out of your mind."

Aristophanes, Wasps

[Here is our parasite's account of what it was like to be a judge in Athens prior to the city's adult male massacre and enslavement of the women and children. Notice how people were dipping their hands into the public purse.]

"Lovecleon: When I get up and go to the courthouse, there are men waiting for me, every one of them a big stooge. [a stooge is a performer, or a person who serves merely to support or assist others.]

As I go in, one of them, with a hand that has picked the public purse gives me a caress [bribe? sexual offer?]. They grovel and whine, pouring out tales of their distress, "please pity me, sir". Perhaps you, too, once dipped your hand in the public till when you were in charge, or when you were organizing the

army supplies. This from someone who wouldn't have known I existed had I not once got him off with a mere warning.

Hatecleon: Ah solicitous people, I will make a note of that.

Lovecleon: So after being solicited and my anger appeased, I enter the court and do nothing, of course, about any pledge I had proposed, but simply listen to every sort of excuse. Is there a single tale of woe that I haven't heard in court? Some whine about how poor they are, and how they go on and on about their lot in life, until it almost seems as desperate as mine. Others spin tales or tell funny stories from Asop. Others try to make me laugh, to soak up my anger.

If any of this fails to move us, he hauls in his kids and I have to listen and look kind while they whimper and grovel in chorus, and their father, quivering as if I were a god, begs me, for their good, not to probe too hard into his livelihood. ... If I enjoy a bit of pork, I should be touched by his crying daughter. So we muzzle a little of our wrath. Isn't that the height of power and mockery of wealth?

Hatecleon: "Mockery of wealth" — let me make a note of that as well. Now kindly tell us what you gain by this supposed hold on Greece.

Lovecleon: Well for a start, when boys are paraded for registration, we get a good look at their dicks. And if Ogrus stands on the docks he won't get off till he gives us a list of the facts from Niobe, his most famous part. [Niobe had 12 children]

...

And if a father on his deathbed bequeaths his millionaire-heiress daughter to someone we simply overturn his will and testament, the same as we do with those pretty little clasps and solemn seals. So we award that girl to someone we think will make it worth our while. And all this is done without any accounting to anyone: A feat unique in all officialdom.

Hatecleon: That last remark, out of all you've said, is the only thing that I applaud. Liberating the heiress' fortune is very bad."

Aristophanes c. 450-385BC, Acharians, I 675

[Apparently in Athens, Arab lawyers, or outie lawyers with expensive habits were fleecing the older generation in court.] "We old men think the City does us wrong. Time after time, we've toiled long and hard in naval battles, that ought to earn us pensions in our old age as fair return. But what do you do? You let the younger men haul us into court on fearful charges. Then these young orators [lawyers] mock us left and right, knowing our vocal powers are quite weak.

Mumbling, dim-eyed, we stand there, and can trace only the faintest outline of the case. The youth who schemed to get himself the case slings hard round words at us without relief, then he questions us with traps all set to spring. He tears us to pieces, leaving us yammering. So off we go convicted, and we sob and weep, and tell our friends: 'That last bit of money, I saved to buy a coffin — it must go thanks to this trial, to pay the fine I owe!

It is a scandal and shame to dishonor and defame these snowy-headed men as they stand beside the water-clock in court. [Note how the Athenians sensibly limited the time people could talk.] His sweat flowed down his brow when he fought for his people at Marathon.

For at Marathon [WW2 — The big one] we were proven courageous men as we hotly pursued our fleeing foes. [The Arab invasion fleet retreated and the Greeks massacred them in retreat just like Stormin Norman Black-head did with the retreating Iraqis in operation Desert Storm.] Now it is us that get pursued by these wicked and lewd men — or

prosecuted, the word is.

Then, when the talking is done, there is no need to ask who has won. It will always be guilty, every time."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #90

"From this passion for glory that the French nation has in general, there has developed in the minds of individuals, something called the 'point of honor'. Properly speaking, it characterizes every profession, but it is more noticeable among military people, where it is found in the highest degree. It will be difficult for you to appreciate what it consists of, because we really have no concept like it [in our culture. In other words, the Arabs have no sense of personal honor at all.]

The French, especially the nobles of the past, observed hardly any laws except those of this code of honor, which governed the conduct of their entire life. And its rules were so strict, that men could not even to neglect the most trivial of conditions.

They had effectively only one method of settling disputes and problems, by means of dueling [thus eliminating many infidels]. But the trouble was that the decision involved other parties besides those immediately concerned. If a man knew one of the parties, however slightly he could be forced into the quarrel, and had to suffer the consequences personally, as if he himself had cause for anger [This made it possible to use men's acquaintances to get them into a duel, a sword-fight, where they could be whacked.] He invariably felt honored by being chosen, and by receiving such a flattering sign of favor. And a man who would have been reluctant to give someone else five dollars in order to save him from the gallows, him and his whole family as well, would make no bones about going to risk his life for him a thousand times over. [What a useful tool for eliminating troublesome members of the flock.]

This method of deciding was not very well thought of, since from the fact that a man was stronger or more adroit [or had a shorter sword] than another, it did not follow that his arguments were any better. Consequently, kings prohibited it on pain of severe penalties, but in vain. Honor which always insists on being obeyed, becomes mutinous and refuses to accept any law.

The French, therefore, are [exist] in a state of violent tension. For these same laws of honor oblige a man to avenge himself when he has been insulted. But on the other hand, the judge will condemn him to the severest punishment when he takes his revenge. If he follows the laws of honor he dies on the scaffold, and if he follows those of justice, he is banished for ever from the society of men. He cannot avoid the cruel dilemma of either dying, or being unworthy to live [thanks to our Arab mecca-nations]."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #129

[Here is an some Arab strategy about undermining law making power]

"Most legislators have been men of limited abilities who have become leaders by chance: [Men] who take scarcely anything into account except their own whims and prejudices. They don't even seem to be aware of the grandeur and dignity of their task. [Instead] They pass the time making puerile [childish, silly, trivial] regulations, which certainly have satisfied those without much intelligence, but have discredited them among men of sense. [Propaganda from Arabs Inc. about becoming a legislator.]

They bury themselves in useless detail and descend into particular cases [tactic]. This indicates a lack of vision,

which means seeing things partially and never taking a comprehensive view. [tactic] And some of them have been inclined to avoid using the common language but instead another one [tactic: put foreign terms in the laws] which is absurd for someone making laws. How can they be observed if they are not know? [Translation: How can the laws be obeyed if they are not understood? Answer: It is just like with our cryptic religions. If they can't be understood, this gives the under-my-thumb priest/judge more range in their selective enforcement.]

"They have often needlessly abolished the laws they found in force — throwing their nation into the confusion that accompanies change. [tactic] Certainly, on rare occasions... it is sometimes necessary to change certain laws. But this situation is uncommon, and when it does occur they should be amended only in fear and trembling. [tactic] There should be so much seriousness about it, and so many precautions should be taken, that the people should naturally conclude that laws are deeply sacred, since so many formalities are required in order to repeal them." [This is Arab propaganda and the opposite is actually true. If the host society gives itself permission, it can change anything in 24 hours. Thus in a day it can undo what the Brotherly struggle took decades and perhaps centuries to accomplish. Here is why the parasite is the number one proponent of slow group decisions. This is because the longer we wait the weaker we get and the stronger it gets.]

Legislators have often made their laws too ingenious, applying logical notions rather than natural fairness. [So "natural fairness" was a good excuse for illogical laws.] Afterwards, these laws turned out to be too harsh. [tactic] Then in fairness, it is thought right to ignore them. [tactic] But such a remedy does further harm, because whatever the laws may be, they must always be obeyed. [tactic] This because they [the laws] should be regarded as the public conscience, and the individual's conscience should always be in conformity here."

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1715, #80

[Among the norther Europeans, it doesn't really make that much difference how much you punish people, because there is general abundance. However among the Arabs it makes a great difference because there is general scarcity. This is like comparing Apples and oranges — These two cultures that are not comparable.

Regardless, Arabs inc. definitely wants the outside world to have super-low punishments for stealing. This is because their new immigrants need to steel more, and having low punishments makes them more fearless and more productive for the cause of their people. Here the parasite gives a justification for low penalties. Northern Europe really should take notice.]

"During my stay in Europe, I have seen many sorts of government. ... I have often tried to decide which [form of] government is most reasonable. I have come to think that the most perfect is the one which attains its purpose with the least trouble. So the one which controls men in the manner best adapted to their inclinations and desires is the most perfect.

If a nation is as obedient under a mild government as when the government is strict, the first alternative is preferable, because it is more in conformity with reason, and because harshness is an extraneous factor. You may be certain that however cruel the penalties are in a state, they do not make people more obedient to the law. In countries where punishments are moderate, they are as much feared as where they are despotic and terrible.

Whether the government acts with moderation or with cruelty, there are always different degrees of punishment; major or minor penalties are applied to major or minor crimes [respectively]. The imagination adjusts itself automatically to the customs of the country that one is in. A week's imprisonment, or a small fine, impress the mind of the European who has been brought up in a humane country as greatly as the loss of an arm would intimidate an Asian [from the Mideast]. Each of them attaches a certain degree of fear to a certain degree of punishment, but interprets it in his own way. Thus despair at incurring disgrace will overwhelm a Frenchman sentenced to a penalty that would not make a Turk lose a quarter of an hour's sleep.

[Mogul = The Muslim dynasty of India that the British superseded starting in 1765] Furthermore, I do not see that public order, justice, and equity are better preserved in Turkey, or Persia, or under the Moguls, than in the republics of Holland, Venice, or even England. I do not see that fewer crimes are committed there, or that men are more law-abiding because they are intimidated by the magnitude of the penalties."

[It is also worth noting that prison time for drug trafficking normally exceeds prison time for sneaky (as opposed to confrontational or violent) theft. The Arabs push down on theft penalties for reasons explained. They push up on drug trafficking penalties because this is normally applied to their competitors.]

Aelius Aristides, c. 150 AD, To Rome, 36

"Just as cases are appealed from a district court to a [provincial court] jury, imperial officials have to answer to an appellate tribunal where they are no safer from an adverse verdict than the appellants... Is this not better than any democracy? Under democracy, once a man's case is decided in his town, he cannot take it elsewhere or to other judges... Under the Roman Empire, neither the plaintiff nor the defendant need submit to an unjust decision. Another higher judge always remains from whom justice is never hidden. At the bar [in the eyes of the judges] there is profound and impressive equity between rich and poor, big and small, great and obscure, noble and commoner."

[Which type of court system do we have? Do we have a democratic court system, or a Roman style one?]

Gaius, Institutes, 1

"The laws of the Roman people consist of statutes, plebiscites, decrees of the senate, imperial constitutions, edicts of those possessing the right to issue them, and responses of the learned... An Imperial constitution is what the emperor by decree, edict, or letter ordains. It has never been doubted that this has the force of statute, seeing that the emperor himself receives his imperium through a statute. The right of issuing edicts is also possessed by magistrates of the Roman people. Very extensive law is contained in the edicts of the two praetors, the urban and the peregrine, whose jurisdiction is possessed in the provinces by the provincial governors. Also in the edicts of the curule aediles, whose jurisdiction is possessed in the provinces of the Roman people by quaestors; no quaestors are sent to the provinces of Caesar and consequently the aedilician edict is not published there. The responses of the learned are the decisions and opinions of those who are authorized to lay down the law. If the decisions of all them agree, what they so hold has the force of statute, by if they disagree, the judge is at liberty to follow whichever decision he pleases. This is declared by a rescript of the

deified Hadrian."

Procopius, Secret History, c.565 AD, 13.32

"The officials known as secretis... [L. secretis = a confidential clerk, a word that roughly marks the point where secretary diverged from secret and scribe.]

... The officials known as secretis were not allowed the privilege of writing the Emperor's secret dispatches—the task for which they had originally been appointed—but he wrote almost everything himself. [In section 8.10 Justinian had "no more sense than a donkey, ready to follow anyone who pulls the reins, waving its ears all the time." The emperor's Arabs administration wrote everything. Also, here we get a glimpse at how few people are involved in the Arab parasitism of a national government. for instance, whenever it was necessary to appoint ...judges/justices, he [or his administration] would lay out the course they must follow in giving judgement. For he would not permit anybody in the Roman Empire to decide any dispute in accordance with [his own] independent judgement, but demanded that everyone go his way. [Thus the Arab administration of the emperor could decide to set anyone free. Thus the Arabs acquired the power to plunder at will and stand above punishment. This is incidentally why the Arabs covet judicial power so much, because it gives them the ability to get away with murder, as well as attack our businesses when they compete with their businesses.]

With insane arrogance, he himself judged what verdicts were to be given. He would accept hearsay evidence from only one of the litigants. And without proper investigation he would promptly cancel decisions already given. He was not swayed by any law or principal of justice, but succumbed to undisguised greed. For the Emperor accepted bribes without a blush, since his insatiate greed had robbed him of all sense of shame." [Clearly Justinian's Arab administration was fiddling with the legal system to the detriment of Byzantine Rome. It would appear that the troubles affecting America's legal system have the same source, and the same outcome is being attempted.]

Procopius, Secret History, c.565 AD, 14.10

"The Emperor and his consort [Brotherly puppet-master] for the most part made a show of taking sides in the questions at issue, but victory went to the side upon which they had already agreed. If a man had broken the law and felt that victory was not securely his, he had only to fling more gold to this Emperor in order to obtain the passage of a law going clean contrary to all existing statutes. Then if somebody else should call for the first law, which had now been repealed, His Majesty was perfectly prepared to re-enact it and substitute it for the new one. There was nothing that remained permanently in force, but the scales of justice wandered at random all over the place, whichever way the greatest mass of gold weighing them down succeeded in pulling them. The home of justice was the free-market, though it had once been the Palace, and there sales-rooms flaunted themselves in which not only the administration of justice but the making of laws too was sold to the highest bidder." [America's congress suffers from a well-disguised and less progressed version of the same disease. The outcome, unless treated will eventually be fatal.]

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 22.6

"Egyptians [Arabs] are a contentious race that takes delight in the complexities of litigation, and are particularly eager to demand excessive compensation for any payment that they have been obligated to make, so as either to escape their debt

altogether or at any rate to have the convenience of postponing its discharge. Another of their tricks is to threaten the rich with prosecution, a sort of extortion, which they will be anxious to avoid." [This is a tip for future generations of Arabs, but it is also a pretty good description of how the Arabs screwed up the Roman court system before Rome's collapse. Also, here we see clearly that these are written by green haremi and not their arch enemies the rich yellow Jews.]

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 22.9

[Emperor Julian] "appeared to find recreation in judicial matters... He was admirably patient in weighing evidence, giving every man what was due, and reaching a just decision. This was true whether it was a question of a moderate punishment on the guilty, or protecting the innocent from inroads upon their property. Although in trials he sometimes showed a lack of tact, asking at inappropriate times what religion each of the parties professed. Nevertheless, one cannot point to any of his judgements which flew in the face of the evidence, nor could he ever be accused of having deviated from the path of strict equity because of a man's religion, or for any other reason..."

The film Primal Fear

Intentional or not, this film makes lawyers look not only unnecessary, but something detrimental to justice.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.3

"when it came to laws which, in the remotest degree, could be used or manipulated to swell profits or buttress property, Astor [Gr. Aster = star. This is about John Jacob Aster an uber-rich Arab front man] and his class were untiring and vociferous [vocal] in demanding their strict enforcement. Successfully ignoring or circumventing laws objectionable to them, they, at the same time, insisted upon the passage and exact construction and severe enforcement of laws which were adjusted to their interests. Law breakers, on the one hand, they were law makers on the other. They caused to be put into statutes, and intensified by judicial precedent, the most rigorous laws in favor of property rights. They virtually had the extraordinary power of choosing what laws they should observe and what they should not. This choice was invariably at the expense of the working class.

Law, that much-sanctified product, was really law only when applied to the property-less. It confronted the poor at every step, was executed with summary promptitude [speed] and filled the prisons with them. Poverty had no choice in saying what laws it should obey and who it should not. It [the poor], perforce [necessarily], had to obey [the Arab laws] or go to prison. Either one or the other, for the laws were expressly drafted to bear heavily upon it [the poor]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"Almost the entire Senate was occupied for days with advocating this or that side as if they were paid attorneys pleading for the interests of either Collins or Vanderbilt."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.7

"The great capitalists both dared and did. If specific statutes were against them, the impelling [driving] forces of economic development and the power of might were wholly on their side. At first, the great capitalists made no attempt to have these

[anti-monopoly, or anti-trust] laws altered or repealed. They adopted a slyer and more circuitous mode of warfare. They simply evaded them. As fast as one trust was dissolved by court decision, it nominally [ostensibly] complied, as did, for instance, the Standard Oil Trust and the Sugar Trust, and then furtively cause itself to be reborn into a new combination so cunningly sheltered within the technicalities of the law that it was fairly safe from judicial overthrow.

But the great [Arab fronting] capitalists were too wise to stake their existence upon the thin refuge of technicalities. With their huge funds they now systematically struck out to control the machinery of the two main political parties. They used the ponderous [considerable] weight of their influence to secure the appointment of men favorable to them as Attorneys General of the Unites States, and of the States, and they carried on a definite plan of bringing about the appointment or election of judges upon whose decision they could depend. The laws passed by the middle class remained ornamental encumbrances on the statute books. The great capitalists, although harassed continually by futile attacks, triumphantly swept forward, gradually in their consecutive progress strangling the middle class beyond resurrection."

18—LEADERS AND THEIR REWARDS

Pausanias, c. 150AD, Guide to Greece, 1.8.3

"no man who throws himself into politics, relying on the good faith of the people, ever has a happy death." [Unless you want to die an unhappy death, you better stay out of politics you dumb Infidel sheep.]

Thomas More, 1516, Utopia (eu-tropia)

[Here is some of the parasite's propaganda advising people to stay out of politics.]

"At Court ... You have to give open support to deplorable policies, and subscribe to utterly monstrous resolutions. If you don't show enough enthusiasm for a bad law, you'll be taken for a spy or even a traitor. Besides, what chance have you got of doing any good, when you're working with colleagues like that? You'll never reform them -- they're far more likely to corrupt you, however admirable a character you are. By associating with them you'll either lose your own integrity, or else have it used to conceal their folly and wickedness. So much for the practical results of your indirect method!

There is a delightful image in Plato, which explains why a sensible person is right to steer clear of politics..."

Euripides, Ion, 620

"Men speak highly of being king, but these words are undeserved. It looks good on the surface, but it is bitter inside. Who can be happy, and who can be fortunate, if he must drag out the years of his life in an eternity of dread, and sidelong glances? I would prefer to live happy as a common citizen than be a ruler, a man who must seek bad men for friends and hate good men for fear of being assassinated. Perhaps you will say that gold overweighs these inconveniences, that it is nice to be rich. But I have no desire to be rich, if I am agonized by every noise I hear. May mine be a moderate social class, free from worry. ... I reckon I am better off here than there. Let me live here. The pleasure is the same whether one rejoices in greatness or is content with little."

Seneca, On the Shortness of life

[4] "You will find that men of great power and positions of eminence, make remarks that indicate how much they long for leisure time — How they praise it, preferring it to all their [many] blessings and advantages. They sometimes crave to step down from the pinnacle they have achieved, providing that this can be done safely and without harm. For [frequently enough] greatness comes crashing down of its own weight, even when no external force attacks or shakes it.

[For example, take] the deified Augustus [d. 14 AD], whom the gods gave more blessings than any other man. He constantly prayed for time to rest and freedom from his affairs of state. [In fact,] his conversations repeatedly came back to this topic — his hope for [more] leisure. The thought that he would one day live for himself was the sweet, if perhaps unrealistic, solace [comfort] that he relied upon to cheer his labors along. In a letter to the Roman senate, he promised that his retirement would not be without dignity or inconsistent with his former renown. I found these words: "But actions are more impressive than promises. But my anticipation of that period so earnestly prayed for has led me to sample some of its delight by the pleasure of words, since the happy reality is still slow in coming." In his eyes, free time was so precious a thing, that he wished for it in thought because he could not enjoy it in reality. This man who saw how the entire world hung upon him alone — a man who determined to fortunes of men and nations — This man reflected with the utmost joy on the day that he would lay his greatness aside. For he had learned how much secret anxiety and sweating [nervousness] was veiled by his brilliant and internationally known [political] felicity". [effectiveness and good fortune]

Plato, Apology

[Here the great Plato Socrates says 'Stay out of government'] "A sort of voice comes to me and always dissuades me from doing what I was thinking of doing. It never urges me on. It is this that kept me from entering politics. And this was a very good thing in my opinion. For you see gentlemen, you can be quite sure, that if I had tried to enter politics long ago, I would also long ago have lost my life without doing any good for either mankind or myself. Please do be offended if I tell you the truth. No man on earth who conscientiously opposes either you or any other organized democracy, and keeps a great number of bad things from happening in his town, can possibly escape with his life. The true champion of justice, if he intends to survive even for a short time; must necessarily confine himself to private life and leave politics alone."

Plato, Republic, 362a

[Here the great Plato Socrates says 'You will do better if you look like a good person but are actually evil'] "the just man will be chained and whipped/scourged, he will get the branding-iron to his eyes, he will be pulled-apart on the rack, and finally after every extremity has suffered, he will be crucified, and then he will learn his lesson. So we should all aspire to seem just, rather than to be just....

To start, his thoughts are just, and he gets a reputation for justice. He can marry a wife from any family he wants, give his children to whoever he wants. And he can trade and partner-up with whoever he wants. And he will profit from all these dealings and partnerships because he has no squeamishness about being unjust. Thus in all matters public and private, he tends to get the better of everyone else, gaining at their expense, benefitting his friends, and harming his enemies.

And he sacrifices and makes votive [elective] offerings [of Arab sacramental goods] to the gods on a suitably grand scale. And he can [afford to] honor the gods and any man he wants to honor in far better style than the just man. So he can reasonably expect the favor of the gods to fall to him rather than to the just man. Thus, Socrates, both men and the gods are said to unite in making the life of the unjust man better than the life of the just one.

[Here the great Plato-Socrates argues Arab propaganda. It says that we would be better off if we tried to look good but were secretly evil and unjust — so long as we used our ill-gotten gains to buy lots of Arab sacraments so as to buy off the gods. Here the nature of Plato's Republic as a work of Arab political propaganda is particularly obvious. Here we see clearly how philo•sophy = leaf•wisdom = cover•wisdom = fool's wisdom]

Plato, Republic, 364a

Everyone says that virtue and justice are honorable, but much trouble and hard work. [they also say] That the pleasures of vice and injustice are easy to attain, but limited by law and disgracefulness. They also say that injustice pays better than justice for the most part. And people are also quite ready to call wicked men as happy, honoring them in both public and private when they are rich, or in other ways powerful. [and on the other hand] they despise and overlook those who may be poor and weak, even though acknowledge them to be better than the others. They also say strange things about virtue, for they say that the gods apportion disaster and misery to many good men, and happiness to the wicked. [For example Plutos, the Greek god of wealth, who was blind. See the Aristophanes play herein. Also note that the Arabs were telling the Greeks that justice would eventually be served on their wicked frontmen in years, decades or sometimes in later generations.]

Plato, Republic, 365a - 366

"My dear Socrates, how will young men be affected by all this talk about virtue and vice and the esteem that men and the gods have for them? I mean, those who are smart, and like bees on the wing, and able to fly between flowers/ideas, and able to draw conclusions/inferences from what they hear [hear, not read]. I mean those are able to infer the character and the path that a man should have to lead the best life. Such a young man would probably ask himself the question Pindar asks:

...

Is it by virtue/justice or vice/dishonesty that I will scale a loftier tower, a personal citadel for my entire life?

...

Men say there is no profit in virtue if you are not also thought to be virtuous. Being this way is in clearly both difficult [due to the virtuous path] and a liability [because everyone thinks you are vicious]. On the other hand, if you are vicious, but have procured for yourself a reputation for virtue, you have the promise of a heavenly life.

Here is why wise men say that appearance rules over truth and is the 'master of reality' and lord of happiness. Here is why you must devote yourself without reserve to appearance and building an image of virtue as the facade and entry of your house. Behind this you can be the crafty fox bent on gain that Archilochus greatest of sages recommends.

Here I imagine someone saying that it is hard to hide wickedness. To which I answer, few great things are easy. All the same, if we want to be happy, we should probably follow the path our argument points to. So with the aim of concealment, we will establish secret brotherhoods and

political clubs. And we will have professors of rhetoric [lawyers/ lobbyists] who teach the art of persuading courts and legislatures and so. This partly by persuasion, and partly by force. Thus we will overreach and make unlawful gains with impunity.

Still, I hear a voice saying that neither secrecy nor force will work with the gods. But what if there are no gods? Or what if they don't care about what men do? Why in either case should we care about being seen by them? And even if there are gods, and they do watch us, we know of them only from tradition and the ancient poets. And these are the very people who say that they may be influenced and turned by prayers and sacrifices.

Here we should be consistent and believe both or neither. If the poets speak the truth, then we should then be unjust/vicious and make sacrificial offerings [to the gods] from the fruits of our injustice/vice. [So steal from the people as you would like, and "the gods" the Arabs gods will protect you because you feed the desperate land of no resources.]

Procopius, c.565 AD, Secret History, 10.3

"When a man cares nothing for the infamy of his actions [because he is using an escape goat] and does not hesitate for fear of being known as a revolting character, no path of lawlessness is closed to him, but armed with the shamelessness visible at every moment in his face, he advances cheerfully and without any misgivings to the most loathsome deeds."

Make Senate service easy with no downside

Make Senate service best and highest

The parasite obviously wants us to stay out of government and leave our government to its moles, its Alexander Hamilton types, and its James Madison types. Once again, we would be wise to use our parasite as a compass — but ALIDAD STYLE, 180° backwards, like an Arab compass.

- 1) We must make our elections as simple as possible.
- 2) We must make it cost nothing to run for office.
- 3) We must maximize the non-monetary joys of holding office
- 4) We must minimize the downsides of holding office.

Which democracy would you rather work in?

- A) The one that "religiously" prohibits its Senators from having any sexual affairs or saying anything dumb ever. or
- B) The one where its Senators have the rights of normal employees — i.e. what they do on their own time is none of the employer's business.

No wonder we can't find good people to work in politics.

Which government is more money corrupt?

- A) The one where the leaders are encouraged to have sex and children for many years, or
- B) The one where a little extra-marital sexting becomes a media circus and a matter of national disgrace.

Pay your Senators with status and br-gens

- 1) This is much cheaper than paying them with money.
- 2) It draws leaders that are not so much motivated by getting rich.
- 3) It increases competition for our parasite's moles.
- 4) It helps the gene pool.
- 5) It is a more powerful motivation than money
- 6) It shuts down the harems.

You are needed in government

In the Brotherly propaganda gazettes above, it is pretty obvious that our parasite wants our best people to steer clear of politics. It is also pretty obvious that we must do the opposite. If you are smart, you are not needed in finance, law, architecture, art, music, fashion, or business: You are needed in government. You are needed in the leadership, making the big decisions for our society.

And once you have served society in this way, you will always be called, "Senator Sirname". For your entire life, you will be esteemed and trusted for what you say. It will be like how people regard judges and university professors today, only we will respect them more because they were all elected, instead of being appointees/hires like our judges and professors today.

So people, let's all change our mind about our political leaders. Serving government under a broad democracy is one of the greatest things anyone can do. Only discoverers, inventors, creators, and gifted presenters should be better regarded.

Euripides, Hecabe, c. 420 BC, 305-330

"Most city-states suffer from this very thing: That men who are brave and patriotic reap no more reward than the spongers. ... Isn't it shameful? Just suppose that we had to mobilize again and fight our enemies: Men would then ask themselves, 'Shall I join up and fight, or stay safe here at home, seeing how those who die in battle receive no special honor?'

As far as I am concerned, while I am still alive, I am satisfied with very little, enough for daily needs; but when I am dead, I want my tomb to be a thing that men gaze at reverently. That is a gift which lasts...

And you foreigners: Keep treating your friends as enemies, and dishonoring those who died as heroes — Greece will grow great while you will reap the fruits of your ingratitude."

Money

Make democratic service into the highest occupation

What a waste of public resources that we don't do this and instead have to pay our leaders for their service.

Isocrates, d. 338BC, Panegyricus, 1

[Before you read this, consider that overlarge salaries of professional athletes today. Basically the parasite like it when our dumb athletes, musicians and actors are acting as our rock stars. This way our smartest men tend to have a harder time leaving lots of children.] "The institution of festivals which include athletic competitions has led me to feel surprise at the large rewards offered for mere physical achievements. This while the unselfish endeavors of men who have set their whole being to work for the benefit of others receives no recognition, though they merit the greater reward. Athletic abilities might be doubled without any benefit to others, while the public spirit of a single individual may bring profit to all who care to participate in it.

There must be no downside for Government service

Today, elections are hugely expensive and time consuming. They also subject the candidate to unpleasantly invasive levels of personal scrutiny. So why would any sensible person pour out a pile of money and run for office? Why even try to serve your narrow democracy? Follow Thomas Moore's advice, "A sensible person is right to steer clear of politics", and leave things up to the false anarchy of the anonymous Barocracy

running the government behind the scenes.

Don't forget the other half of Justice

Justice does not merely consist of punishing those who harm the world: That NEGATIVE JUSTICE is only half of justice, the part of justice that keeps society from falling apart. The justice that pushes us forward is POSITIVE JUSTICE, a way of accurately rewarding those people who do things, or discover things to make the world a better place. This is the part of justice that propels humanity forward. Unless we give honor and status to those who help society, we will be ignoring positive justice, and our human enterprise will tend to stagnate more.

Procopius, the Secret History, 21.6

[Here is the way our parasite likes to run the government service reward system if it can. Note how the parasite is lending the money to buy the offices. Note how all the income is going to pay back the parasite's loans taken out at high interest rates. Note the high, usury (use•ouri) loan rates.] "Everywhere in the Roman Empire Justinian followed this method. He picked out the most degraded specimens of humanity he could lay his hands on and sold them the offices they were to corrupt, charging a very high price; for no one with any decency or any vestige of good sense would ever think of pouring out his own money for the pleasure of robbing inoffensive citizens. After collecting the cash from those with whom he was negotiating, he gave them permission to do anything they like to those under them. This enabled them to ruin all the districts allotted to them, inhabitants and all, and make enough money to keep them in luxury for the rest of their lives. To find money to pay for their cities, they obtained a loan from the bank [fronting for the parasite] at a very high rate of interest, handing over the money to the seller [of this license to steal, the Justinian administration]. Then when they arrived in the cities, from then on they brought every variety of misery upon their subjects, having no other object in life than to make sure that they could satisfy their creditors [the Haremi Brothers]."

Lavish is the opposite of s-lavish

When figurehead leaders live in extreme luxury, it is normally to cover the money leaking out the back door to the Mideast parasite. The multi-MILLION dollar imperial palaces exist to explain the multi-BILLION dollar stealing done by the Haremi. So the Forbidden City of the Chinese emperor existed to hide the immense stealing that the Arab parasite race has always perpetrated upon the people of China — so much stealing that only a city would do as an excuse. And likewise, the palace of Versailles did the same thing with the French king. And recall how Imelda Marcos' vast shoe collection got so much press. It cost nothing in comparison to all the stealing her husband Ferdinand did for the Arabs. Recall the garish mansion of the toppled Ukrainian figurehead Yanukovich. All existed to cover up stealing.

Good leaders live responsibly

When I see leaders acquiring great wealth while in office, I automatically think they are crooks. Don't you? Maybe one of the simplest things we can do in our battle against corruption and parasitism is to simply say that political people are not allowed to increase their wealth during their time in office. Make them file before and after wealth tax statements with the tax house. Make them file this a few years after leaving office. Make lying on these forms a felony. Also check on their family

and close associates.

Don't let expensive goods corrupt your society

If you really want to help the world get better, stop letting people get away with using expensive show off products to rise in status. It should be the duty of all smart and responsible people to jam this process by openly mocking those who wear designer clothing, "precious" jewelry, expensive wedding sacraments, expensive vehicles, and large houses.

Once we institute a non-corrupt democracy, we should do what we can to help make public service the best way for people to acquire status. Once that happens, please everyone try to disdain and shun all the money-bought status-symbols you can identify. Do this because these are actually a corruption of our real status award system. Be sure to include gold, gemstones, fancy wristwatches, expensive wedding sacraments, perfume, expensive handbags, designer clothing, overpriced cars, and monster homes with seldom-used rooms.

Wealth is only an intermediary goal

Our parasite makes so much media promoting money, particularly stolen money, as the ultimate goal in life. Society would gain much by stigmatizing this sort of media, and increasing the opposite idea in the media, the very believable idea that wealth is only at best, an intermediary step towards happiness.

Mary Kay Ash

"There are two things people want more than sex and money ...recognition and praise"

Ronald Reagan

"The best minds are not in government.
If they were, business would steal them away."

We don't get better government leaders by paying more

Please do not listen to our parasite's propaganda about people being mostly motivated by personal greed. We all know that this isn't true. We all know that there are millions of good people who chose their occupation because they want to help others, or give something back. In today's world of abundance, it is not at all unreasonable to expect that we can find countless people who will dedicate themselves to serving the public in an honest way. Paying large sums of money to our elected officials (and corporate leaders too) is not only wasteful and expensive, but it is counter-productive in that it draws the wrong sort of person into public service.

Stipends, not wages for elected officials

Pay Sub-Senators the median national wage once they are confirmed. Pay them this amount so they will all know what it is to live on this much money.

Pay Main-Senators around 1.5 times the median national wage. Pay Over-Senators twice the median wage. Also, all Senators should be able to borrow money from the state equal to their pay at the prevailing interest rate for government debt, and payable over 7 years. This must be paid back within 7 years or the Senator's Senate status shall be suspended pending repayment.

A part time Sub-Senate

Instead of given a fixed amount of money to each Sub-Senator. Let's only pay the Sub-Senators that get confirmed. This way everyone in the Sub-Senate will be fighting to distinguish themselves so they can earn confirmation in the top half.

All Senators must take their Senate pay

It is required by law. Everyone must take this money, and they must not give it away, or make a donation to charity. It is important that the Senate be paying a fair amount to diminish the value of bribery.

It is Corrupt when societies sell status

It is a corrupt society that makes status something to be purchased by those who can afford it. In this sort of a world, people focus on making money to buy status and engage in a wasteful consumption arms race. Instead, let's have an alternative way for people to achieve status, one based on public service and democracy.

Selling status for money can encourage crime

Let's all try to have a world where criminal money isn't at all useful for buying either status or sexual pull. If you are not sure where his money comes from, don't give him any status or romance.

Ubiqs

An offer few will refuse

The government wants to buy your book/media for a fair price and confer upon you lifelong status as an Ubiq. Who says no to this? And because so many people will honor the findings of their meritocracy, this purely honorary title is coveted and its recipients very highly regarded.

Inventors only get 10% today

Today it is not at all unusual for an inventor to give 80% of an invention away to the people bringing about its commercialization. And then after this, in some parts of the US we see around 40-50% being given away to the tax man. Thus we can say that it is normal today for inventors give away 90% of the profit the invention generates. Some give away more, some less, but the inventor generally gets around 10% of the invention's profit — unless he commercializes the invention himself.

Inventor windfalls and the law of diminishing returns

Which nation is more inventive:

- A) The nation with 5000 awards of \$1,000,000
- B) The nation with 50 awards of \$100,000,000

Clearly nation A will have more development teams and evolve faster than nation B.

Inventor windfalls are a great opportunity for parasitism

This is part of the reason why the parasite always makes sure to run the inventor patent office. Another reason is that the parasite benefits from suppressing change and inventions are one of the biggest sources of change.

What percentage of great inventions see two inventors proposing the same thing at roughly the same time. Make a graph over time. I bet for the best inventions, we see a peculiar spike at the 1-14 day range. What percentage of people proposing great inventions suffer a health problem, or financial problem within 1 year of submittal?

Tax huge inventions to subsidize the tiny ones

There is no economic reason for letting inventors make billions on an invention — and this does aid parasitism as just discussed.

Instead what we will do is have high income taxes on

the greatest "billion dollar" inventions — for the increment between \$50 million and \$500 million offers little motivation for any individual. Then we will use all this tax money (and some more money) to fund many thousands of ubiquitization payments for our smaller and more incremental inventors. This way we will be like nation A above, and not like nation B.

A low Ubiq threshold

Let's err slightly on the side of inclusiveness with our awards of Ubiq status. Let's have a great many of these.

non money compensation

Society can motivate with things beyond money

Society can skip the money and the cars named Fer·ouri, and lamb·br·gyno. It can directly award status instead — eliminating massive waste by doing so.

The parasite always struggles to make gold valuable

The parasite needs a store of value more than the host. The host only needs money as a vehicle.

The shift to gudos is a fundamental part of the recursion process.

It reduces materialism

Once humankind starts using status in this way:

- 1) The overall level of greed will be reduced.
- 2) People will stop being so materialistic. The big houses will stop mattering and the consumerism will mostly fade away among the public. — even if we don't use the media to help it go away.
- 3) Our leaders will no longer have much of an excuse for excessive greed.

Shift the focus of humanity

Mankind now has a Krell machine (Forbidden Planet film) for changing any idea into reality — also called a global economy. Now we no longer need to reward the makers so much. Far more important now are the people who come up with the dreams for the machine to turn into reality.

Give these non-money status, the higher status, and leave the people spending money on public luxury tokens another type of status, a somewhat lower status. Shift the focus — make everyone join the arms race to serve the good of all mankind.

Reward leaders with things money can't buy

It would be so nice if we had a world where the greatest game and greatest achievement in life involved a competition to serve society as either Senator or Ubiq. To bring this new world into reality, we must make serving the public good as rewarding as possible. However, this said, government should only offer an ordinary pay level for reasons already explained.

Instead, we want a society that attempts to minimize the role of money in determining status. We want a society where contribution to the group cause is the big game, and money without public service is vulgar.

Money is an intermediary goal

Let's try to skip right over money and pay as a motivator for public service. As much as possible, let's give our leaders things that money can't buy, or things money can't buy effectively. Let's pay our government managers with our respect and our admiration as much as possible.

Here we will harness one of human society's most powerful forces — the will of people to distinguish themselves. We will use the Senate to award status for group service. Effectively we will start conferring status based on how much people have helped society for the better — And this will be measured by our broad democracy. It is meritocracy, pure and simple.

Juice up the senators up

Ladies, it is all in your power. You want to push the accelerator pedal down for the progress of mankind, give our Senators and Ubigs the goodies. Give them the love of your lines (what a blurd loins is) and the love of your heart (our•te) and life (ali•eff). Give them this and watch the whole human enterprise go vertical.

Ladies, if you can't tell who to have a child with, do the right thing and give your lines to the Senate.

To the most "gifted" young people

While you are most desirable, I ask you to do your duty in making Senate and Ubiqu service as desirable as possible. Please help me to fire the wills of people towards helping all mankind. Treat these Senators and Ubigs as if they were all rockstars or celebrities. And treat all the current film, music and athletic stars as if they were all awful.

Lifelong status is similar to teacher tenure

It is the way of the parasite and its evil and status should not be lifelong. Thus we should concentrate the benefits of being a Senator on say the first few years or decade after being confirmed a senator. This will hopefully make men more eager to return to Senate service. Ladies, help me with this. Please concentrate on men who remain productive. Give them a couple years of enjoyment if they do nothing. Give them a few years if they do something, and give to them while they are working on something.

Always a Senator

Once you have been confirmed a Senator, you will always qualify as a Senate sperm/ova donor. You will also always be suitable for government management unless disqualified for a crime.

My peace corps costs nothing

The big game will now be about getting elected to the Senate somewhere on earth. Thus the most backward places in the world will have something of incredible value to offer to those who come to them in the new Peace Corps. They will be able to award Senate status and progeny to those that come and help them.

straight status

Please devalue educational credentials

Titles of status are a tremendously good thing for society. But please stop using all educational titles (MA., Ph.D., JD, M.D.) These are conferred by non-democratic institutions that are easily and frequently corrupted, especially at the top.

In fact, what a great invention educational degrees are for our parasite. It gets us to distinguish ourselves in mock intellectual battle, mostly before we can do so in real battle, where we might actually discover or invent something. This way, it is easier for our parasite to spot and quietly eliminate our brightest stars before everyone notices them.

Why does our society esteem these mock battle

ratings so much? Wouldn't it be better to esteem what people actually have done to help society instead? And if someone discovers something important in and academia, by all means reward them by awarding ubiq payments of money and status. But don't leave our society's status outside the democratic process.

Please people, educational degrees are not only non-democratic, but they dilute the value of the only titles people should be using, those who have actually served the group good in our democracy. Basically, the ONLY titles of honor we should use are for:

- 1) Those who have served their posterity by discovering or inventing something.
- 2) Those who have served their democracy.
- 3) Those who have risked their lives in the service of the public good, say in in the military, police, and other emergency services.

Senate titles

All Sub-Senators, Main-Senators and Over-Senators should be addressed with the title 'Senator —' if their name is known, or 'Mister Senator' if their name is not known. Sub-Senators will be abbreviated as SS. Main-Senators as MS. and Over-Senators as OS. Thus 'OS. Smith' is said as 'Over-Senator Smith', or just as 'Senator Smith'.

Now some people may feel modest and not wish to use/display their public service titles or insignia. This, however, is bad for society so it should be discouraged. People who have received titles for public service have an obligation to further the system that rewards people who make a public contribution, at least while out in public. So upon receiving this reward, they have an obligation to encourage others to strive to make the world a better place. Therefore, people should use their government service titles and markings at all times, and it should in general be considered extremely bad taste (but never illegal) to mock them as leaders. It should be the crime of impersonating an officer to pretend to be a Senator or Ubiqu.

With respect to people who create things that are ubiquitized by the public, they will be known as "UBIQ", written as "UQ". Instead of saying 'Mr. Smith', we will say 'Ubiqu Smith'.

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Laurel, n. The laurus, a vegetable dedicated to Apollo, and formerly defoliated to wreath the brows of victors and such poets [poet laureates] as had influence at [the royal] court. (Vide Supra.)"

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Ovation, n. In ancient Rome, a definite, formal pageant in honor of one who had been dis-servicable to the enemies of the nation. A lesser 'triumph'. In modern English the word is improperly used to signify any loose and spontaneous expression popular homage to the hero of the hour and place." [Ovations are what the Brothers start when you have helped their egg out. Ovations "egg" people on]

All must honor Senate honors

Our Senate will democratically confer honors. We would be wise to require that these be displayed publicly — perhaps on the clothing (a pin ring or insignia) and formal communication of all Senators. We don't want our Senators being modest and undermining the value of Senate service. We want them amplifying the value of Senate service, making it more effective.

Mandatory display Senate stigma?

We might also say that those stigmatized by the Senate must display their stigma in certain ways. This will offer society an alternative to sentences of public service or jail time. It should also probably be the social norm for everyone to ask the PENITENTS about why they received their Senate stigmatization. We might also require all penitents to answer all such questions in a 100% truthful way.

Tacitus, d. 120 AD, Germania, 13

"There are grades of rank even within these entourages [gangs of young men], determined by the [gang] leader whom they follow. And there is great rivalry, both among the followers to obtain the highest position in their [gang] leader's assessment and among the [various gang] leaders for the honor of having the biggest and most valiant entourage. Both prestige and power depend on being continually attended by a large following of selected young warriors, which is a distinction in peace and a protection in war. And it is not only in a chief's own nation that the larger number and quality of his retainers brings him glory and renown. Neighboring communities honor them also, courting them with embassies and complimenting them with presents. Very often the mere reputation of such men will virtually decide the outcome of a war."

The parasite doesn't buy graffiti with money

There is so much to learn from the way our parasite organizes its social matrixes. Take for example all the graffiti tags along our energy-saving transit lines and in our energy-saving inner cities. Consider how the boys who spray tags are being paid by our parasite's decentralized "government" to do this. Now they are not being paid in money, but in respect just like with the young Celtic warriors of Germany 2,000 years ago.

Anyway, our new broad democracy would be dumb not to use status as a way to motivate the people. A million points of light, or a million points of graffiti tag darkness: Now we decide which world we want.

Regularly audit status

It is a crime today to impersonate a police officer. It should be an equally severe crime to impersonate a Senator or Ubiquitous.

A status maximum

We certainly don't want to create any monarchs with our award of status. Nor do we want any oligarchs with so much status that a few thousand men can sway our nation. No. Status must never be awarded beyond the 1:50,000 men who serve in the Over-Senate each year. There should be no status higher than this. This will result in about 5,000 people per year with the status maximum, a number that offers little potential for corruption.

Now with respect to Ubiquitous, some people may have their work ubiquitized many times. However, we should never accord them any more official respect than an Over-Senator. To do so is step in the direction of oligarchy and monarchy. To do so is to narrow your society's group mind — something that must always be avoided.

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #89

"The desire for fame and glory is related to the instinct for self-preservation that every creature possesses. We seem to be adding to what we are when we are able to impose ourselves on the memory of others. Thus we acquire a new life, which becomes as precious to us as the one we received from God.

However, just as men are not equally attached to life,

they are also not not equally influenced by glory. It is certainly a noble emotion which is always enshrined in their hearts, but their mentality and upbringing modifies it in countless ways. And these differences found between individuals are even more noticeable between one nation and another. For it can be stated as a basic international truth that, the desire for glory increases in proportion to personal liberty, and diminishes similarly [under Arab-style slavery]. Glory is never coupled with slavery or servitude.

A man of sense said to be me the other day: 'In France, in many respects, there is greater freedom than in Persia [the Mideast], and thus there is a greater love of glory. This fortunate peculiarity makes a Frenchman gladly do things that your Sultan can only get out of his subjects by endless urging and with rewards and punishments. ...

The difference between French troops and your own [Mideast forces] is that the latter consist of slaves, which are cowards by nature. In these, the fear of death can only be overcome by the fear of punishment. This results in a new kind of terror in their souls, one that nearly stupefies them. Whereas ours [our free troops] gladly face the enemy's attack, banishing their fear by a satisfaction [think dueling honor] which is superior to it.

It seems that the sanctuary of honor, reputation, and virtue is to be found in republics, and the lands where men can say, 'my country'. In Rome, Athens, and Sparta, honor alone was the reward for the greatest of services [in war]. A [mere] wreath of oak-leaves or laurel, a statue or public congratulations was an immense reward for winning a battle or capturing a town.

In these cities [ancient republics], a man who accomplished some great feat was sufficiently rewarded by the accomplishment itself. He couldn't meet any of his fellow citizens without feeling the pleasure of having done something [important] for them. He could calculate the extent of his services by [counting] the number of his countrymen. Everybody is capable of doing good to one man, but it is god-like to contribute to the happiness of an entire society.

Now this noble feeling of emulation must surely be completely dead in the hearts of your Persians, since for them official positions and honors depend merely on the monarch's whim."

They fairest way to award status

Perhaps soon, we will feel comfortable that our democracy is the fairest way to decide on who has done the most for the group cause.

Governments should not squander social status

GUDOS = the social status that people naturally give to their leaders. This can be one of human society's most powerful motivating forces. And this gudos is not only mighty, but it costs society practically nothing, and it is endlessly renewable. Why not use it as way to pull good people into government service? Once again, our parasite has us doing things backwards from the way they should be done.

The mountains of gudos

It is sometimes said that money is like fertilizer. If you pile it up in one place all it does is stink. You have to spread fertilizer around for it to do any good.

Today unfortunately, all the world's narrow democracies squander their gudos by heaping it on one man, one lottery winner, odious rex, front-man, schmuck. Then we go out and buy the services of our public employees on the

open market. This is a huge waste, because we could easily stretch our nation's gudos out so it fertilizes over a million people. After this, society will have its choice of the best men and it will only have to pay a stipend, so they can get by while they serve.

FALSE GUDOS = the social status that stupid people give to musicians, actors, athletes, those who drive expensive cars, and those who live in big houses.

CORRUPT GUDOS = the social status that people give non-elected appointees like judges, bureaucrats and professors.

REAL GUDOS = social status awarded by a broad democracy.

Society should not motivate with money

Gold/money has always been such a poor motivator of human energies. After all, it exerts the strongest pull on the most selfish and deprived people. The logical ones, and the ones who are altruistic are not really so motivated by money. Money is the natural motivator of the evil ex•pull of the parasite — and Gudos is the natural motivator of good people from the host part of the world.

Perpetual summit

Some people will certainly be motivate to serve in government by the company they will keep.

The age of money is ending

Now we change the vehicle of our evolutionary system with profound system-defining results. It is like we have been using a bad refrigerant that doesn't compress very much in air conditioners. Now we will simply use a new refrigerant, and all our energy inputs will produce many times greater results.

Another way to see it is that we have been driving our human enterprise in 1st gear. When we go fast, we waste just so much energy revving our car engine at 6,000 rpm. Now humanity shifts into 2nd gear and it will go much faster with a fraction of the energy inputs or wear.

A **FOREMAN** = someone who comes to the fore of their society either through government service or through being ubiquitized.

A **BESTMAN** = someone who comes to the fore of their society either through government service or through being ubiquitized.

OMNI = Ubiq

SIRE = a confirmed Senator or Ubiq. These are allowed but not obligated to sire as many offspring as they can find women to bear up to the sire-age limit. The sire-age limit shall be 500 except when the Senate elects an individual as MEGAGEN.

The perks of being a Senator

They should only get a little more privacy, immunity, protection. Give them the right to privacy, to demand that others leave them alone, as we do with our media celebrities today. Give them immunity from prosecution while in office, and defend them from any claims or attacks that appear in to be politically motivated in any way.

Other than this, the only perk of being a Senator will be a form of status that should remain totally undefined in all official ways. Thus the main perk of being a Senator is individual and 100% voluntary on the part of the people.

women

Ladies: Please push hard in every way you can

It is your choice, and it will always be your choice. But I ask you: Please do not be impractical about romance and companionship in this life. Think of your line, and your life force going forward in the lives of your children. I ask you: Don't be selfish, find the best sire you can find for your children. And make sure that society gives all women enough money to raise a conforming number of children. And make sure society also makes it as easy as reasonably possible for women to raise their children without the financial support of a man.

How do we drive people to give their all for the public good?

Bribing them with money is not the answer. It is both expensive and corrupt. A far better way is to bribe them with sex and babies. This way, we not only reward our leaders, but we also improve our gene-stock in the next generation.

Aristophanes, Wasps

"He's so given to clutching his voting pebble...

If he sees written on a [toilet] door:

'Demos, son of Pyrilampes, is such an attractive boy',

He writes underneath: "So is the ballot box".

[Keeping your votes a secrete prevents this sort of exchange.]

Hands off Senators in active service

Hands off Senators in active service between midnight and 7pm. We don't need the distraction. You can't touch each other, and you can't be in a room alone together if you are unrelated or of the opposite sex — except from 8pm to Midnight. We don't want our Senators getting too distracted. The only except occurs when the new Senator registers someone as a pre-existing partner within one teneth of his election. If that happens then the foregoing does not apply.

The pivotal decision is up to the women

Everything I say here is provisional. It depends on one assumption. That many women will choose to receive natural or artificial sir-age from the Senators and Ubigs of our new democracy. If that doesn't happen much, then the systems I propose may not work.

The great pivotal decision

- 1) On one hand, for most women, the biggest decision(s) in their life is the choice of a sire (and "bread-winner") for their 16-year (minimum) investments.
- 2) On another hand, this is the physical fuel (sex) and mental fuel (children) that can transcend any money motivation for group contributions. If we do this, most of the men in the world will strive with all their hearts to be of public service.
- 3) If we do this, money will not really matter any more to our government people.
- 4) Finally, and most importantly, if we do this, our species will stop degrading genetically as it has been doing under the pair-bonded marriage that all Arab parasite religions support.

There is nothing wrong with the "rockstar" instinct

Many people instinctively gravitate towards leaders and great men. There is nothing wrong with this, so long as it is with one of society's actual leaders, and not one of our fluffy, parasite-chosen musicians, actors or athletes.

The term rockstar is incidentally a reference to the

giant mythical meteorite at the center of the Borg-cube in Mecca. In the old days (before the iron age) the Arabs would sell "space metal" (iron/steel) weapons for a king's ransom. This came from the mythical meteorite at the ancient pilgrimage site of Yatrib (today Mecca). This mythical meteorite (the one in the Borg-cube, the Kaaba, the original black box) is the ROCK in the terms ROCKSTAR as well as ROCK AND ROLL and roll.

We should honor our Senators

We should honor in hosting Senators visiting from the other parts of the world.

Our leadership: Stop punishing "adultery"

One of the greatest strengths of the haremi is that it picks the smartest of its smartest and then give them the ability to have many children by virtue of its harem breeding strategy. Now in the houses of its host societies, polygamy has always been emphatically opposed by our parasite. In fact, harems (our-em's in Brolingo) are forbidden in our societies by law. Had our parasite not vehemently and even violently opposed all harem-like breeding behavior among our leaders, the results would quickly have been disastrous for them, as they would have quickly lost what slim mental advantage they have over their host.

Here we see the force that has always struggled to make our culture so strongly dedicated to the idea of a life long pair bond marriage. Here is why that eternal Mideast puppet the Roman Catholic Church has always been so ridiculously emphatic about life long marriage without divorce. The reason is that our smartest men must be prevented from having lots of offspring; and this naturally occurs if society does not in some way penalize "Bastards" and "Illegitimate" offspring.

Don't we all pretty much agree that adultery should not be a crime? Don't we all think that it is none of society's business to punish adults for having sex with other adults? Why then do we do this with our leaders? And doesn't it open our society up to all sorts of corruptions and political manipulations if we penalize our elected officials for this? Once again, our parasite has us doing everything backwards from the way it should be done.

Marco Polo, The Travels, Ch.4

"There are men living in villages perched on the hills along the [spice] road. These have beautiful women, which they offer freely to passing traders. These traders give the women a yard of cloth, or some other trinket. Then after taking his [sexual] pleasure, the trader mounts his horse and rides off. Then these people jeer at him: You there, you that are riding off. Show us what you are taking with you that is ours. Let us see, you irresponsible man, what profit you have made. Look at what you have left for us, what you have thrown away and forgotten." [The people in the middle are still doing this today in various ways. Today if you do the Arabs a favor, you are allowed to visit their harems. If you are smart, you are given women that should be ovulating at that time. If you not smart, you are given women who should not be particularly really fertile at that time.

You ladies out there. You will do the greatest service to mankind if even some of you offer yourselves to our Senators. If even a small percentage of you do this gladly for the good of mankind, then the Harem trips will plummet in value.]

Let your bestmen/ foremen have sex and breed

As long as it is with consenting adults, what is the harm?

Government treats everyone the same

Under the law, status will be in two levels only: Normal and SENUBIQ = Senator or Ubiq. The senubiq people shall not be treated any better by government. All preferences in status will come directly from the hearts and minds of the people.

All senubiq status shall be democratically conferred by the Senate. Except for this, everyone is all the same. And among the Senators, they are officially all the same as one another. The only perks our Senators get is that they get to sit among themselves wherever they want to sit.

Excuse the most valuable Senators from voting duty

Once a Senator is elevated, he should be excused from voting duty.

Use a point system for Senate status

Give the people who ask or change the simplest things one point. Then based on how important or significant the contribution, give more points. If someone makes a huge contribution by discovering or explaining something huge, award him ten thousand ubiq points. Make standards, and use an UL-curve, or a diminishing-returns curve for each award.

Senate awarded status is a free resource of immense value

One of the most remarkable about awarding official Senate status is that it costs society absolutely nothing at all to use.

Everyone's favorite job

The US Peace Corps. used to run ads saying that theirs was the "toughest job you will ever love." Isn't that the attitude we want from the people serving as our elected officials? Shouldn't Senate service be about a total fascinating immersion with some of the smartest, most interesting, most driven people you will even know? Shouldn't we all strive to make service as an elected official the most exciting, highest power, most give-it-all-you-got, most respected job there is? They should all work like people do in a start-up.

Respect the privacy your elected leaders

Nobody wants to have their life dragged out in public and scrutinized by today's Arab-run gotcha media. This keeps just so many good leaders from entering public service. So I say this:

- 1) The non-criminal behavior of your leaders is nobody's business.
- 2) If you automatically rule out hot-heads like me, your group mind will be ruling out your smartest ones.
- 3) If you automatically rule out philanderers, and men with 'illegitimate' offspring, your group mind will be much weaker without this powerful force.
- 4) If you automatically rule out emotional people, your group mind will be less diverse.
- 5) If you automatically rule out schizophrenics, OCDs and depressives, your group mind will be dumber.
- 6) If you automatically rule out homosexuals, your group mind will be dumber.
- 7) If you automatically rule out anti-social people, your group mind will be dumber.
- 8) If you talk about the minor foibles of your leaders, your group mind will be dumber, much dumber because many of your smartest people and most diverse minds will stay away from

public service. Don't talk about such things, and struggle against those who do discuss such things for their gossiping does your government and your people a great disservice. It really doesn't matter if the smartest guy is the most anti-social obnoxious jerk. Is he the smartest? Can he see farthest? Then he belongs in government— And you are doing a great disservice to your government and your people to talk about his foibles.

The world has changed

Thanks to automation, wealth creation is no longer so important. It will happen anyway now. We don't need to worry about wealth creation so much now. More important now is our group effort and making it so it works right, and so it helps the wealth creation process.

Award status democratically

The democratic award of status is a hugely important thing for society, because status is a primary motivating drive for people. We simply can't omit this in our new democracy.

Government service should be a simple and realistic goal

We must make public service as simple, as realistic, and as downside-free a goal as we can for people who earnestly work to serve the public interest. Under the broad democracy proposed herein, getting elected and confirmed as a Sub-Senator, at some time during one's 40-year adult prime will be a reasonably attainable mark of honor. In fact, the life-long odds of being a confirmed Senator will theoretically be 1-in-10 of the male population assuming no re-elections and an 80/20 male/female split among Senators. ($500 \div 40 \times 80\%$).

Hopefully, this more realistically attainable status level will help sustain a broad-based culture of public service in our society. Hopefully, there will be millions of people striving for this goal across the nation. Hopefully, these will be doing all sorts of good things, large and small to make our nation work better, and so they can get elected to the Senate. Hopefully this new form of government will change our national culture. Hopefully, it will give our young people a new goal to strive for, a constructive alternate to the ambition of being a sports, acting, or music star — and an alternative to being in a street gang.

It starts out at 1%

Year	Number of Senators	Percentage
1	4	1%
3	8	2%
6	12	3%
10	16	4%
14	20	5%
18	24	6%
22	28	7%
26	32	8%
30	36	9%

In the first year, there will be 4 Senate terms, and 1% of the people will have been Senators. By the end of year 3, this will be 2% of the population. By the end of year 6, 3% will have been Senators. By the end of year 10, the number will be 4% assuming no re-elections.

When to favor recent Senators

If someone was in the Senate 10 or 20 years ago, and they have done nothing since, don't given them much status. Do this especially when the percentage of Senators rises above 5%.

Encourage slumming

It would be good if our best people moved down into bad neighborhoods so they have a better chance of becoming a Senator. This should be encouraged because:

- 1) More of our best will enter government.
- 2) It will help equalize society and neighborhoods.

If someone is so motivated to become Senator that he moves into a bad neighborhood, that should be a good thing — But it is only a small thing, and it should only be of the tiniest benefit to a candidate. If you can discern any difference in the ideas the candidates, or their clarity in explaining those ideas, then that should matter more than if the candidate moved down from a really good neighborhood.

When I grow up I want to be a Senator

You shouldn't think of Senate service as something that merely motivates adults, think of the incredible and realistically attainable motivation force it is for kids to strive for.

No official powers

As individuals, our Senators will never have any official powers or distinctions under the law — none at all. However, the people should hold their leaders, acting or retired as the personification of their struggle for goodness in a world of more and better.

How to rise in the Senate

Whether as an individual or part of a team, if a Senator does something that sticks, he will make a name for himself and rise in ranking. Here are some ways in which a Senator might rise in ranking:

- 1) Proposing some government action or thought.
- 2) Producing valuable information of one's own.
- 3) Research or compile information.
- 4) Offering valuable criticism or questions on what was put up for a vote.
- 5) Recognizing valuable public input and elevating it.
- 6) This is an open-ended list.

Riding an idea

The author of an idea that impels Main-Senate action shall frequently ride that idea into high office. For surely The Main-Senate will want the creator to participate in the discussion that will drive action for the entire nation. And those who drive action for the entire world will also participate in the worldwide discussion of their idea, so global ideas will frequently get one elected into the Over-Senate and UM.

It should be expected for the Senate to respect insight over hard work. Only among those with equal insight shall hard work matter. Those riding an idea into office may be drafted by the UM to serve first in the UM and then go back for nations service.

Senate benefits for existing offspring

This begins as soon as the Senator is confirmed to the Sub-Senate.

19—SOCIALISM

Bill Clinton

"Democrats think the country works better with a strong middle class, real opportunities for poor people to work their way into it and a relentless focus on the future, with business and

government working together to promote growth and prosperity. We think 'we're all in this together is a better philosophy than 'you're on your own'."

John Adams, Thoughts on Government

"Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people; and not for profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men."

Thomas Jefferson

"Government shall restrain men from injuring one another, but it leave people otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement."

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 11.1

"After Solon reformed the constitution as already described above, men persisted in coming up to him and complaining about his laws, criticizing some and questioning others. [Many were not happy and there were many questions about his new laws.] And since he did not want to either change them, or stay in Athens and incur hostility, [many people hated these laws] he went [fled] overseas, to Egypt to trade and to see the sights, saying that he would not return for 10-years. He didn't think it right to stay and explain his laws, but everyone should simply do what he had written. [blind obedience is the hallmark of the parasite's agenda.]

Besides, many of the aristocracy were angry because he had cancelled [all of] the debts, and both parties regretted his appointment because his settlement was different from what they expected. The people thought he would carry out a complete redistribution of property, [it was an incomplete cancellation of debt] while the aristocracy thought that he would restore the to the same position as before, or make only small changes." [The aristocracy suffered. Only the parasite came out well.]

The 5 great problems with socialism

- 1) The motivation to work hard is diluted.
- 2) It is hard to centrally plan anything but rules and laws.
- 3) Old and moribund industries and institutions tend to be protected by society instead of being allowed to die of old age.
- 4) New businesses become much harder to start and the economy become less able to adapt.
- 5) The economy grows less efficient.

Today, all rich nations are a mix of capitalism and socialism

For example, communism exists throughout in the US military, in our fire departments, and all through the US Government. In fact, the government of the United States itself is a confiscatory communist entity: It confiscates part of your income and then redistributes it.

And in all "communist" countries of the world there always exists a capitalist (or monopolist) black market run by the parasite. Thus communism and capitalism are all just shades of gray, or relative ideas existing as a continuum. No nation is completely capitalistic and no nation is completely socialistic.

Individualism vs. groupism

To me the GROUP EFFORT CONTINUUM is not between capitalism and socialism, but between INDIVIDUALISM and GROUPISM. What percentage of the individual's effort should the group tax for group infrastructure?

I imagine my EUTROPIAN SOCIETY is UBIQIST in

nature, a society that is always be adding more basic UBIQUITIZED services as free common services. Certainly this will include the most definitive library of educational material available. Certainly tis will include free communication services including internet, cellular service, urban transit, a driverless car network, and tier-1 healthcare. Also, at near cost, we will provide high-speed intercity rail, driverless taxis, package delivery, and basic tier-1 foodstuffs among many other things.

Government efficiency is the key to effective socialism

Higher taxes and government spending have generally proven to be a burden on most economies. The reason is that the government spending remains much more wasteful than private spending. But let's say we implement a broad democracy, a democracy administered by 1,000,000 democratically elected Sub-Senators and 100,000 Main-Senators in 10 specialized houses. Shouldn't this government be less corrupt and wasteful than the current one run by some 500 people?

What would happen if the efficiency of our government spending approximated the efficiency of the private sector in general? Well firstly, we would see our utilities better run by government, because today it is a tie whether we run these by the government or by regulated monopolies. So with respect to "industries" like telecom and railroads, our government should easily become more efficient than the private sector.

Here we imagine a society able to have many more cost-saving group infrastructure systems. Socialized media and intellectual property rights management, rail transportation, internet, telephone, cellular service, and category-1 healthcare are also just the beginning.

Have we really tried any form of government?

Have we really tried any form of government, or have we merely been measuring how much power our parasite has to corrupt us under a variety of approaches that are all vulnerable to its corruption?

Now once again, recall how our parasite is happiest when its host societies are completely disorganized and anarchic. Maybe our parasite is struggling to make hands-off economic anarchy seem like the best approach. Maybe this approach really is not best. Maybe it is simply what our parasite favors in the long term, so it can maximize its long term influence over its host societies.

Cicero and socialism

[Here Cicero/Caesar/Caesar explains why Rome should not scrimp on its public sacrifices of costly Arabian incense.]

"This whole empire has been created and increased and maintained by the power of the gods."

[In the Roman mental matrix, the Romans thought that they revered 'the gods' more/better than any other race — and they thought that this reverence was a big reason for their imperial success. They also probably believed that their poorly designed, and totally corrupt democracy helped with their imperial success as liberators — like many Americans today.

Little did the Romans realize that an ancient race of totally desperate, and totally godless/GOODLESS men were out there pretending to be the gods. And thanks to the costly and frequent sacrifices made by the Romans, this parasitic race maximized its own income by secretly sabotaging all of Rome's enemies and helping Rome to thrive — at least for some centuries while it was profitable to do so

So the Romans were right, but for the wrong reasons. Their frequent and costly sacrifices of expensive Mideast sacraments were a big reason — perhaps the biggest reason why Rome was so successful as masters of the Western world.

Here is why we should not judge things merely by whether they seem to work. It is because we have a parasite that tries very hard to make its choices for our system seem like they work best. A good example of this is the way the parasite enjoys the sort of monopolies and cartels that arose under the US-style laissez-faire capitalism of the late 1800s. Clearly the parasite always pushes for these, all over the world. And clearly we need to go in the opposite directions as much as reasonably possible — towards a world that discourages monopolies, cartels and giant Roman style corporations as much as possible.

Another good of our parasite's efforts to shape the world is the absurd way that the socialism was implemented in so many parts of the world — namely as initiative-destroying confiscatory communism — and initiative-destroying 60% to 95% marginal income tax rates. Both approaches are absurd, and both are intended to turn the world away from a more infrastructure-rich world.

The march of socialism is the march of societal progress

All the good things we like about our societies, the shared knowledge, the shared technology, the mass production, the common surplus, the roads, and communication technology — All of these things that are shared among mankind, they are all from the march of socialism.

Less motivated to work

Will more socialism make people less motivated to work? I think that it most certainly will. However, human society is reaching a point in time where this may not actually be a bad thing. I mean, what sort of true eutopia has citizens working even 40 hours a week in an unrewarding job?

Louis Dembitz Brandeis, 1856-1941

We can have democracy in this country, or we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can't have both

Inequality standards for government

Nowadays, the absolute equality of communism, and the absolute inequality capitalism are both generally regarded as bad approaches. The true path obviously lies between these both severe and impractical extremes.

But why do we leave something as important as inequality up for grabs? Let's instead say in our constitution that our nation should have a range of inequality that it is happy with. Perhaps we should have two rules like the following:

- A) If the richest 5% have more total wealth than the poorest 50%, we want to raise taxes on the rich 5% until their net after tax income is lower than the poorest 50%. and
- B) If the richest 5% start to have lower wealth than the poorest 25%, we want to lower taxes on the rich until our society becomes more unequal again.

Now I don't know what the right numbers are, and they will probably change over time. And this is not something for me to decide. In fact, I think that this is something that will have to be tested and optimized over some decades to find the right place for the various cultures of the world. Nevertheless, some sort of simple metric for maintaining an optimal level of inequality should be instituted for our democracies.

Jerome Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient Rome, Ch. 3

[Rome] "was crushed under the double weight of the masses, from whom a crazed economic system had stolen all hope of normal betterment, and of corrupt bureaucracy which aggravated the absolutism of the monarch whose fabulous wealth it commanded and translated into acts of arbitrary omnipotence."

EQUAL PROTECTION = the right to government protection from violence

EQUAL GOVERNMENT = the right to equal treatment in all matters with respect to government.

IMPOSED EQUALITY = When government imposes and enforces equality on the private sector..

PUBLIC EQUALITY = Equal protection and equal government, but not equality imposed on private individuals.

FULL EQUALITY = the right to equal treatment in all matters
OVER-EQUAL = A society too equal. A society where equality erodes the drive to work.

UNEQUAL = A society where a small number of people are very rich

Fixing socialism's weakness

The weakness of communism and socialism was always the corrupt administration. Let's replace this administration with a broad and incorruptible democracy. Then let's only "socialize" or "ubiquitize" that which needs no allocation — things like public transit, innovation rights, public mineral deposits, public grazing prairie, internet and phone access among other things.

Are people ENTITLED to their ENTITLEMENTS?

Are the people receiving government handouts actually entitled to those handouts? Or an even better question: How on earth did we ever start calling government handout payments as entitlements? This word is ambiguous in the worst way for the Free World's fastest growing budget item. We simply must stop calling these payments as entitlements. Let's instead start using the term MUNI payments, as this term suggests public munificence, or lavish generosity on the part of the public.

Hesiod, Theogony, 104

"Hello, fellow children of Zeus. [Let's sing a lovely song and celebrate the holy race of the immortal gods. Those born of Earth, starry sky, gloomy Night, and those born of the briny Sea. Tell us the origin of the first gods, the Earth, the rivers, and the endless sea, with its raging swell, and the gleaming stars, and the wide heaven above, and the gods who were born of them, givers of good things, and how they divided their wealth, and how they shared their honors amongst themselves, and also how...](#)" [Here is an ancient Greek creation myth, and right in the middle of it we find two bits of Arab propaganda. 1) That the ocean and huge and full of rage and should be avoided. And 2) That people are supposed to share their wealth and honors. The parasite always struggles to increase the money flowing through the easy to group effort. This is for the simple reason that it is always much easier to crash a banquet than a family meal.

Here it is worth pointing out that the Greek suffix -CRACY also means mixing bowl. The constantly ex-migrating, invading, infiltrating Arabs learned long ago that it is relatively easy for a bunch of them to crash a party and help themselves to a share of the feast. It is certainly a lot easier than showing up, one-at-a-time at people's house. So the number one proponent of big government has always been the

parasite.]

The original meaning of CRACY says much about government

Normally Gr. KRATER is translated as mixing bowl, vessel, container, power, strength and government. And Gr. KRASIS is translated a mix or mixture. Gr KRATIA = power, rule or government.

From this word we get VOLCANIC CRATERS, and PACKING CRATES which are a sort of vessel, although more of a box or a black box. We also get CRATCH = a feeding trough of manger, as well as CRUET = a small container or food or wine. Here it seems that CREATE = to mix-up out of nothing. A CREATURE is beast that was mixed-together, like griffon or a sphinx. As well, a CREED is perhaps not so much a system of belief, but a belief set or mixture of ideas.

Here I would like to define -CRACY, at least from our parasite's standpoint. It is a sort of mixing bowl, where our society's desires are mixed up by our parasite. It is also a bit of a crate, a black crate or a black box for hiding things. And it is a volcano, ready to erupt at any moment.

Income inequality and desperation are twins.

However much the parasite pushes for income inequality, it also pushes for desperation. Our tax systems have all been "pulled" by our parasite to help with this objective.

Vow of limited wealth.

Our parasite has a number of strategies for "ruling out" thoughts in the group minds of its host societies. One of the most effective is to frame ideas in an all-or-nothing way. Our conception of taking a vow-of-poverty seems to have been framed for us in this way: As an all-or-nothing thing. Today, we have normal life on one hand and a complete renouncement of all possessions on the other. Why is there nothing in between? And why is a vow of this sort not legally binding for a period of years?

Now we are always hearing complaints about corporate greed and government corruption. Why don't we make it as easy as possible for people to swear binding oaths limiting their wealth before running for office? We should also make conditional vows binding — especially if stated in a Senate campaign: "If elected I will live under wealth controls during my term in office, and for X-years thereafter". Then if they are elected, their pre-election vows will become automatically binding. Perhaps this will help our democracy to find leaders who will forgo personal financial gain, and go directly for social respect and the satisfaction of knowing that they helped the society in some way. Here we come to the idea of VOLWISTS, or people who take a Vow of Ordinary Living and Wealth.

What is the harm (or cost) of letting people make this sort of commitment to society official and legally binding? Wouldn't society benefit if our elected officials (and other trusted people) could take this sort of vow? Here I would like to suggest 5 degrees of volwist based on the percentile of wealth relative to the general population. We will institute these standards and let the market/electorate determine which (if any) it wants from people:

99% percentile = 1st degree volwist Vw1 (15 year renunciation period)

95% percentile = 2nd degree volwist Vw2 (10 year renunciation period)

80% percentile = 3rd degree volwist Vw3 (7 year renunciation

period)

50% percentile = 4th degree volwist Vw4 (3 year renunciation period)

33% percentile = 5th degree volwist Vw5 (1 year renunciation period)

15% percentile = 6th degree volwist Vw6 (no renunciation period)

The first degree volwist's vow is not a big deal to most people, because it only says that you will not have wealth above the 99th percentile — which 99% of people never attain. All 1st degree volwists thus agree not to have wealth in the top 1%. However a 6th degree volwist promises to not have wealth greater than the poorest 15% of society. Any amounts over this are due to the government just as one's income taxes are due today — with similar penalties for non-payment.

Now, there should be no stigma associated with being a volwist for a time and later giving up your vow. In fact it should be regarded as more honorable than never having been a volwist at all. Also, perhaps we want to allow optional child exclusion riders where 4th, 5th and 6th degree volwists are allowed to go down a notch to 3rd, 4th, 5th degree volwists immediately upon the birth of their first child.

Volwist vows should be recorded by the county recorder's office. And people who make volwist vows should be scrupulously held to them. And the vow should be just as binding as a tax obligations. Failure to adhere to the vow should result in criminal charges that are similar to those for tax evasion. There should also be fairly regular audits of our volwist, especially during and after their time in office. Also, volwists should be required to live openly and notoriously as a volwist, putting their title everywhere they use their name. "John Q. Public PS., Vw3". Then, if John Q. Public rescinds his oath, he becomes a Vvr3 for three years. This will both normalize being a volwist, and make it harder to cheat on one's vows.

It shall be a crime for a volwist to touch cash, or engage in barter. All volwists must use a credit card or cash card for all purchases. They might also tattoo a V across the outside of the 2nd joint of their right thumb. All volwists shall be on the public volwist name index, and volwist map.

If volwists conspire with non-volwists to funnel money to someone else, it should be punished just like a similar tax fraud and a crime for both parties. Also, volwists should be required to file a public income statement, even if nobody is paying income tax in the nation. Also, VOLWISM is a matter of personal wealth, and volwists should be free to run businesses and fictional citizens.

Uddhava Gita, 13 (Optional Read)

[Here we see some Arab propaganda framing a life of renunciation in the most extreme, all-or-nothing way so few people choose this sort of life. This is because our non-materialism is the flip-side of the Arab struggle to sell us things at premium prices. If we become less materialistic, then the Arabs have a much harder time profiting from its many scams and tricks.

When one is ready to] "devote oneself to the third stage of life, the vana•prash•tha, one retires to the forest [where] one should live on only the purest foods — like wild bulbs, roots and fruit. One should clothe oneself only in bark, simple cloth or animal skins and sleep on a bed of straw or grass.

There one should give up all vanity and allow the hair on one's head and body to grow. The body should be plunged

in water three times daily without the need for social cleanliness. There the anchorite should sit in the midst of the five fires in the heat of summer, and in the lashing rain, or immersed in icy water in the cold of winter. There are the austerities that will be required.

The anchorite [anchorite = religious recluse] should eat food cooked over a flame or ripened naturally. Hard foods may be ground with a pestle and mortar or against stone — or even with the teeth.

Having become aware of the place and time of the growth of things, and also of personal digestive powers, the anchorite should gather food, only when it is needed — and not eat what has been stored.

All the seasonal sacrificial rights should be performed at the appropriate time using wild grains. never should the forest anchorite use an animal in sacrifice, even when prescribed to do so by the Vedas.

The Vedas command the anchorite to perform all those rituals including Agni-hotra, that are performed by the householder. Thus the rituals of the new moon and the full moon, and also the rituals of the three 4 month seasons should all be done.

With the body emaciated by these austerities, the anchorite will reach the higher realm of the rishis, and from there will be directed to the supreme Self.

Uddhava, there is no bigger folly than one who engages in all these austerities only to gain the fulfillment of passing [worldly] ambitions. When the anchorite reaches and age when due to infirmity, the austerities can no longer be practiced, the anchorite should place the sacrificial fire in the center of the heart and mentally enter the fire [mentally only?... or physically as so many million stupid Indian wives have done upon the death of their husbands?]

The anchorite who has developed a distaste for the higher heavenly realms, which can be gained only through effort, may enter the sannyasa stage of life. Then, free from all desires, the sacred rites pertaining to such an occasion should be performed, and all that is still possessed should be given to the fire that is sannyasa. The gods believing that will be transcended in excellence by one making such a renunciation, will send obstructions through spouse and family [so the religious ascetic is throwing himself on the fire. Also, we see the same sort of nonsense in so many of the world's religions. Give up your life in this world so that you may live forever after you die. Can't you all see through this? Isn't the parasite's bullshit bargain for immortality particularly obvious here?] If the sannyasin would have a cloth to cover the body at all, it should only cover the loins. No personal possessions should be retained other than a staff and a pot for [boiling] drinking water. [this is necessary to live.] The sannyasin must take care in walking, not to step on another creature, and water to be drunk should be strained through a cloth [what about the micro-organisms?], A sannyasin must speak only those words that ring with truth, and always act according to conscience.

Sannyasins [as icons of extreme piety] must control their vitality, and avoid idle talk and action for gain [, thus setting an example for all their people on model behavior in society.] One who cannot do this is no more a sannyasin than the staff that is carried. A sannyasin should beg for food from households of any of the 4 castes. [Our parasite seems to have started his caste system in baby steps: With only 4 castes which later proliferated into many casts with many rules each.] But he should avoid the houses of people with sinful habits, the sannyasin must approach no more than seven houses in all, and must be satisfied with whatever is obtained

from them.

Then going out to the village watering place, the sannyasin should wash the food gathered and offer portions to the gods and others in need. Only then may the sannyasin in silence eat what remains. Nothing should be saved or set aside for another time. [Can you all see what a monstrous slave master our Arab parasite would be if we let it?] Sannyasins should roam the earth free of attachments and with the senses under control. With a steady mind and impartial vision their only pleasures and pastimes should be in seeking the Self. Sannyasins should dwell in a secure by solitary place with their minds fixed on the discovery of that Self. That is the same Self in me. Thus the sannyasin should be engaged in inquiry into the truth Regarding the nature of bondage and liberation of the Self. The sannyasin must discover the bondage of the senses and the liberation in their control. Completely controlling the five senses and that sixth sense, the mind, the sage should live a life totally detached from trifling pleasures and immersed in the eternal bliss of the Self that is the Self in me.

Going to towns, villages, settlements and places of pilgrimage only to beg for food, the sannyasin should travel the earth visiting its sacred places, its flowing rivers and soaring mountains with their deeply penetrating solitude. The sannyasin can also beg for food at the hermitage of anchorites. This will be the more pure food consisting of grains gathered from the field. Such food will quickly cleanse and steady the mind. The sannyasin should not regard this phenomenal world as real. [instead he should have] a mind unattached to this world and the next. And the sannyasin should refrain from all activities intended to secure worldly pleasure. ...

One for whom this phenomenal world has grown pale, who is steadfastly devoted to me and wants nothing but the self, should take to the sannyasin life regardless of previous station or status and rise above [all] these petty distinctions. Then, though possessing a sound mind, the sannyasin should be as spontaneous as a child, though intelligent: Behave like a fool, though articulate: Speak in riddles, though learned in the scriptures...

The sannyasin should not expound the rituals of the Vedas nor speak against them. The sannyasin should not tend towards cynicism or controversy, nor indulge in vain arguments concerning the scriptures."

20— MEDIA

1. INTRODUCTION

James Madison

"A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both." [In other words, a democratic government without democratic systems of self-information is pre-determined for tragedy. Democracies must democratically self-inform—they must perceive the world for themselves—or they will be doomed to fail. It is far too easy to pretend to be a consensus opinion.

Samuel Adams, c. 1749, An essay in the Public Advertiser

"Neither the wisest constitution, nor the wisest laws will secure the liberty and happiness of a people whose manners are universally corrupt."

Thomas Jefferson, 1816.01.16, to Charles Yancey

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free... it expects what never was and never will be."

George Orwell's novel 1984

"In a way, the world-view of the [totalitarian] Party imposed itself most successfully on people incapable of understanding it. They could be made to accept the most flagrant violations of reality"

George Orwell, 1984 novel

"The Party could thrust its hand into the past and say of this or that event, it never happened.... 'Who controls the past', ran the Party slogan, 'controls the future' "

Thomas Jefferson, 1816.04.24, to Dupont de Nemours

"Enlighten the people, generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like [evil] spirits at the dawn of day."

James Wilson, c. 1790, Of the study of the law in the United States

"Law and liberty cannot rationally become the objects of our love, unless they first become the objects of our knowledge."

George Washington, 1784.12.15, to George Chapman

"The best means of forming a manly, virtuous, and happy people will be found in the right education of youth. Without this foundation, every other means, in my opinion, must fail."

Thomas Jefferson, 1810.05.06, to Trustees for the lottery of East Tennessee College

"No one more sincerely wishes the spread of information among mankind than I do, and none has greater confidence in its effect towards supporting free and good government."

Samuel Adams, 1775.11.04 to James Warren

"No people will tamely surrender their Liberties, no can any be easily subdued, when knowledge is diffused and virtue is preserved. On the contrary, when people are universally ignorant, and debauched in their manners, they will sink under their own weight without the aid of foreign invaders."

Thomas Jefferson, 1787, Notes on the State of Virginia, 14

"History, by apprising of [teaching the people about] the past will enable them to judge of the future. It will avail them of [give them] the experience of other times and other nations. It will qualify them as judges of the action and designs of men. It will enable them to know ambition under every disguise it may assume. [And] in knowing it, to defeat its [history's] views."

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary:

"**Clio**, n. One of the nine Muses. Clio's function was to preside over history—which she did with great dignity, many of the prominent citizens of Athens occupying seats on the platform, the meetings being addressed by Messrs. Xenophon, Herodotus and other popular speakers."

[Zeno•phon=Foreign•tongue and Hero•do•todos = everyone's•Hero. Democracies must compile their own version of history; of the events they caused and the events long before. They cannot leave this to the false anarchy or the parasite's muse of history Clio.]

Fronto, Elements of History 18

"Because of his shrewd understanding of politics, the emperor [Trajan] paid much attention to the stage actors and other performers of the race track and arena. He knew that the Roman people are held under control principally by two things — [government] grain handouts, and the shows [media]. That political support depends as much on entertainment [the matrix] as it does on matters of serious importance.

Neglect of serious problems does more harm, but neglect of the shows [media] bring damaging unpopularity. In fact the shows are even more fervently desired than the gifts. This is because the gifts placate only the common people on the grain dole, but the shows please everyone." [Translation: If you kill lots of Romans as sport, you will not only have less mouths to feed, but you will keep the poor from thinking about their hunger and thus you can feed them less. This will result in more food for the parasite.]

Galen, Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics 17a.606

"Ptolemy was so enthusiastic about books that he ordered every book on every ship that came to Egypt to be brought to him. He had them copied onto new papyrus, and the [adulterated] copies [from the ministry of truth] were then given to the owners of the books, whereas the originals were deposited in the libraries with the ascription, 'From the Ships'." [Then when the Arabs had enough of the real books and all the outside books were adul•ter•ated, They took the good books to the center of the desert and burned all the books in Egypt.]

Galen, Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics 17a.607

"The way Ptolemy negotiated with the Athenians demonstrates very clearly his enthusiasm for acquiring old books. He gave them a security deposit of 15 talents of silver for the authorized [official/ original] texts of Sophocles, Euripides, and Aeschylus, on the understanding that he would make copies and return the originals safely. He made expensive copies on papyrus of the highest quality, but kept the originals and sent the Athenians the new [censored] texts, telling them to keep the 15 talents."

Catholic edict 409 AD

"Any person... in possession of noxious [pre-Christian] books and writings, or having hidden away any [pre-Christian] books under any pretexthaving failed to deliver them [for destruction] is hereby notified that he shall suffer capital punishment if found guilty of the crime of maleficium." [The Catholic Church began in 325AD in present day Iznik Turkey. By 409, the new Mideast church with a Mideast prophet was rounding up all the Greek and Roman knowledge it could. Clearly the Catholic Church from the very beginning was a tool of the Arabs.]

Galen, on Hippocrates' Nature of Man 15.105

"Before the kings of Alexandria [Egypt] and Pergamum [Turkey] became such eager collectors of old books, authorship was never falsified. But as soon as bounties were paid to the people employed in rounding up the books written by a particular ancient writer, they started to bring in many books that they falsely attributed to that author." [Here the Arab Ministry of Truth admits to paying bounties and rounding up all the books it could around the time of Galen's death in 199AD. Apparently these were all modified, mollified, or softened up, like what happened with the legend of Odious Rex.

Now Sophocles lived to be 90, and he wrote about as

many works. So we imagine that Sophocles was one of the authors that many works were falsely attributed to. Sophocles was the halfway, purgatory stage. If like Oedipus, the version stuck, the work lived on. If it was like most of Sophocles' work, it didn't work, or it was turned into G-br-ish, then it was simply removed from the central libraries, and thus purged.]

Pliny, Natural History 13.70

"When he was contending with Eu·menes [good·men], the king of Pergamum [northwest Turkey], in the acquisition of a library, Ptolemy cut off supplies of papyrus. This led to the use of parchment in Pergamum and subsequent widespread use of that material in guaranteeing the [non] immortality of human accomplishments." [Parchment is not porous like paper and therefore, the material can be (in the words of George Orwell) "scraped clean and reinscribed exactly as often as was necessary". Thus parchment is a good material for those who wish to erode works through palimpsest. Funny how the Arabs controlled the supply of paper and kept the price high so that people would use parchment more.]

Zonaras, Annals 14.2

"A snake's intestine measuring 120 feet, with both the ILIAD and the Odyssey inscribed on it in letters of gold, was destroyed in a fire that destroyed a library of 120,000 books in Constantinople in the late 5th century." [A great scroll written with golden letters, the original, and uncorrupted version of the Iliad and Odyssey was destroyed in a fire. All that survived were the copies. And these famously were full of errors due to inconsistent penmanship standards, and people copying copies of copies — or at least that was the excuse.]

Also, the "books of Homer" are not two but dozens today. The ILIAD = illi·ad = bad-people·towards. ODYSSEY = hodi·sea = sea·routes = shipping·routes.]

Seneca, Epistles 115.15

[When a character in one of Euripides' tragedies argued that wealth mattered more than morality] "the whole audience rose up to throw both the actor and the play out of the theatre. Just then Euripides leaped to center stage, begging them to wait and see the evil end in store for the character who valued gold so much." [Apparently Euripides = Giant·steps said things in his plays that were offensive. So the Greek audience stopped the performance. Here we imagine that the offensive stuff continued for most of the play, and then at the end, the rich crook dies after some years.]

Media by government appointees is awful
Media by a broad democracy is wonderful

Our worthless media

It is filled with actors, athletes, and singers. It tells us about worthless information, and offers little real insight or learning. It gives us little to better our lives. Can you not see the parasite's hand at work? Everything is the opposite of what it should be. Clearly we do not run our own media.

Juvenal, Satire 7

"He'll lend you a clique of freedmen and other hangers-on
To sit at the end of each row, and dish out the applause"

[Eng. clique = a group of people hired to applaud or heckle. It is also a group of sycophantic followers. We must know about cliques, because without awareness of cliques we are vulnerable to them.]

It is everyone's civic duty out and oppose any

suspected clique activity, whether the objective is political or economic. When you suspect that a clique is at work, you must say to all who will listen, "here is a clique at work."

Applause to like and to dislike

Ordinary applause shall still mean approval. However a 1-second beat such as how people used to do at rock concerts, that shall now be the beat of disapproval and disliking what was said.

Also, flashlights and handhelds at night protests shall be considered opposed to the speaker.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.16

"he [Gould] owned a newspaper, the New York 'World'; a curious sight it was to see one of the great pirates, who many a time had narrowly escaped prison, instructing the public as to its duty, moral, political, and otherwise. But the known fact that Gould owned this newspaper helped to discount its utterances and reduce its circulation."

A much more successful and insidious method of influencing public opinion was by his control of the Western Union Telegraph Company, and, through that corporation, of the Associated Press, the foremost news distributing agency in the United States. Distorted, misleading or false news dispatches were manufactured, or artfully colored and supplied to the public press. These not only gave Gould superior underhand facilities for influencing the course of the stock market, but they were also used in favor of capitalists, and against labor and radical movements at every opportunity. The public was fed on grossly perverted news accounts of strikes and labor and political movements. Upon this fabricated news, the newspaper owners, themselves capitalists or largely servile to capital, based hostile, if not malevolent editorials. And the combination of the whole was used to prejudice the mass of the public against any movement or agitation threatening the complete sway of capital."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"The motto of the whole commercial class was to keep the public in the dark as much as possible. And even when the usual legislative investigating committees, fortified by summary powers of law, mildly sought to ascertain the surface facts only, without probing too deep, they were, as a rule, obstructed at every turn."

Such facts as did become public came out adventitiously [by chance] despite every effort of the magnates concerned to hush them up. Sometimes embittered competitors would supply revelation to investigating committees."

Indiana Jones, Crystal skull film

[Here an absurd Russian super agent says some things that are meant to look absurd. They are aspects of the parasite's agenda made to look absurd.] "To peer across the world and know the enemy's secrets. To place our thoughts in to the minds of your leaders, make your teachers teach the true version of history, your soldiers attack on our command, we will be everywhere at once. More powerful than a whisper, invading your dreams, thinking your thoughts for you while you sleep."

We will change you... all of you from the inside, we will turn you into us. and the best part, you won't even know it's happening."

Star Trek 2 film, Wrath of Kahn

"Their young enter through the ears and wrap themselves around the cerebral cortex [of government]. This has the effect of rendering the victim extremely susceptible to suggestion. Later as they grow follows madness and death [of the nation]."

CORPORATE MEDIA

Horace, (d. 8BC), Aequam memento

"All must die

Be sure to keep a fair mind in vexation
Avoid excessive joy from profits gained
And whether you lead a life of gloom
Or relax lying on some far away field
Throughout the holidays

Rejoice in classic Flaernian wine."

Why do the pines and silvery poplars
share their hospitable shade?
Why does water run and tremble
In winding streams for us?

We command all perfumes, wines
and the all too brief spell of the rose.

While time and affairs and the
black thread of the fates allow."

[This is not a single brand of wine.

It a type of wine being advertised in literature]

Horace (d. 8BC), Natis in usum

"Throwing cups is behavior fit for Thracians
Refrain from such barbarous habits
And keep Bacchus free from bloody brawls
A Persian scimitar goes so poorly with wine and lamps
Friends, friends, contain your blasphemous cries
And lay back on your couches
[the Romans and drank lying down]
I too must drink my share of potent Falernian
Then Megilla's brother shall tell us
with what wound he was blessed
what arrow made him droop"

The ancient tree of knowledge

This term says clearly that the Arabs have been pruning the tree of knowledge for thousands of years. This is so their harem race can continue on. This is so they can continue to have dozens or hundreds of children with Arab houri whores — some of which turn out quite smart and keep the Semitic "races" racing with the rest of eu•man•idi.

Hesiod, Works and Days, c.700BC, 1.25

"Muses from Pieria [Bri•A, The Brothers, Mt. Olympus], who give glory through song, come to me, tell of Zeus your father... Through him, mortal men are famed or defamed, sung or unsung alike, as Zeus wills. For he easily makes [men] strong, and he easily brings strong men down. Easily he humbles the proud and raises the obscure, and easily he straightens the crooked and cuts off the proud that stick out. Zeus who thunders aloft, and who lives in the highest position...

great

Hesiod's Theogony c.700BC (lines 81-93)

[Here ZEUS is the Godfather or sultan of Mideast Inc. and his daughters are the Brothers, his sons. The MUSES are thus the Brothers in the media, singing songs of praise or lament for whomsoever they choose to.]

Calliope, is the chief [muse] of them all, for she attends to worshipful [dutiful] kings [figurehead rulers]. Whichever heaven-nourished [Arab-supported] kings the daughters [sons] of great Zeus [Mideast Inc.] favor, turning their eyes upon this man at his birth, they will pour sweet dew [words and ideas] upon his tongue, and from his lips flow gracious, honeyed words. [Recall how the Bar•ak Hussein Ob•ana campaign never really mis-stepped while his opponent, a genuine martyr for freedom was made to look like too much of a hot-head.] And the people will all look [kindly] upon him while he settles their causes with true [reasonable] judgements. His decision is certain, and expertly he makes a quick end of even great quarrels and debates. This is why there are wise kings: because when the people are being misguided in their assembly [legislature]. They [these kings] set matters straight again with ease, persuading people with gentle words [thanks to their Brotherly administration]. And when he goes among his subjects, they seek his favor with deference, as if he were a god, and above ordinary men. Such is the sacred gift of the Muses [the Brotherhood] to man. For while the Muses and far-shooting Apollo make men singers and 'cithar-ists' [guitar-ists, lyres, liars, rockstar propagandists] — it is from Zeus that they become kings. Every man is fortunate whom the Muses love, and their words flow sweetly from their lips.

George Orwell, 1984 p.34

"The Party could thrust its hand into the past and say of this or that event, it never happened"

CNN and the truth

On June 5, 2009, CNN reported Bar•ak Ghassan Obama's visit to the Nazi's factory death camp of Buchenwald. The original report had Obama speaking about the beauty of the place and the absurdity of the Holocaust deniers. But for almost a full day, every half hour, the 10 second sound bite only had Obama speaking about the beauty of the place. Here we see the Arab Ministry of Truth trimming the tree of knowledge.

Wynton Marsalis (win•ton Bars•alias)

"I have absolutely no idea what my generation did to enrich our democracy. We dropped the ball. We entered a period of complacency and closed our eyes to the public corruption of our democracy.

Spotting media corruption

Media corruption is often easiest to see at the intersection of headlines and the interpretation of real events. For example look at the reporting on the British election of June 2017.

1-DM. Our corrupt media: Rock and roll

There was this particularly lame song from the early 1980's that was customized for most of America's largest cities. The lyrics went something like "I drink that dirty water, Boston [or insert other city name] you're my home." Why did a rock and roll song talk about dirty water? And why did this song about dirty water need to be customized for most of America's largest cities?

Well around that time, there was also this big scandal about radio DJs being paid by the "recording industry" to play songs. Perhaps this wasn't about selling more albums. Perhaps it was more about bombarding America with a certain set of a few thousand rock and roll "classics" — songs that hammered America's great and powerful baby boom generation with our parasite's propaganda for our society. Instead of staying sober and working hard, these songs told us

to:

A) SLACK: "Take life a little easier, make life a little easier" (a message so important it needed to be an ad, so it could be heard many times a day)

B) SEX: Spend more time thinking about Roman romance if you are a woman — and sex if you are a man.

C) DRUGS: Enjoy the temporary and artificial pleasures of drugs and partying.

D) ROCK & ROLL: Be obsessed with music, particularly our parasite's propaganda music, rock and roll. Disco, which lacked our parasite's propaganda dimension was savaged as the music of the underclasses in the film Saturday Night Fever.

E) ENVIRONMENT: And finally to help turn waterways and wetlands into something that needs protection from the evil corporations that pump oil from the ground. Hence the lame song first mentioned in this paragraph.

2-DM. Our corrupt media: beer ads and oil reserves

There is a large segment of voters that doesn't read newspapers, or even watch the television news. These people, the "Jocks" and "Rockers" for example, form their opinions in other ways. Remember those beer ads from the Adolph Coors Company? It's the water you know, the pure Rocky Mountain water free of any pollution, especially oil drilling pollution, that makes the beer taste so good. Are we all really so stupid and gullible as to believe that we can actually taste the purity of the water beer is brewed with? Isn't this obviously propaganda in support of clear water regulation?

Now perhaps it is just a coincidence that these ads ran in the years leading up to the Congressional votes on tighter and tighter clean water laws; laws that turned 100% of America's oil rich swamps, coastlines and river valleys into precious wetland habitats. But where are all the clean water ads now that our parasite no longer need any more clean water legislation in America?

3-DM. Our corrupt media: oil spills as environmental terrorism

What a huge coincidence that the recent BP oil spill happened right when America began talking about expanding offshore drilling. Given the timing, it sure seems like it might be an act of environmental terrorism designed to play to the news media. How come nobody in our supposedly free news media has ever asked if this was an act of environmental terrorism? Do you really think that conspiracies only exist in government and the desperate people from the land of no resources are unable to infiltrate our oil companies, or our new-corporations?

To see something interesting and incriminating, make a timeline for the remarkable wave of drilling rig spills that started right when the Mideast needed to control offshore drilling in the late 1960s. Then notice how the spills mostly stopped when they weren't necessary. Then notice how they started again when they were useful to Mideast Inc. If you add in all the media stories about oil spills and double hull tankers the cause of nearly all offshore oil spills will be clear — environmental "accidents" occur mostly to support of high oil prices.

4-DM. Our corrupt media: Surveys

Someone should catalogue all the surveys that have been broadcast on the TV news. Look carefully and you will see our parasite telling us what we think, simply stretching the truth, and stretching the realm of the plausible. Please people, everyone should be super-skeptical when our corrupt for-profit news media usurps the primary role of our democracy and

tells us what we think.

Anyway, there will be little room for this sort of thing under our new broad democracy, where both our Sub-Senate and Main-Senate will regularly poll themselves on attitudes and policy.

The smyth catalogue

Our democracy really should catalogue all the propaganda and smything that has been going on. Mark Twain said it well.

"The trouble with the world is not that people know too little, but that they know so many things that ain't so." We really need to know all the parasite's many lies, so we can put its effort into reverse.

The Oscars: The nobel prize of the media

If you are going to tell a story in a way that will move people, there is nothing like a motion picture. In fact, film is held by many to be the greatest and most moving medium known to man. So it is a sad commentary on the state of mankind that the highest honor in the greatest medium is something that is corrupt and can be bought.

I mean, just look at the great Mideast propaganda film Lawrence of Arabia, the so-called "Best Picture" of 1962. Look at how they hired 3 MPAA crews in 3 locations. They hired 3 crews, while all the other films only had one. On top of this, they hired thousands of extras. All these people tended to vote their resume around Oscar time.

The MPAA renamed itself

It is now the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. Talk about a power grab by an Arab tool.

Income taxation subsidizes advertising and media corruption

We have already discussed how our corporate fictional citizens are openly corrupt because they sell voting rights with shares on the stock market. We have also discussed the immense cash flows of these fictional citizens. And we have discussed how our government seems almost designed to run on money.

Shouldn't we at least have some sort of tax on corporate advertising if it is so corrupting and anti-democratic? It is the strangest thing that we don't have a tax. In fact, we have the opposite of a tax. We have a 100% tax deduction — a subsidy — for corporate advertising. Apparently the parasite needs more corporate advertising.

9-DM. Designed to hear groups, not individuals

US style democracy is a system that works really well at listening to groups. It does this by offering pretty much no channel at all for individuals to be heard. I mean, you can go to Washington (the proverbial distant capital in the middle of nowhere) and try to meet with your 1:1 million congressman, but he probably won't have time to see you. Pretty much the only way to get heard (in general) is to be part of a large group. And of course this is what our parasite wants. This because our parasite is strongest, and we are weakest when all change flows through our non-democratic, and corruptible sub-groups.

Our new democracy on the other hand will work the opposite way. It will hear flesh and blood voters very well, but it will offer no specific way for non-democratic, or extra-democratic groups to be heard. So if one like Exxon needs to be heard, it will have to ask its shareholders to "lobby" their Nomes as individuals.

Make lobbying a crime

Let's make illegal to take money for presenting the ideas of others to the Senate. We all accept that people have to cast their own ballot. Why do we allow people to lobby government for others?

A democracy is a group mind

Is your group mind completely honest and truthful with itself?

Star Trek 2, Wrath of Kahn film

"Their young enter through the ears and wrap themselves around the cerebral cortex. This has the effect of rendering the victim extremely susceptible to suggestion. Later as they grow follows madness and death." [This is more about our group mind, but it also applies to us as individuals living in a matrix.]

A democracy is a group mind

There is this desperate parasite race that has focused its entire national effort on climbing inside our group minds and taking over our institutions. This parasite race is manipulating the group mind of our societies for its own parasitic agenda — something that is entirely negative and bad for us. Herein I offer you some ways to exclude these people, and their group spirit from your institutions, and especially your governments.

George Orwell's political novel 1984

**"WAR is PEACE
FREEDOM is SLAVERY
IGNORANCE is STRENGTH"**

George Orwell grew up in Islamic Bangladesh and Big Brother was largely based on the Mideast's big Brotherhood. In Bangladesh, Orwell's tele-screens walked around and talked. Orwell incidentally died (or was assassinated) at only age 47, the year after publishing his political novel 1984.

The ministry of truth is real. It must exist in total secrecy, but it is real, and it does gently change historical events and words like odious rex into Oedipus Rex.

The Arab ministry of truth runs all media outlets today

Something must be done about our parasite's "influence" over the commercial media. Something must be done with the thumbs-men like Rich-ard Quest, and Wolf Pull-it-sir (with matrix names for corrupt thumbs-men). And clearly, if the highest award in journalism is a Pull-it-sir prize, we in the host part of the world have big problems. Something also must be done with the "Bros", the Brotherly shape-shifters like Ourin Br'n-et, We-alter Koran-ak-ite, Al'oo D'obs, and Jeraldo Rivera the old river herald. These are like those perfect Cylons in the Arab heuristic guide called Battlestar Galactica.

Get them out of our heads

Don't let the Arabs work in your media any more. Make them confess one and all, or pay hell for failing to do so.

The matrix lies in the explanation of reality

Here are 3 real events that were spun into stories, and then into policy that benefitted our Mideast parasite: How can we leave this incredible power to a false anarchy?

1) German hyper-inflation from the 1920s teaches us that we can't endlessly print money and lower the value of our currency. In truth, the only people harmed by a little constant inflation are savers like our parasite. If ever the world suffered a consistent inflation rate of even 10%, the parasite would eventually cease to exist. The parasite hates inflation the

same way vampires hate daylight.

2) The internment of Japanese Americans during WW2 teaches us that the land of the free can't lock up whole classes of citizen, like for example all Mideast and Muslim Americans in time of war or crisis. In truth this is something that absolutely must be done in this crisis, unless Islam completely implodes.

3) The bad example of the USSR shows us that communism is always bad. In truth communism has its place within a capitalist framework. Examples include the post office, the military, street lighting, internet and telephony services, public transit, water, and sewer. In other words, as long as communism is used in the right ways, it is a great idea.

Mnemosune

Gr. **MNEMOSUNE** (meme+sym) was the Greek goddess of memory and the mother of the muses (fathered by Zeus). Her name meant memory. Now the Greco-Roman gods were mostly group gods: The people of Athens were protected by Athena, the people of Rome by Jupiter Capitolinus. Hermes protected merchants, traders, and travelers and kept the roads safe from bandits, and the waters safe from pirates. Hermes was also the patron of thieves, cheaters, and liars. Mars was the god of war and armies. And Nike/Victoria was the goddess of victory for whole cities or armies.

So MNEMOSUNE is probably the god of group (rather than individual) memory, group thought, and group perceptions. This leaves us with two possibilities about MNEMOSUNE:

1) She was the god of accurately preserved group memories, group thoughts and group perceptions, sort of the goddess of accuracy in media and archives OR, 2) She was the god of changed memories, changed group perceptions, and changed beliefs — a sort of goddess of George Orwell's famous Ministry of Truth. Here we also imagine Mnemosune as a goddess of propaganda and our parasite pruning its tree of knowledge. Not a god not of memory and history, but of forgetting and re-writing history, re-writing our group memories and group perceptions that were problems for the Sphinx agenda of our parasite.

Gr. **A•MNE•SIA** supposedly is about individual forgetfulness, but maybe it is group or cultural forgetting brought about by the parasite. Maybe it is redundant to say collective amnesia. Maybe most amnesia is collective amnesia. Are their any reliable statistics on the occurrence of head-injury amnesia? How common is this? It seems that amnesia is much more a collective, group problem than an individual one.

Gr. **A•MN•OS** is normally translated as lamb, but actually, it means without thoughts. Here we see another dimension to all that talk of lambs and flocks. The Brothers want for their flock to be made up of dumb amnesiac Gr.amnos=lambs that mindlessly follow their Arab shepherds and do as they have been programmed.

Gr. **MNE•MON•IC** and Gr. **MNE•MON** = "mne+mono"= having one thought in your mind, like most Americans after September 11. The memory-aid definition of this word is a blurd or blurring word that comes from our parasite. The intersection of the two meanings is how September as a mnemonic is very hard for the American people to forget.

ANEMONE is from Gr. anemone=the metaphorical windflower, or daughter of the wind. and Gr. anemos=wind or thoughts or seeds scattered to the wind like Amnesia.

Plato's Apology (23d):

[Here SO•CRATES, the impersonization of Athenian ISO•CRACY=equal•rule, talks about the Arab smear campaign launched against the Athenian all-men-are-created-equal form of government.] "They were so jealous, I suppose, of their own reputation, and also energetic and numerically strong, and spoke about me with such vigor and persuasiveness, that their harsh criticisms have for a long time now been monopolizing your ears."

CNN edition 2016.05.31, quoting Donald Trump

"The billionaire had called the news conference to announce an accounting of his at least \$5.6 million in fundraising for veterans groups, but spent most of the 40 minutes criticizing and insulting reporters -- collectively and at times individually -- as 'dishonest', 'not good people,' sleazy, and among the worst human beings he has ever met." [The beginning and ending quotation marks are mine. Note how the underlined was not in CNN's quotation marks. CNN seems to have put these words into Trump's mouth, saying much about the corrupt paid commercial media.

Now I must leave it at this, but I think that the media is obviously persecuting Trump to help him. Trump is after all just what they are looking for in a figurehead. And he did get his start obtaining the air rights over a church. He made a whopping fortune on this in fact. Then he went on to bring gambling to the east coast — another objective of the parasite.]

Anton Chekhov:

"Advertising is the very essence of democracy"

[Advertising is the very essence of the current Arab-friendly form of democracy practiced around the world today]

Martin Booth, Cannabis a History, Ch.18

"In 1968 Lewis Yablonsky [Loo•is Yid•al•one•sky]... published The Hippie Trip, a sociological study that estimated there were 200,000 hippies in America with the same number again who lived a hippie existence when they could and hundreds of thousands more young professionals, students and middle-class executives who used psychedelic drugs, occasionally LSD but most commonly marijuana, but did not become hippies per se. This was still less than 0.2 percent of the American population but, because of press attention, they were considered to be a substantial minority with millions of sympathizers." [Here is the parasite explaining the tactics it uses to manipulate our openly corrupt paid media — So it can fake its tiny insignificant little sub-culture into ubiquity. So it could put America to sleep under drugs for the embargo.

Can we leave this aspect of our society up for grabs? See, the parasite doesn't work with small lies so much as entire sub-cultures, matrixes, religions.]

Corporate fictional citizens are back doors to our democracies.

Corporations are institutions that generally must give voting rights to anyone who buys shares. This generally includes investors, but it also includes those who might want to buy 5% of their competitor, and then gently but persistently sabotage it into bankruptcy. It also includes people who might want to use the corporation as an advertising or lobbying tool. So, inherent in the for-sale voting architecture of all corporations is the potential that shares might be bought up, and the fictional citizen used as a front for nefarious activities.

Now total ownership or even 50% ownership is not

needed to steer a corporation. However, in an environment of 3/4 shareholder apathy, it would take 12.5% of a company's shares for absolute control. But it might only take 2% or 7% of shares to swing a close vote — especially if the matter is unimportant to most shareholders. For example, using this ad company or that ad company. And in an environment of widespread shareholder apathy, it still might only take 5% ownership to swing a CEO vote. Thus it might only take 5% to swing the vote and install a new CEO who will pursue a given strategy that is superficially plausible, but destructive in the long run. For example, the new oil company CEO might "boost profits" in the short term by outsourcing its drilling services to "specialist" drillers run by OPEC. Or he might cut corners in a way that makes a mess of the environment, thus provoking new environmental regulations that will significantly raise the cost of oil drilling over the long run.

Here we see how the people who brought the world the assassin and the suicide bomber also use our fictional citizens as yet another sort of expendable suicide terrorist. This time it is a fictional citizen committing suicide and provoking Byzantine regulation in our nations — regulation that will raise the operating costs of Mideast competitors.

Or perhaps we are talking about the financial industry, and the new CEO might get the company to foolishly guarantee subprime debt obligations. Then these debt guarantees increase the amount of worldwide borrowing, thus pumping up the world economy so that Arab oil embargo 2.0, "the stealth embargo," can take place in the years 2002- 2008.

5% of a company's shares might also get the company's advertising company changed, so the brotherhood can piggyback its subtle propaganda messages. 5% of a company's shares might also get an oil company to foolishly give money to the very environmental groups that seek to increase regulation of the company's industry.

Now, clearly, some of "our" corporations have served as backdoors for foreign interests to buy influence in our democracy. So under the circumstances, why do we allow undemocratic corporate money to have any voice/ sway in our democracies?

And if it really is our corporations themselves that are so powerful in America, how come they lobby for legislation that harms their own competitiveness and helps boost Mideast wealth? Apparently, it is not our corporations that are so powerful, but the land of no resources using our corporations in concert to push for their own parasite's agenda in our government.

Tip: To find Haremi moles in boardrooms, just look for the people who are overly concerned with the choice of ad men, and those overly concerned with giving money to environmental charities.

Free speech and the corporate citizen

We created fictional business citizens (Corporations) because they are supposedly a harmless economic expedient. But clearly the current rights we grant to our giant corporations are the source of much harm to our democracies, and their ability to accurately hear the true voice of the people. There is clear evidence that our largest, wealthiest and most powerful corporations have been 'possessed' and exploited by the Mideast parasite race to subvert our national interests over recent decades.

For example the oddly named Shell oil company pours out millions to tell us on TV that "all the easy oil is gone". And Exxon and Chevron indirectly say much the same thing when they pour out millions to run ads about their moronic

deep water drilling platforms. And many oil companies also run 'environmental' ads against the interests of the US oil industry. And Exxon is also one of the largest Congressional lobbyists, constantly lobbying for more environmentalism and against the interests of the US oil industry.

Fortunately, our democracy is under no obligation to treat its fictional citizens as it treats its real flesh and blood citizens. If we have a good reason, we are totally free to strip our fictional citizens of any rights we choose, including the most primary right of free speech.

Free speech is the free exchange of knowledge between citizens — real flesh and blood citizens. And this public discussion has head-and-shoulders primacy over all other rights in a democracy. Knowing what we are voting for (we the flesh and blood people casting ballots) is the single most important thing in a democracy. It comes ahead of all other rights of human citizens. Then, after this, we have the other rights of human citizens, Such as: the right to assemble, to bear arms, the right to due process, the right to be free from intrusive government. Then after these rights, we as human citizens have dozens of other rights that come ahead of the rules we establish for the behavior of our fictional citizens.

Human free speech trumps all else

The right to free speech is the right of real flesh and blood citizens to discuss what this are voting on. Nothing must ever be allowed to dilute or crowd-out that first-and-foremost right in any way. And fictional citizens shall never have the right to divert their immense cash streams to express political or economic views that may drown out the voice of the real citizens.

The flesh and blood citizens that own the corporations shall always be free to say what they want. These humans can lobby our democracy all they want on behalf of their financial interests, but the fictional citizens themselves do not have this right. Fictional citizens must remain absolutely apolitical in every way, or they must pay punitive 'environmental' sized fines like our oil companies have had to pay when they spill a little oil.

We absolutely want firewalls (as many as practical) between our democracy and the enormous and easily diverted revenue streams of our openly corrupt public corporations, institutions that sell influence by the share. These fictional citizens are simply too easy to use as lobbying puppets, as well as adversing puppets and sponsorship puppets.

If we do otherwise and give our fictional citizens the right to free speech, there is a massive downside. Then we see a dilution of the single most fundamental thing in a democracy, the right of real flesh and blood citizens to have a fair and open discussion about what they are voting for.

We have every right to change the rules of fictional citizens

Don't get confused. Fictional citizens are not real — they are entirely fictional. And because they are not real, they have no inherent rights the way the people do. Therefore, the human citizens have the right to establish absolutely any rules they want with respect to their fictional citizens — anything at all they find expedient.

We are free to say to Exxon, "you are a commodity company, and commodity companies never have any legitimate reason to advertise because of the interchangeable nature of what they sell."

We are also free to take Exxon and cut it up into 900 little pieces. In fact, in 1911, the US Supreme court actually did

break S.O. or Standard Oil into 34 pieces. Unfortunately, the Arab fronting monopolist beast was not killed. It reformed into a new behemoth first called Esso and then Exxon. And today Standard Oil, 146 years old, lives on. And once again, it owns most of the oil industry in the US.

Theodore Roosevelt's speech on trusts 1901.12.03

"There is a widespread conviction in the minds of the American people that the great corporations known as trusts [monopolies] are in certain of their features and tendencies hurtful to the general welfare. This springs from no spirit of envy or uncharitableness, nor lack of pride in the great industrial achievements that have placed this country at the head of the nations struggling for commercial supremacy. It does not rest upon a lack of intelligent appreciation of the necessity of meeting changing and changed conditions of trade with new methods, nor upon ignorance of the fact that combination of capital in the effort to accomplish great things is necessary when the world's progress demands that great things be done. It is based upon sincere conviction that combination and concentration should be, not prohibited, but supervised and within reasonable limits controlled; and in my judgment this conviction is right. [This is the talk of the Arabs seeking to maintain their highly profitable monopolies like Standard Oil as long as possible. The correct path is to smitherine these entities, leaving their citizen shareholders all with their fair share of the former company's component parts.]

It is no limitation upon property rights or freedom of contract to require that when men receive from Government the privilege of doing business under corporate form, (which frees them from individual responsibility, and enable them to call into their enterprises the capital of the public), they shall do so upon absolutely truthful representations as to their value of the property in which the capital is to be invested. Corporations engaged in interstate commerce should be regulated if they are found to exercise a license working to the public injury. It should be as much the aim of those who seek social-betterment to rid the business world of crimes of cunning as to rid the entire body politic of crimes of violence. Great corporations exist only because they are created and safeguarded by our [nation's] institutions. And it is therefore our right and our duty to see that they work in harmony with these institutions.

The first essential in determining how to deal with the great industrial combinations is knowledge of the facts - publicity. In the interest of the public, the Government should have the right to inspect and examine the workings of the great corporations engaged in interstate business. Publicity [public knowledge of their activities] is the only sure remedy which we can now invoke. What further remedies are needed in the way of governmental regulation, or taxation, can only be determined after publicity has been obtained, by process of law, and in the course of administration...

The large corporations, commonly called trusts [monopolies], though organized in one State, always do business in many States... and as no State has any exclusive interest in or power over their acts. It has in practice proved impossible to get adequate regulation through State action. Therefore, in the interest of the whole people, the nation should, without interfering with the power of the States in the matter itself, also assume power of supervision and regulation over all corporations doing an interstate business. This is especially true where the corporation derives a portion of its wealth from the existence of some monopolistic element or tendency in its business. There would be no hardship in such

[supervision. Banks are subject to it, and in their case it is now accepted as a simple matter of course. Indeed, it is probable that supervision of corporations by the National Government need not go so far as is now the case with the supervision exercised over them by so conservative a State as Massachusetts, in order to produce excellent results."](#)

Arab insulation industry sabre-tage

Look at the remarkable coincidence of how the nation's insulation companies all suffered from asbestos lawsuits around Embargo time. Look at what this supposedly did to their ability to scale operations and reduce the cost of insulation. Clearly the Arabs sabotaged and set up our insulation companies so that the cost of insulation would stay high.

Government oversight of public corporations

It is remarkable how frequently American corporations have gotten themselves and their investors into trouble. Just think of Enron, Tyco, Worldcom, Subprime, the S&L crisis, the Dot-Com Bubble. And let's not forget how America's car companies "mysteriously" produced their largest, heaviest cars gas guzzling cars just before the oil embargoes of both 1973 and 2003.

We have been trying to regulating corporate behavior through a huge set of rules and ruinously expensive civil court judgments. There is obviously a problem here. This is obviously not working, because we have destroyed much of our nation's industry using this approach.

We are never going to think of all the circumstances under which our companies might be used as puppets, or lead into self destruction by our parasite. It is a situation where loopholes will be endlessly discovered, exploited and then "fixed," while regulations grows and grows, stifling our nation's industrial base. Let's instead have some basic, simple, and commonsense rules for those who accept a bicameral corporate board with a Senate jury serving as the secondary house of their corporate board. If 2/3 of these Senators vote against any spending they can cancel that line item for that corporation. And in exchange for this, the corporation will not only get democratic oversight, but it will also get civil indemnity for all fully disclosed matters and all unknown worker fraud. The recent VW emissions fiasco is a great example.

Let's cut the rules for public corporations to a minimum, a common sense bare minimum where our industrial sector can better function and compete. Then instead of having lots of rules, we should use teams of Sub-Senators to visit our corporations to find out what they are doing and planning and reporting on anything harmful that they find. Think of how bank regulators watch over what our banks do. Anyway, as follows are some things that our elected and relatively unbiased Sub-Senate business regulators might look for:

1. Excessive management compensation.
2. Taking excessive risks to boost profits.
3. Excessive harm to the environment.
4. Short term profit at excessive long term cost.
5. Producing dangerous products like drugs with known side-effects.
6. Unfair or unwise labor practices, either domestically or foreign.
7. Involvement of the corporation in politics.
8. Abuse of market power, collusion or anti competitive behavior.
9. Above market purchases or leases by corporate officials that suggest corruption.
10. Below market sales/ leases/ loans by corporate officials

that suggest corruption.

11. Advertising that contains Mideast propaganda.
12. Commission incentives that make employees behave in anti-social ways.
13. Harming or deceiving the public.
14. Causing harm in other countries.
15. Behavior that might in any way lead to a public bailout.

The Sub-Senate watches over the nation's industry

Perhaps we want to assign say 10% to 20% our Cent-Nomes to watch over America's public corporations. We can use this sort of democratic oversight to slash the level of regulation in America, something that shifts the entire work-enjoyment coefficient. With this sort of oversight, we can absolve our corporations of most liability for all possible honest mistakes. Perhaps it is only common sense that we invade the privacy of our fictional entities a little bit in exchange for their right to do business more-or-less freely.

For certain industries, like chemicals, Senate oversight should be mandatory. For others, like software companies, it might be optional, and up to the shareholders to impose or not on their management.

No right to privacy for fictional citizens

Vampires are a metaphor for a certain type of parasitic bloodsucking evil — practices that dies if exposed to broad daylight. Basically, evil needs darkness or obscurity to live, because when people can see evil going on, they stop it and the evil dies.

This is why our fictional citizen should all be under democratic scrutiny. Basically, if any group wants to use one of these vehicles, they will need to allow a huddle of Sub-Senators on their board to observe what is going on. What is the fictional citizen spending money on exactly? What are the results of the drug trial? Are the salary schemes being using to compensate people excessive? What are they doing about the rupture-prone gas tanks on their Pinto cars? Our democracy has a right to know all this in detail from our fictional citizens — and our fictional citizens have no real right to privacy with respect to Senate oversight.

Then, because our democracy, our society is taking so much responsibly here, we as a society can probably waive or indemnify most liability for honest accidents on the part of these fictional citizens.

Our fictional citizens are run by oligarchies

Do we really want to grant the DOZENISH people on the board of Exxon, GM, Chevron, Google, Apple, etc. so much power.

Exxon ads: Our oil is better

The very idea of commodity and financial companies pouring out good money to differentiate their inherently undifferentiated commodities is absurd. The benefits to these companies are so slim that their immense size is the only possible justification. Nevertheless, zero times anything is still zero, and the advertising still seems contrived with respect to actually generating profits.

Luckily, our society is free to limit the rights of fictional corporate citizens in any way it wishes. It is even free to discriminate based on what sort of business activity the fictional citizens engage in. After all, we only recently allowed lawyers and doctors to advertise (fools that we are).

So here we ask: What does society gain from letting its biggest fictional citizens attempt to differentiate their undifferentiated commodity products except an enormous

backdoor for democracy manipulation? Our parasite gets to kill three birds with one stone here: A) It gets its competition (our commodity companies) to waste their money running ads B) It gets to put its own messages in these ads, messages like the idea that we running out of whatever commodity our parasite is monopolizing, and C) It gets to pick which destructive programming we see.

So let's prohibit commodity companies from advertising, just like we used to prohibit lawyers and doctors from advertising. And let's include some other industries that could loosely be called commodities, and some others: insurance, healthcare, non-novel drugs of any sort including alcohol and tobacco, legal services, education, transportation in addition to every commodity currently traded on the Chicago Board of Trade. And let's not forget the all important financial industry, in its widest definition, including stock brokers, banks, lenders, debt relief, structured settlement buyouts etc. And why on earth do we allow fictional citizens to run ads encouraging people to take on more debt?

5-DM. Corporations pretending to be the people

Our public corporations are all openly corrupt. After all, they all sell voting rights along with ownership rights on the open market. Buy a share of stock and you automatically get a vote. Buy a million shares, get a million votes. What can be more corrupt than this?

profits from. On an individual basis, companies can be steered off a cliff. Car companies can be steered into making idiotic small cars like Pacers and Gremlins and the famously flammable Pintos. They can also be steered into not making larger iPhones for years, while their competitors gained a foothold. And oil companies can be made to foolishly drill for oil in the ocean. Oil companies can also be made to support the same charities calling for regulation that will curtail their own corporate profitability. So as individuals, our corporations are completely corruptible.

As well, our corporations, can be made to run like a herd. So when our puppet corporations all lean at once towards oil-wasting "renewable energy," it convincingly gives the matrix illusion that our own business community, and own national political consensus is leaning in that direction. When the puppets all lean towards tighter environmental standards, our business community seems to lean in that direction. How about that for "manufacturing consent"?

Now recall how our national political system has been designed to run on money. Also recall how our corporations are openly corrupt in how they sell voting rights by the share. Next ponder the immense cash streams of our corporations. Put it all together and we have the massive cash streams of corrupt corporations working to corrupt a democracy designed to run on money. Thus a 5% to 10% minority of corporate shareholders overall (in many corporations) — if they can all work under one flag, for the same cause, will have significant sway over our nation's corporations. If this happens with enough corporations, they will also have significant sway of our nation's democracy.

These immense corporate cash streams can be used to support candidates, political agendas, and parties. They can also be used to support anything at all in the media — environmentalism, slender women, alcohol consumption, anti-reproductive propaganda, "Take life a little easier - make life a little easier" commercials, anything really.

All of this is thanks to how we give our fictional citizens the right of free speech. So basically, our parasite thanks to the corporate investments it made with our oil money,

steers our openly corrupt corporate sub-democracies that fund our media and our campaigns. Pretty corrupt huh?

So the question is, why do we allow these fictional citizens to have the same free speech rights as real flesh and blood citizens? Why do we allow these massive, and openly corrupt sham democracies to spend money to help certain candidates get elected, and help certain policies to be implemented? These are not real citizens, and they are not allowed to vote. In fact, the idea of a company like Exxon voting is absurd. So why do we allow our corporations to divert huge sums of money from our national economy and use this money to corrupt the voting of our democracy?

I say that the right of free speech is the right of real people. I say we are wrong to let these fictional citizens, these pseudo democracies, these for openly corrupt entities, use their billions to shout out the true voice of the people. I say that by doing that, we are just handing our democracy over to our parasite.

Benito Mussolini

"Fascism should rightly be called corporatism, as it is the merger of corporate and government power."

Thur·good Mar·shall (thur=sacrifice, mar=bar)

"Our whole constitutional heritage rebels at the thought of giving government the power to control men's minds." [He didn't say democracy or corporations, he said government, or co·br'n·ment.]

Thomas Jefferson 1800.09.23:

"I have sworn upon the altar of god, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the minds of men"

8-DM. Free speech is the right of real people

Nobody argues for giving fictional citizens the right to vote with humans because the idea is totally and obviously corrupt. But what about the right to advertise messages that voter decisions are based upon? If we give this right to our openly corrupt fictional citizens and their huge cash streams, aren't we allowing our democracy to be corrupted just the same as if we let our fictional citizens vote?

Just as voting is the exclusive right of real flesh and blood citizens in a democracy, so must the right of free speech to inform those voters be the exclusive right of real flesh and blood citizens. The rights of fictional corporate citizens and other institutional citizens to express their opinions (inherently corrupt as they are) should be considered utterly irrelevant in comparison to this primary right of real flesh and blood citizens.

I mean, consider Exxon, the largest company in the world at times: Do we want to give this company any political power at all outside what its shareholders have as individuals? Do we want to give the Exxon fictional citizen even the weight of one flesh and blood citizen? Why then do we allow its immense cash flows to lobby our democracy and attempt to change/corrupt its decisions? Doesn't Exxon then become a backdoor to our democracy? And what of Exxon's sponsorship of the news media? Doesn't that corrupt the news media?

We must not allow these non-electorate voices to drown out, or pose as the voice of the people informing itself about how to vote. We must not allow these giant corporate money flows to be used to run ad messages that are politically, economically or culturally oriented in any way at all (as judged by our broad Sub-Senate).

Most advertising by fictional citizens should not exist.

The only fictional citizens that have any business advertising are the ones with substantially new, and genuinely new products to promote. It is also wrong to allow our immense corporate money flows to be used to support any particular TV show/ magazine over any other. If we allow this, our parasite will just go on sponsoring its choices for what we see in our openly corrupt paid commercial media.

The main point of corporate advertising

Look at how C&H sugar spent so much money on national advertising. What did it get for is money? Perhaps the main purpose of much corporate brand advertising is not to stimulate the advertiser's business. Perhaps corporate advertising exists to sponsor the Media that the parasite wants.

YELLOW = yell•o = yell•not = someone who is afraid of talking about something the Brothers wanted to keep secret.

My dog **OLD YELLER** = old yell•our = A dog (a man) that yells on behalf of the Brothers, whenever someone comes up a path

YELLOW FEVER = yell•o feever = yell•not fever. Germ warfare used to stop the people from yelling about some dangerous idea.

YELLOW BELLY = yell•o pulli, or yell•no pulli

BLUE•BELLY = pull•oo puli

YELLOW JOURNALISM = yell•o or yell•not journalism

YELLO•CRACY = rule/ influence by those who are yell the loudest, or bitch, cry, complain, wail or ululate the most. All yellocracies are corrupt like Islam's Umma is a yellocracy.

TERROR•OCRACY = rule/ influence by those who might commit violent acts. Terrorocracy is a subset of yellocracy.

weak

Corporate Yellocracy as a backdoor

Democracy doesn't happen when we vote — it is only measured there. Democracy happens in the court of public opinion. And since ancient Greek times (at least), the court of public opinion has largely operated as a shouting match — a shouting match that one big well-organized clan (the Arabian Harem spawn) has mostly dominated.

Today, the chorus of brothers is still the loudest voice in the world's media. This is due mostly to: 1) That our corporations, with their massive cash streams are pretty much the only ones who can afford to advertise and sponsor. and 2) That our corporations all sell voting rights by the share. If you buy a thousand shares of stock, you automatically get a thousand votes in that fictional citizen.

Thus our media has been corrupted. Thus our corporations, our openly corrupt fictional citizens dominate our media, and the people in our democracy are all priced out of their own media. Thus "The big guys have it all sewn up", and the people are significantly disadvantaged in using their own media. In other words, the voice of the people is drowned out by the voice of our fictional citizens supposedly organized for the convenience the people — but actually sponsoring the messages of Mideast Inc.

Under this state of affairs, our openly corrupt corporations decide which television shows, and which magazines and newspapers get enough ad dollars to thrive and even survive. And notably, these decisions are not normally made by the corporation itself, but by "ad-men" that supposedly compete for juicy contracts from the nation's corporations. It is these ad-men who make the decisions about which TV shows and magazines get the corporate money. They are the sphinx in the system. Now the parasite apparently had some problems with the matrix here. This is

why it put together that super entertaining and memorable TV series Mad Men — to reinforce its official parallax reality.

It is important to realize that with only 5% or 10% of a company's stock, and the other shareholders mostly indifferent, the Brothers can easily tip the boat and hire their chosen Mad Men — people like the famous Charles (Ghas)Saatchi, an Arab ad man who looks rather like Muammer Gaddafi. The result being that many ads have subtile piggyback messages and most corporate money goes to sponsors the parasites choice for our media.

Here it is worth suggesting that the primary purpose of all those \$100,000 wristwatch ads in Time, Newsweek, the Economist, and the New York Times is not to sell more overpriced "Swiss" watches, but to sponsor the Arab parasite's version of reality for its host. In other words the primary purpose is to prune the tree of knowledge.

Here we see that these expensive luxury product ads are not primarily for "branding purposes", but to shape our worldview by deciding which news outlets survive. These ads also exist to gently encourage broad subjects: more coverage of environmental issues, more coverage of Mideast politics, more head injury sports, more fashion, more gas guzzling SUVs, etc. Here it is easy to imagine someone saying: "We at Brolex watches will have to see more green stories from your news magazine or we will have to cut our ad purchases."

The ability of the people to express their own organic voice is diminished, severely diminished by this system. In fact, it seems that US style democracy, and US style media were designed to minimize the power of the voting public, and maximize the power of organizations that the parasite can buy, up or otherwise influence.

The power of the people, the actual electorate is severely diminished under this system. It is diminished because the voice of the people, the electorate must compete in a super expensive system where elections cost millions to buy/win. It is a system where corporate investors, and corporate board members have far too much power in our media and in our elections.

NEWSCORP: our parasite's ministries of truth

Our corporate news outlets, on TV and in print not only define our political debates, but they define the nature of free speech as if their opaque, openly-corrupt, for-profit "business" was the all critical link.

Democratic Media: Media of the people, by the people and for the people

The alternative to a commercial media is not a PBS style media where a few appointees or hirelings "edit" what we see and hear. The true alternative is a democratic media, and here is where America will use most of its 1-million Sub-Senators. These will form a huge corps of democratically elected new editors that will vote to determine value. This army of Sub-Senators will assemble, and oversee our democratic news and democratic educational channels. They will create a system of parallel competing and redundant feeds for democratically informing the people, by the people, about every subject.

People will still be able to say anything they want in the paid commercial media. But there will also be a new sort of media (a media funded with a sliver of GPD, maybe as low as 1% of GDP). It will be a media where hundreds of thousands of our best people, our 1:500 Sub-Senators decide in a decentralized sort of artificial market, what is valuable. Here, our democracy will use its own voice to inform itself — a voice without any extra-democratic money involved at all — a

voice that will compete with those who would use money to change our group decisions.

We will have free speech, in that anyone can say anything as today; but the role currently played by our commercial information outlets will have competition from a huge corps of democratically elected Sub-Senators. Hopefully, very quickly, the feeds run by our elected Sub-Senators will come to be the most respected news source. Hopefully this will significantly hamper the efforts of our parasite to alter our group mind and culture.

If we can trust our elected officials to make our government decisions, why can't we trust them to run alternate channels in our news media? Now certainly we don't want the same officials both deciding for us and informing us about reality, but we will not be doing that. Our massive Sub-Senate will run the government's democratic media, and our very large Main-Senate will make the rules. Certainly this system will be less corrupt than Exxon and Rockefeller fronted sponsorships. Certainly it will be less corrupt than NewsCorp as fronted by Rupert Murdoch, the owner of Newsweek, the Wall Street Journal, Fox, and the NY Post.

Incidentally, Saudi prince Alwaleed Bin Talal is reported to own over 5% of NewsCorp and Rupert Murdoch with only some 30% is supposedly desperate to keep control away from rivals. It is reported that in exchange for Bin Talal's critical vote-swinging proxy, Murdoch gives the Saudi prince control over content in NewsCorp outlets like Newsweek, the Wall Street Journal, etc. This is probably why all the Wall Street Journal vending machine in the US ceaselessly display Arab propaganda about oil discoveries on the sea floor — a story that makes one think that deep sea and hard to find oil is all that is left in the world.

Anyway under a democratic media, our hundreds of thousands of Sub-Senators will vote on what are the most important information items, actually electing the most relevant new information, instead of letting ad dollars from Mideast puppets like Exxon decide which news stories come to fore. See, democracy of the people by the people and for the people is not merely about the people voting on policy themselves. The people must also inform themselves in a way that is of the people by the people and for the people. Failing to do that, our democracy has a backdoor for corruption to enter through.

Here is perhaps the biggest reason why America needs a corps of a million Sub-Senators. Most of our Sub-Senators will work figuring out what is true and relevant. Our Sub-Senators will thus act as a democratically elected corps of editors, producers and librarians, educators, and most importantly buyers. They will vote on the stories of the hour/week/month/year, as well as eternally relevant works.

The Sub-Senate will also allocate the federal UBIQUITIZATION BUDGET where it helps our democracy and indeed our society the most. Here our Sub-Senate will create a sort of reverse economy, a communist economy, one that pays inventors and creators a percent off the top, tax free and hassle free. Then society owns the intellectual property and focuses on getting it into use quickly.

Our thousands of Centi-Nomes will each vote on how they will allocate their ubiquitization budget. Here is how our society will UBIQUITIZE all sorts of important books, films, educational material, inventions, drugs, treatments, and other things. Here society will con-dem the intellectual property for slightly generous amounts to the originator(s) — more than fair value on the open market, and money trouble free. Then society will place the intellectual property in the public domain

for all to freely use.

And generous is the key term here, because our generosity is our society's innovation subsidy. It is our generosity (or stinginess) here that will make our PISS = public innovation subsidy system. At the most basic, the UBIQUITIZING PAMENT will be based on the value to society: And this payment by design must be more money in less time than the market would net the UBIQ or ANDAR.

From Khaled Abou El Fadl's "Wrestling Islam from the extremists"(p. 87-88):

["Saudi Arabia had created a complex worldwide system of financial incentives that amply rewarded those who advocated 'the right type' of thought. ... A Muslim scholar spending a six month sabbatical in a Saudi Arabian university would make more money in the course of this sabbatical than he would make in ten years of teaching at the Azhar university in Egypt. Similarly, writers or imams espousing pro Wahhabi positions would qualify for very lucrative contracts, grants and awards... In fact, the most alarming development of the 1980s was that even Muslim scholars who were known for their liberalism and rationalism wrote defending Wahhabism -- portraying it as a movement most capable of confronting the challenges of modernity."](#) [Do you really think the Arabs have not done the same thing with our media, our science and our academia?]

44. Dubai, Dubai, Dubai!

Some years ago, a CNBC financial news anchor named Erin Burnett did a week long special on location in Dubai. At first, it seemed that Miss Burnett was simply impressed with Dubai. But after a while, it became apparent that the word Dubai was being crammed in wherever possible. In fact, one got the distinct impression that Miss Burnet was being paid a sum of money each time she mentioned Dubai on the air. Finally, one day, when Miss Burnet had already worked the word Dubai into the program far too many times, she was apparently told to stop saying Dubai by her producers. At this point Miss Burnet said something on air like, "I guess I am saying Dubai too many times. I don't know why I'm not supposed to say Dubai any more. If I want to say Dubai, I am going to say Dubai as much as I want, Dubai, there, Dubai, Dubai, Dubai, Dubai."

Miss Burnett's behavior is a window to the journalism industry today. Clearly we have journalists taking bribes to insert messages. And while these remarks while totally unethical, and probably a matter of interest for the tax man, are not really criminal today. And by itself, mentioning Dubai is harmless. However, if all of the world's 1,000 top journalists are "sleazy" and taking a little extra money to run our parasite's version of news, that is a big problem. Here are some of the message I would suggest are being inserted into our media:

- 1) That the world running out of oil and other resources.
- 2) That our tsunami flood zones should be considered precious wetland habitats worthy of 100% protection from the environmental horrors of oil drilling.
- 3) That tsunami generated sand bar beaches are the best place to live .
- 4) That all the easy oil is gone outside the Mideast.
- 5) That global warming is manmade and due to CO2.
- 6) That coal (which competes with Mideast oil) can't be burned due to CO2 'emissions'.
- 7) That remote open pit mines are ugly and somehow a crime against nature.
- 8) That black oil well pumps are hideously ugly. (modern pumps can be the size of a dishwasher and easily shrouded in

shrubs.)

9) That massive white windmills are beautiful and a great part of any natural landscape.

10) That wind energy only needs a little help to be practical. In fact, wind energy will never work because there simply isn't enough energy in the wind.

11) That chlorofluorocarbons which are substantially more energy efficient than current refrigerants needed to be curtailed. Refrigeration is by far the leading use of electricity, particularly peak electricity, which is mostly generated by oil, not coal.

12) That vehicle emissions which were over 98% clean are just not clean enough. And for this reason we will all have to suffer reductions in our vehicle mileage.

Married with children propaganda

The point of this Arab propaganda is to show the boring life of the idiots that get married and have more infidel children. Who wants to be like these losers?

Honeymooner TV propaganda

Jacki Gleason was J•aki kali•son. Here we see a message about childless losers living in the city. This show coincides with the advent of automobile-enabled American Suburbia because it helped drive that shift. This is what our corporate advertising budgets buy

The shows we see

Why do we allow our corrupt puppet corporations to select which TV programs and magazines we see? Why do we let them decide which movies to give their make-it-or-break-it product placement money to? Let's have a prohibitively high tax on product placement sales. Let's also have lots of prohibitions on what

The media was created for propaganda purposes

I explain [elsewhere](#) <link> how the play Oedipus Rex started as cautionary tale (tell/ warn) about the Sphinx Mafia, and how it once got control of ancient Greece through their king who became known as Odi•ous Rex = "our-ways" king. Then because this legend was a problem for our parasite, a new version was created, where the incriminating Sphinx was minimized or mined-out to the minimum role possible.

And most Greek Theatre contains propaganda in favor of a number of Arab belief systems/ matrixes. In Oedipus Rex, we see 93 mentions of the Arab oracle religion/matrix. Here we see that Greek Theater, and by extension, the media itself began as a ministry of truth — a ministry that would block out what was harmful to Mideast Inc. and substitute it with either helpful information, or rot. In Oedipus Rex, the ministry makes a harmful legend about an odious rex go away. Then it built a church on top of Oedipus Rex, calling it the greatest of all Greek plays.

An openly corrupt media is a back door

It is the funniest thing how we allow our openly corrupt commercial media to inform our democracy. Is this a check on plutocratic power within our government or a back door to it?

Rot media

The original meaning of ROT is as decay, deterioration and decline. However as slang, and referring to content or talk, the word also means nonsense or rubbish. It appears that this 2nd meaning (a limited and peculiar meaning) is a cover term for content that causes slow gentle decay, deterioration and

decline in the host society. Rot = our•ot = our•ear.

Today our minds rot on a diet of sports, celebrities, gun-battles, chase scenes, crime-solving, reality TV, fashion, homes, religion, sitcoms, historical dramatizations etc. I mean, what a bunch of time wasting, mind slowing garbage we watch.

The news media is not real

Look at all the fashion, celebrities, food, TV, automobiles, music, pop culture, film, art, real estate, decoration, gadgets and propaganda about the environment. Aside from this, the only "real" or "hard" news we see is about frightening Mideast violence designed to scare us all back into our holes.

The etyma of DRIVEL

The "archaic" meaning of DRIVEL is DRIBBLE, and a dribble is a weak trickle. So when people call media as drivels, it means that it dribbles on in a trickle, slowing the mind and putting the host society to sleep.

How to inform the people

There are basically 3 ways for society to determine what information should be seen by the people.

1. Use the market, an openly corrupt method.
2. Use appointees as with the corrupt Soviet new agency Pravda, and America's NPR and PBS.
3. Use a broad base of relatively incorruptible elected people.

I think we should use a combination of 3 and 1, with no restriction on 1 other than Sub-Senate ratings, stigmata, and child censorship. As well the Sub-Senate will have the right to strip harmful content of its copyrights and profit rights.

Identify all Temaseks and partial Temaseks

Temasek is the old name of Singapore. It is also the name of the Singapore government's wholly owned investment arm. Temasek owns 5% to 100% of dozens of corporations that all own stock in each other. The only outside owner is Temasek. Therefore, all these corporations, despite their confusing ownership structure are all owned by SPQS, the senate and people of Singapore. Here are some points about TEMASEKS:

- 1) All such confusing ownership structures over a certain scale have generally been created by the parasite to aid in feeding on a host society. This feeding may be today or it may be planned for centuries hence.

- 2) This sort of confusing hard to understand structure (like sub-prime) was created by the forces of darkness to hide economic parasitism. This sort of confusing ownership structure is a form of darkness, and a hallmark of the parasite.

- 3) If one of these corporations does something really bad, all should be responsible and we should not consider any of a Temasek's legal "fire-stops" as valid.

- 4) We might by rights declare all holdings of any Temasek simply as the Temasek.

- 5) Who really owns and profits from the Singapore Temasek? Is it the people of Singapore living in their little two-way tsunami funnel paradise for uber-rich people? Or is it the people who constantly seeks to reduce and eliminate all outside races?

- 6) Is the ownership structure of China's corporations a Temasek?

DEMOCRATIC MEDIA

Democracies must inform themselves

Our democracy must be self-sufficient with respect to the information it uses to make decisions. Anything less would be

a backdoor to power. To this end, our democracy should make every effort to inform itself start to finish using Senators.

Democratically elected reality

Don't leave your national consensus to a false anarchy.

Stop corruption first

It should be a top priority for our democracy, that it keep its thoughts clear and un-corrupted. The elimination of all identified sources of corruption, no matter how small should be a first priority.

Orwell's 1984

George Orwell's book 1984 provoked a number of great political insights in most readers. The book was also highly visual and easily adapted into a film.

The film 1984 (made in 1984) however provoked no insights at all. There were practically none of the useful political messages of the highly visual book. Instead, the film version of Orwell's remarkable book was totally gutted. Basically Orwell's warning was suppressed in a film produced by Mideast interests. So lesson #1 is that here we see what suppressed ideology looks like. Read 1984 and then watch the film (if you can find it anywhere). The difference is a lesson in Mideast Inc's suppression of ideology it finds harmful to its interests.

Now look at the way the Arab Ministry of Truth monitors and fills the web's bulletin boards and Wikis with their comments and content. This is lesson #2, what the ministry of truth really looks like today in 2013.

It is also worth suggesting that we are already living in an Orwellian world, a world where we spend most of our days in front of live two-way tele-screens. Perhaps the camera/screen on your laptop/ handheld should be viewed as a tele-screen. Perhaps big brother is in the process of tightening his grip. And perhaps Big Brother is not a government, or a political group, or a private army, but an ancient fraternal clan from the land of no resources, the same clan that perpetrated the Western Dark Ages 1410 years ago, along with some other ages of darkness on this planet. They are the same clan that has for most of history pitted the three continents against each other. So lesson #3 is that Big Brother is real today, and so are his tele-screens.

Boy the media gave/gives lots of free coverage to Twitter and Facebook, and the other networking websites. Big brother probably loves these websites. Now big brother knows alot about you. And most importantly he cares who is smartest in certain critical ways — who has certain dangerous interests, like history and democracy and or who reads or writes at a certain level. So Lesson #4 is that Orwell wrote his book over 60 years ago, and today Big Brother has even better ways to locate our smartest and "tallest" ears of corn. These can be cut down later, or eliminated today with a lawsuit, a marriage testing romance, a car accident, a disease, or any number of other ways.

Copyrights: Our two priorities

We have two priorities with regard to Copyrights. Firstly and obviously, they should incentivize people to spend lots of time exploring and sharing their discoveries. But secondly and less obviously is that they should never help people in their efforts to remove ideas from general circulation. By this I mean that nobody should ever be allowed to buy up an idea and mothball it for long periods of time.

The film version of George Orwell's novel 1984 is a

great example of rights being used to hide the truth. Look how we only have one film version of this great book. It comes from 1984 when they had to make a move. Look at how badly this movie hides the true meaning of the book. Look at how it is mostly un-available on video. Here we see the nation's intellectual property laws used to harm the people and their knowledge of the political truth.

Categories of free speech

We must draw a distinction between the right to utter your ideas in safety and the right to recover the money you spend trying to give life to your ideas. The right to know the truth is the primary right and imperative of thinking beings. The right to profit from your ideas isn't even a secondary right like the right to due process or the right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure.

Defective freedom of speech in American

- 1) The people have to either pay or beg some corrupt media outlet for access.
- 2) It is nearly impossible for people to communicate with one another over the din of the commercial media.
- 3) The world is full of graffiti, spam, junk mail, advertising, touts, robo-calls, and computer viruses so all the other other communication channels are jammed and nobody pays much attention to them.
- 4) We are free to say whatever we want about our American and European figurehead governors. However, when it comes to our real imperial masters from the Mideast, we risk our lives like Charlie Hebo the Danish cartoonist, among others. With the amount of heat I will incur by this message, I obviously risk my life. Why should that be? Why should other people like me risk their lives in the same way?

Corporate ads & freedom of speech

It is worth repeating, that the ability of the people to discuss and debate the truth in safety is the single most important right under a democracy — a right must be regarded as absolutely sacred. Here we are talking about real human citizens, the flesh and blood people casting ballots. Anything that interferes with, or dilutes this primary right of the people must be restrained.

Now free speech with respect to corporate advertising is not this type of real citizen communication because:

- A) Corporations are fictional citizens that have no voting rights in our democracy.
- B) Corporate fictional citizens often have immensely large mouths that overpower the true voice of the people and "manufacture consent" (to re-appropriate the term of a two-time Arab frontman).
- C) Our fictional corporate citizens are openly corrupt in that they sell voting rights with each share of stock. and
- D) Advertising often pays to instill ideas that are not believable enough to spread on their own.

For these reasons we would be right to discourage and tax the paid communication of our fictional citizens like the Exxon — fictional citizens that have for decades served as backdoors for installing our parasite's economic and political propaganda.

Stop subsidizing paid corporate speech

For a real flesh and blood citizen to use \$100 on political advertising, they have to make \$156 assuming a 36% income tax rate. However for a corporation to donate \$100 to a candidate, they only have to make \$100, because corporate

advertising and lobbying are tax deductible. So on balance we are subsidizing the voice of our fictional citizens, while we are offering no subsidy to the voice of our real flesh and blood citizens. Don't we have this backwards?

Luxury goods and advertising

In general, luxury brands spend more on advertising than any other class of goods. More advertising breeds more sales, which are reinvested in more advertising. The result is that the luxury brand owners/ managers have immense ad budgets/ flows and immense power over our media, power that we really should not allow them to have. I mean, simply look at how luxury goods in the form of expensive wristwatches, automobiles and handbags fund all our supposedly free news magazines, like the Economist, Time and Newsweek. Instead, we should A) impose a heavy luxury tax on luxury products (discussed elsewhere). B) eliminate all tax deductions and subsidies for corporate advertising, and replace them with a tax payments. and C) Simply prohibit certain types of goods from advertising.

Why we must prohibit lawyer ads

The reason we once prohibited lawyer advertising had nothing to do with lawyers marketing themselves to customers. The real reason we once prohibited lawyer ads is that if lawyers can advertise at all, then they can advertise on behalf of their clients — and thanks to attorney-client-privilege (an absurd idea), those ads can be placed in the lawyer's own name. So by allowing lawyer ads, we are actually allowing lawyers to act as, black boxes for anyone to secretly pour out money for any sort of advertising at all — including political advertising.

With lawyers able to advertise, the world functions in the opposite way that it should. The ideas of our massively wealthy and openly corrupt fictional citizens (along with foreign interests and other people who have no business hiding what they are doing) get help to stay anonymous. Thus they can advertise secretly and anonymously when everything they do should be done out in the open and totally documented. Thus, with lawyer able to advertise, our parasite's propaganda gets lots of help to stay anonymous, so it can better compete with the organic thoughts and voice of our human citizens.

Aspects of free speech

1) The right of real people to speak out without interference.

Keep this the same.

2) The right of real people to speak out anonymously and safely.

Add this.

3) The right to sell what you say.

Let's be a little more restrictive with this

4) The right of group entities to dilute or drown out what real citizens say.

Let's be super restrictive with this.

5) The right of real people to speak out against a war.

Let's be super liberal with this so that the voices opposed to war will tend to rule over the voices in favor of war.

Bertrand Russell

"To acquire immunity to eloquence is of the utmost importance to the citizens of a democracy." [Actual content should always trump style. Please disregard style, and go only for content.]

Herodian, Mob Insurrection, Rome, 35 AD.

"It was the general practice for Roman citizens to go to the Senate House to find out the news."

James Madison, 1791.12.19

"Public opinion sets bounds to every government, and this is the real sovereign."

Thomas Jefferson

"Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government."

Thomas Jefferson, 1821.09.28, to William Charles Jarvis

"I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education."

[To simplify:

Only the people can be trusted with power. And if we think they are not wise enough for the task — the remedy is not to take this role from them, but to educate them.]

Government media the right way

If we allocate say 1% of GDP for government intellectual property acquisition, that is about \$150 billion/ year, or around \$30 million/year (\$3 million/teneth) for each of our 5,000 Sub-Senate Centi-Nomes to allocate. This is also about 1,000 payments of \$3,000/teneth/Centi-Nome. Thus our Centi-Nomes will disburse billions on creating a public media, a public library, a public education system, and on public knowledge development.

Under this system, most intellectual property (which includes both copyright and patent IP) will be ubiquitized or "socialized" or made public domain, and free for anyone to download and use, or re-use in any way. In the first few years, the selection of public domain IP may be a little light, but over time, all the world's most important content will eventually be included in the world's universal public media library. Here we imagine:

1. Thousands of democratically selected news channels/ feeds, both in print and in video. These are channels not funded by ad dollars, but from tax dollars democratically administered by our 5,000 Centi-Nomes.
2. An all-inclusive multi-format public library and encyclopedia.
3. A definitive body of free textbooks and interactive material to grade 16.
4. Many parallel teaching modules because people learn differently.
5. Entertaining educational 'television' for relaxing after work or school.
6. First rate training tutorials for every common job there is.
7. Competence testing for every common job and subject there is.
8. Games designed to teach while they excite.
9. Product testing, and services reporting — democratic version of Our•alfa Nadir's Consumer Reports. Here we will again try to diminish the value of the corrupt and wasteful system of paid product advertising we use today.
10. A robust media library about anything having to do with politics, propaganda, economics, economic parasitism, and history. This library should be widely distributed on thumb drives to preserve the anonymity of our political inclinations.
11. Later, perhaps not much later, the role of the Sub-Senate may be expanded so that it is spending more, and also acquiring most good inventions (patents) for the public domain.
12. Eventually, this spending will come to provide more and more to the people, and will grow into a small, but immensely

valuable pocket of socialism within a generally capitalist economy.

How many billions do we waste on live stand-up teaching

One of the most cost effective things we can do as a society is to produce lots of awesome educational material for free download. Once we do this, we can stop using our teachers for the part of education that can easily be automated with technology. Instead we will use our teachers where automation will not work, in 2-way dialogue with our kids in small groups. See, the kids will spend 2/3 or 3/4 or 4/5 of their time viewing the best educational media money can buy, and then they will spend 1/3, 1/4, or 1/5 of their time in question and answer with the teacher.

Here we imagine high school classrooms of say 45 kids meeting for six 50-minute classes per day. 10 minutes/ class hour is in groups of 9, the other 40 minutes is in automated single-player, or multi-player instruction.

Sub-Senate spending rules

To reduce corruption, we should have some spending rules. The first one probably being that no more than 1% of any Centi-nome's tenethly budget can go to any one place. And to make our system genuinely altruistic, we should require that all spending be more than 100km from the Centi-Nome's geographical edge. And also, the swapping of votes should be considered a serious and shameful crime if ever proven. Also, for the sake of precision, honesty, and the prevention of over and under payment, we might require that the spending of each Centi-Nome be stated in line items and occur in real time. Also, all unspent money should go back into the government's general fund if it is unused.

Secret ballots

Again, it is vital that all Senate voting be by secret ballot.

UNUM and PLURUM: Centralized and decentralized government funding

Here are two approaches to government spending. The first approach is the centralized UNUM approach that we all know well, This is where one government spends as one body, or as specialized bodies. The other approach, the PLURUM approach is where we create a bunch of small bodies (like our 5,000 Centi-Nomes) and give them each a small amount of money to allocate redundantly. The idea is that 5,000 heads are better than 1 when it comes to making our governments decisions more granular.

We will still use an unum (or a near unum) where it is most effective, with rule making, standard setting, MACRO-MANAGING, military spending, national infrastructure systems, and funding entire programs in large chunks. This type of activity is all best done with an Unum. However, Plurums are better in matters where money needs to be doled out and MICRO-MANAGED, for things like media acquisition, patent acquisition, educational content, and research.

Here we imagine educational content, research, inventions, discoveries, and even entertainment media all competing for funding in a Sub-Senate funded innovation marketplace of 5,000 Centi-Nomes. Here books and computer applications and media will be funded not because they promise to turn a profit, but because they promises to be of benefit to society. In this way, our society will be able to fund many different forms of innovations that stay unfunded today, largely because they seem like they will not be "profitable".

And the 5,000 independent Centi-Nomes of the Sub-

senate will create a healthy bias towards experimentation, as it will frequently only take one Centi-Nome to fund a trail. And if the general sentiment is that the existing approaches are inadequate, then the bias towards experimentation in a given area will tend to increase until a better way is discovered.

Spend more through the plurum

To my mind, a plurum, with only 1% to 2% of GDP is underutilized. I think that it will ultimately disperse a much larger portion of our government budget. But this may take a number of approaches and years to make work perfectly. Let's first try with a small budget and increase spending gradually, while we debug our funding rules.

The con-demmed

Look how the word CON•DEMN is repeatedly connected with the worst criminals in the media. Look at all the criminals condemned to hang by the neck until dead (i.e. in The good, the bad and the ugly film). Why isn't CON•DEM a good word, or at least a neutral word that simply means WITH THE PEOPLE? Why does it have to apply to the wickedest criminals?

Here it is worth noting that condemnation for the public good is an instant trump card that the host can play with any of our parasite's "possessions". Therefore, our parasite hates condemnation and struggle against this idea. Here is why the very word CON•DEM=with the people, so it has a negative association to it.

Con-dem•nation, eminent domain, and ubiquitization

Whatever you call it, it is a hugely important tool for society to use in accelerating discovery and innovation. It is also a hugely important tool for both urban development and recouping the cost of shared infrastructure.

No appeal of ubiquitization prices

All over the free world, the process governments use to buy private property for the group good is absurdly long, legalistic and costly. This is not for our benefit — this is for the parasite's benefit.

We must go in the opposite direction, and empower our Sub-Senate to con•dem any property it wishes for whatever it judges to be "fair compensation". If the public needs any land or intellectual property, or it needs all the land in a region, then it shall have the right to compel the sale of that property. When the public compels a sale, it shall pay 115% of fair value as determined by the Senate. If a simple majority of the infrastructure sluice votes to condemn any property, for the public good at a given price, then that shall be the price paid — Done in a day, with no right to appeal

Later, if the intellectual property is found to be very valuable for society, and the price or rate paid is found to be too low, the Senate may add money. But the recipient should have no right to appeal of this payment in any court, because it was determined by a legislature, and no court is above any legislature in any way.

Dream sheets

The people pitching a new business idea never have a clear idea of how much money their idea will make. They always give ranges, and sometimes the top is 100 times the bottom, or more. This is because nobody knows when it comes to innovation. By nature, innovation is something that nobody has ever done before. If they had done it before, it wouldn't be called innovation, would it?

The slave society

Nowhere on earth are people free, we all live in the interpretive matrixes of the parasite spirit. We are all informed by our parasite's censored media. We all mostly obey and pay taxes to our parasite's governments. On top of this, many of us also obey and pay taxes to our parasite's religions and fantasy prophets of "god's true word". On top of this, we also work hard to make money to buy our parasite's oil that is not actually scarce.

The thing that may be hard to grasp is that we are not enslaved as individuals, as much as we are enslaved as entire societies under a great all-inclusive lies, a matrixes.

Your mantra

Your mantra is "How could I have been so stupid that I didn't see it?" It is time to get rid of all the Arab propaganda like: Married with Children, The Honeymooners, Sin•dar•ella, and I Love Loo•see. Get rid of all of it and please believe me when I say that your Bible and your Koran are the same thing, just older and more time tested and harder to disprove.

Invest in intelligence

We will be paying generously for new mental pathways in much the same way our government buys real-world pathways for roads for need and fair payment. The main differences are that the mental pathways have a much higher cost benefit ratio. Also, the mental pathways will not need any maintenance. It is worth saying that our tax money will go much further with developing mental pathways than physical ones.

A Sub-Senate bias towards smarter content

Because our Sub-Senators are 1 in 250 in our society, they will probably be funding content that pulls the rest of society upward a bit. This bias is a good thing, a very good thing. Mideast Inc. does the much same thing incidentally — only it uses its geniuses to pull humanity's intellect downward.

Taxing innovation — patents

With respect to patents, we as a society should eliminate most:

- 1) IP registration costs.
- 2) IP monetization and transaction costs.
- 4) IP rights management costs.
- 5) IP rights franchising costs.
- 6) IP rights marketing costs.
- 7) IP legal costs.

All of these costs — if we can eliminate them are taxes on innovation.

Taxing innovation — copyrights

Publishing is over 95% wasteful

As a system for rewarding authors, the publishing industry today is about 95% wasteful. I mean, authors normally gets something like \$1 pretax from a \$12.99 paperback costing with \$14 including sales tax. So the author gets around say 70 cents after tax on a \$14 book — that's 5%.

Isn't it crazy the way books cost 20 times the payment the author gets? Who's idea do you think that is? Who wants its human herds to slow down so they are d'umber and easier to manage. What could be better for our parasite than a 2,000% tax on books?

Isn't it strange how nobody is selling an e-library of all

the ancient texts? Isn't it strange how nobody ever sells a complete library of the 500 biggest public domain books of all time for \$1,000, \$2,000 or even \$3,000? Why did this never happen if these books cost less than a dollar to print each. Why did nobody grab this easy money? Why didn't our government do this so it could reduce spending on education and libraries?

Let's do this. Let's pay the authors between a penny and \$2 dollars per unique download after tax. Then it will be up to the reader to print their books if they are so crazy for paper books.

We will spend less and get more

With publishing waste currently around 95%, written media will become about 20 times more efficient in terms of cost. In other words, if we each spend \$5/month on print media delivered online, we will get as much print media as if we each spent \$100/month. This 20 fold increase in MAKER-MONEY will rapidly accelerate improvements in research and education. It will also produce tutorials in every subject that exists. The striking difference in cost-to-benefit is due mostly to the immense inefficiency of the publishing industry today.

A democratically administered "command" economy

It is probably impossible to exaggerate the implications a democratically administered "command" economy will have for invention, discovery, educational materials and general media. As automation causes labor-money to depreciate due to glut, innovation money will take its place and rule mankind's reward system. It is this new economy that will carry our humanity towards its meta-flux or recursion where we become as the group god we have long imagined.

The SNEAKERNET PARALLAX

If the discrepancy between the the internet and the sneaker-net grows too big, they you had better find the source.

DEMOCRATIC MEDIA RATING

"We're taking over"

- Recent Arab song lyric

From Tatian's Address to the Greeks (c.170 AD) p.21

"What Romans are you teaching? ... I have often seen an actor... [perform a list of socially destructive roles] ...[you are led into slavery by these men, while you despise those who do not take part in your pastimes](#). I have no desire to be amazed at a chorus of singers, nor do I desire to be moved in sympathy by a man when he is winking and gesticulating in an unnatural manner. What wonderful and extraordinary things are acted out before you. The actors perform ribaldry in affected tones, and go through indecent movements; [your daughters and your sons watch them, and are given lessons in adultery on the stage](#). Admirable places [like these] indeed, are your lecture-rooms, where the lowliest activities of nighttime are proclaimed aloud, and the audience is entertained with the most scandalous dialogues! Admirable, too, are your lying poets, who by their fictions beguile [charm, enchant, deceive] their audience away from the truth."

From Philip Stubbes, The Anatomie of Abuses 1583

"... Do they not induce whoredom and sluttyness? ... are they not devourers of [maidenly virginity and chastity](#)? flocking...to see [plays and interludes](#)...wanton gestures... bawdy

speeches... kissing... winking... glancing of wanton eyes... they play sodomites, or worse... devirginate maids, deflower honest wives... to murder, flay, kill, pick, steal, rob, and rove; if you will learn to rebel against princes, to commit treasons, to practice idleness, to sing and talk of bawdy love and to flatter and smooth; if you will learn to play the whore master, the glutton, drunkard, or incestuous person; if you will learn to become proud, haughty and arrogant, and finally if you will learn to condemn God and all His laws, to care neither for Heaven nor Hell, and to commit all kinds of sin and mischief, you need to go to no other school, for all these good examples may you see painted before your eyes in interludes and plays." [The harping on virginity and chastity, the opposite of harem breeding, here we see the parasite's footprints. Also, note that interludes, trailers and commercials tend to be much more heavily loaded with propaganda. The interludes probably went too far and provoked a reaction.]

Star Trek film, 2009

"For my dissertation, I was assigned to USS Kelvin. Something I admired about your dad. He didn't believe in no win scenarios... You know that instinct to leap without looking, that was in his nature too. And my opinion, its something Star-fleet lost... something I admired about your dad" [the famous captain, martyr.

- 1) Here we see how leaping before you look is called admirable twice by great leaders of myth. Arab propaganda this is to make us all easier to manage.
- 2) Use this as your alidade, as your inverted Arab compass. If the Arabs are saying this, rest assured that you want to go in the opposite direction towards carefully considering most things before you leap.
- 3) Don't accept Arab propaganda like this in the media. Stuff like this should suffer the shame of a prefacing by government as well as a "stripping" of its intellectual property rights.
- 4) This is a film that most of the boys in the world saw. And most saw it in a total adrenalin-rush where it was burned in deeper.
- 5) The Arab de•ex•pull actually pays money to install messages this broadly detrimental propaganda in our kid's media.]

Dear Wendy

The film Dear Wendy, judging from its title and cover looks like kids romance about a boy and his girlfriend Wendy. But Wendy is not a girl, she is a pistol. Basically, Dear Wendy is a film that glorifies both gun collecting and children dying in a completely unnecessary and unprovoked martyrdom shoot out with massed law enforcement people. Sound familiar?

It is pretty clear who paid or "struggled" to produce this film glorifying martyrdom in our children. And it is pretty clear that this film was designed to raise a generation of children to be Columbine-like killers. Here is why Dear Wendy was made. The narrator (a boy) had nobody in his family, he was living by himself, he didn't like anyone, he got not respect, he had no confidence, and on and on ... until he started carrying a gun. In this film we see kids being instructed on how to find old guns in antique stores and attics. We see the kids giving the guns names and making the guns into their friends. And we see the kids gaining confidence because they walked around town with a gun in their waistband.

Dear Wendy was a PG-13 film, so small impressionable children would be allowed to see it on DVD. There is also a breast flash from a pretty blond girl, so all the young boys would watch and talk about the movie.

Now our society obviously does not allow child pornography, and few people consider this rule to be in conflict with free speech. What of propaganda aimed at brainwashing our children? What of propaganda designed to raise a generation of children to be gun-toting mass murderers? Obviously we have another exception to absolute freedom of speech. Obviously free speech does not include the right to say things intended to induce children to become gunmen.

Does freedom of speech include the right to spread propaganda that is obviously designed to shape the values of our young people while they are young and vulnerable to manipulation? What about pro-homosexual propaganda aimed at children, like the recent film, The Babysitter? What about propaganda merely designed to get kids thinking about moving to low tax jurisdictions as that Prince of Persia movie did? What about Barney=Bar•nee=bro•children, and how dinosaurs/dragons and the color purple are all Brotherly symbols?

Who do you trust more?

A quarter million people elected by the people, or the invisible Arabs running CNN, BBC, RT, CBS, NBC, ABC, Discovery, Disney, etc.?

The Apple Dictionary definition of Expurgate

[To] "remove matter thought to be objectionable or unsuitable from (a book or account) the expurgated Arabian Nights."

Democratic stigmatization of media

Just as we will give our 500,000-man Sub-Senate the power to reward good content through payments and government condemnation, we should also give it some power to stigmatize bad content and products. Now certainly, we must allow our citizens freedom to say what they want without risk of fine or imprisonment. And this is a slippery slope here, so what we will do is create a punishment that is not a punishment, a punishment with no legal teeth.

We will have a punishment that means nothing more than the Sub-Senate disapproves of the work.

Today at the beginning of films, we see the MPAA film rating for a few seconds, (G, PG, R, X). A similar warning should appear for all dynamic content. However, we should have separate ratings for: violence (V), sexual content (S), cultural manipulation (M), and propaganda and disinformation (PD); each with levels 0-9 so we can be accurate. We should say that any Sub-Senate rating of say 7 or higher in any of the four categories should be considered as a vote to stigmatize, and any stigmatization vote must be explained by a statement as to why the content was stigmatized. Also, the Sub-Senate must be cautious with what it chooses to stigmatize, because if too much content is stigmatized, the value of stigmatization will fall and our Sub-Senate will dilute this important power.

Start first with the most destructive media like the film Dear Wendy. Explain how this film encourages malcontent children to form into bands of gun toting martyrs. Explain how the film glorifies the idea that these kids should die in a blaze-of-glory shootout with law enforcement. Also, don't forget to go back and stigmatize old media like mid 1942 film Casablanca for mentioning Nazi concentration camps in a minimizing way 10 times. Have an especially low bar for propaganda fiction designed to manipulate children, or deceive the public about scientific, historical, social, or economic reality.

The MPAA renamed itself

It is now the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. Talk about a power grab by an Arab tool.

Stigma categories

Let's have some precision in the way we stigmatize our content

- S1) Ideologically manipulative, inaccurate, headings that tease.
- S2) Glorifies killing, violence, hatred, war or crime
- S3) Glorifies drugs or a go-nowhere lifestyle
- S4) Overly sexual or morally manipulative
- S5) Unfinished, fvapid or unremarkable

Condemnation categories

- C1) 1% condemnation
- C2) 50% condemnation
- C3) 100% condemnation

A lot less violence, a lot more love and altruism

Our parasite is engaged in a great and eternal struggle. One part of this struggle is to discourage us from reproducing, and another part is to encourage us to go and kill each other. Perhaps this explains why our MPAA has little problem with films that are nothing but a long series of bloody murders; while at the same time, it is so oddly intolerant of scenes that encourage the love making that leads to more infidels. Also, why are all images of altruism made to look ridiculous as with that 1970s TV show Shazam?

Hidden messages aimed at children

Some media has hidden suggestions that only work with children and sometimes then on only a narrow slice of kids. It might be advisable that all child oriented media with any sort of psycho-social dimension be run through some sort of child focus group (formal or informal) before any action is taken by the Sub-Senate.

Plato's Laws (c. 400BC) 797

[Our parasite has been meddling in with the young lambs of its flock for at least 2,400 years.]

"If you control the way children play, and the same children always play the same games under the same rules and in the same conditions, and get pleasure from the same toys, you'll find that the conventions of adult life too are left in peace without alteration. ... Change, we shall find, except in something evil, is extremely dangerous. ... We must do everything we possibly can to distract the younger generation from wanting to try their hand at presenting new subjects, either in dance or song; and we must also stop pleasure-mongers seducing them into the attempt."

Plato's, Apology, 18a-19a:

"Gentlemen of the jury... My greatest opponents are the people who took hold of so many of you when you were children, and filled your minds with false accusations about me, saying, 'There is a smart man [form of government] named Socrat(es) [Iso•cracy = equal rule], who has theories about the heavens [astronomy/navigation] and has investigated everything below the earth [all its mineral wealth], and can make the weaker argument defeat the stronger.[can change your minds about all Arab-imposed traditions]'

It is these people, these rumor spreaders, whose accusations I fear most. Those who hear them suppose that anyone who inquires into such matters does not also believe in the gods. Besides, there are so many of these accusers, and they have been accusing me now for a great many years. And what's more, they approached you all at the most impressionable age, when some of you were mere children or adolescents, and they literally won their case by default,

because there was no one there to defend me. [He is talking about Iso•cracy = equal-rights, or all men are created equal]

And the hardest part of all is that I can't even tell you their names, other than those who are playwrights. These people who have struggled to turn public opinion against me are very difficult to contend with, whether they did it out of envy, or love of scandal [like the media today], or they were merely passing on rumors. It is impossible to bring them here for cross-examination. So I have to conduct my defense and argue my case against an invisible opponent, because there is nobody to answer." [See, in ancient Athens, many people were saying that Iso•cracy=all-men-are-created-equal was the wisest form of government. They probably thought this because any time they instituted a government, our parasite crawled inside and took over, thus sucking all their group efforts dry. Our parasite responded to this dangerous democracy idea by getting the Athenians while they were still children as explained above. Later, they hid everything by turning the word Iso•cracy into a wise man named So•crates. And incidentally, pretty much all the great names of the ancient world have names that sound like popular movements or ideas. I list around 50 under the keyword IMPERSONIZATION.]

All operations must pay for themselves

It is a lot easier to keep doing what you are doing if what you are doing is paying for itself as a business. Thus, if we start stripping the parasite's media of its ability to recoup costs, we are going to substantially reduce its ability to create and sustain propaganda channels. Here our government takes a CYCLE-ON economic activity and turns it into a BLEED-OUT one. After this, other parts of the operation will have to start subsidizing these channels.

Is profit right always 100% guaranteed?

What if you are harming society?

Freedom of speech is the citadel right. The right to profit from what you say is merely a tertiary right that can be taken away. The people will always have total freedom of expression. They will always be free to say and depict anything they want (except for pro Islamic and Arabic media of course). It is just that if they make media like Dear Wendy, the Reservoir Dogs, and Goodfellas their ownership rights will not be secure.

Ubiquitization vs. condemnation

Both UBIQUITIZATION and CONDEMNATION relate to property that is con•fisc•ated from the individual by society. Ubiquitization comes with generous cash payments, and frequently social status. Ubiquitization is a prize, an honor, and people will generally want society to ubiquitize their work. It is a full unbiased validation by their society that their work was worthwhile and their effort fruitful.

On the other hand, the owners of condemned property don't get any reward money when society takes their property away. They only get fair compensation plus a 15% nuisance surcharge.

Million dollar book deals buy history

They buy the exclusive right to publish and more importantly "edit" the story of the principal for many years. For this period of time, the Arab-friendly puppet publisher will be the only one with the official story. Everyone else will be telling the story from second-hand accounts. And in many cases, the principal will be prohibited (by the million dollar contract) from expressing his story any other way than in his book, which the

Arab-friendly publishing house edited.

No exclusive rights with respect to history

The exclusive right to retell a witness's story may be sold, but no rights in that sale shall be enforceable in the nation's courts. If the buyer doesn't pay according to the contract, the person selling the story cannot bring a claim in court. If the witness takes the money and then tells someone else, then the witness may keep the money paid.

Lying into the camera

People are better at figuring out what someone is feeling when that person is talking to a third person. If they are lying or hiding something, it tends to be harder to see if they are looking right at you and talking directly to you. With this in mind, it would be wise for our society to ban or at least discourage media productions where the presenter looks directly into the camera while presenting factual information.

Educational trumps entertaining

Please make useful things a higher priority than mere entertainment.

The no buy list

Our Centi-Nomes should not be allowed to use their budgets to ubiquitize things like:

- 1) The exaltation of criminal activities.
- 2) The exaltation of murder, violence, or war.
- 3) The exaltation of recreational drug use, alcohol, or smoking.
- 4) Head injury sports and spectator sports
- 5) Astrology, palm reading, psychics, ghosts, etc.
- 6) Religious material.
- 7) Subjects that are disbelieved or denied by over 3/4 of the Sub-Senate.

The stuff left will be reality

After we are done getting rid of the parasite's fake media, the stuff that is left will be reality.

No IP protection for brainwashing jingles

The extent you know stupid lyrics is the extent of your brainwashing. Genuine thought has been washed out of your mind, or rather drown out, by gibberish lyrics. Don't give any IP protection for brainwashing jingles or other forms of music. It will hurt society not one bit if government stopped considering music as intellectual property.

We already have more music than we need

If musical innovation stopped dead: would that really hurt society?

Mooming summaries

Summarization and focus are similar brain functions. What do we as a society of cells organize to focus on, and what do we omit? And just even more importantly, who makes this defining decision?

Now most important media will be reviewed by our Sub-Senators. But imagine that our 500,000 Sub-Senators are also highlighting the most interesting or most important parts of what they are reading. Imagine that every word in every ranked book is ranked according to highlight popularity, and imagine that people could view a democratically determined 1% summary of any book, or a 13% summary simply setting the moom function for that highlighting percentage. (to moom is to zoom in mind-space) This will substantially improve the EB

RATIO (=effort to benefit ratio) of our reading efforts and make our society considerably smarter overall.

Now some books, magazines, videos, etc. will be highlighted front to back by our Sub-Senators and some will not be highlighted much at all. Here we imagine that the amount of highlighting will become a sort of democratic vote on the interestingness of our information material. And given that the Sub-Senate will tend to be our smartest people, their highlights will tend to pull the rest of society upwards.

It is also easy to imagine that rather than funding entire works pre-ubiquitization, the Sub-Senate will be funding those individual tracts that are highlighted over a certain level. We also probably want to allow negative highlighting to the system with this negative highlighting serving as a prelude to other Senate actions.

Democracies should keep official score

In the dystopian novel Ready Player One, we see a great WORLD GAME that much of humanity is engaged in — A game with an official score visible to all, and a game with immense rewards. The rewards in the book should probably be millions of times more diffused, but the rewards system is nonetheless a good idea.

From here it is easy to imagine the Senate democratically rewarding and elevating people with credits for their contribution to society. Perhaps there will be two types of credits that come at the same time:

GRANTOS (= monetary credits) and

GUDDS (= non-defeasible status)

Get enough gudos credits and you will be automatically awarded Ubiq status

Who does what in the Senate Media

The Sub-Senate draws and writes the media and rewards with money. the Main-Senate ubiquitizes and further honors quality media and runs specialized media outlets. The Over-Senate provides a single media outlet for all the top stories and ideas

Tracking status to the penny

It is such a remarkable thing the way modern society keeps track of money to the penny, but with respect to status, we have no real hard measure at all. What folly it is that we offer our people no way to transcend money as a marker of status. And what poor measure is money as to any man's true value to society.

Assention rate = The Sub-Senate will assemble a library. All centinomes will cover everything. They assent to whatever they want and the assention rate is tracked as a measure of veracity.

UBIQ INNOVATION

Wouldn't it be nice

Whenever I hear this beach boys song, I always think more along the lines of science fiction utopias than romance. Anyway, wouldn't it be nice if we had a form of government that could efficiently dole out money to inventors and discoverers, so that their inventions can? Wouldn't it be nice if our government was just as efficient at spending money as any large organization in the private sector? Just imagine all the group projects we could undertake if we brought our government efforts up so they were just as efficient as our corporate efforts.

Wouldn't it be nice

If every Phone came with every app and all the money we spent on apps went to the developers. It would not cost any more to have this sort of system.

How many ubiquitization awards will make one a Ubiq?

We might also say that 100, or 50, or 10 or even 3 unique ubiq awards (from 100, 50, 10 or 3 unique Centi-Nomes) is enough to confer ubiq status on one person.

Overshoot with ubiq payments

Society should probably aim to always overpay a bit for innovation. At least give the inventor/ discoverer/ producer a bit more than he would net if the public con•dem•national system did not exist, and he had to monetized his IP himself. At most pay ubiq the benefit to humanity worldwide.

Also, if we overpay a bit, it is not such a big deal. All we do is subsidize and increase the rate of innovation in the future.

Isocrates, Panegyricus 40

Everything from the daily news to the Greek "art" plays, the worthless TV of the day.]

"A further gift of Athens is the chance to find the surest friendships, the most varied of associations. [In Athens we] see contests not only of speed and strength, but intelligence and explanation, and all sorts of other activities, for which high prizes are awarded. In addition to the rewards that Athens actually offers, she incites other elsewhere, because awards made by Athens [like those of America today] are held in such esteem as the object of universal admiration. Festivals/ parties everywhere are periodic gatherings which quickly disperse. But Athens is an ongoing festival/party for visitors which will last until the end of time.

Philosophy [the love of knowledge] took a part in the discovery and development of all these, and gave us education in the field of [commercial and government] affairs and civilized society. It helped us distinguish between the misfortunes [inequality] due to ignorance and those due to necessity. It taught us to be wary of the former and bear the latter bravely. [Here the context show us how philosophy is really knowledge and learning]

Our city showed the way to it, and also gave honor to skill in words [knowledge, mass communication], for which she became the desire and the envy of the entire world. She realized that this alone is naturally the particular [tiniest and most powerful] possession of mankind [pro-men-thean eu•man•idi], and that this [one] development led to all other superiorities [of the Athenians. With this one innovation, Athens] saw that [all] other activities showed such confusion in practice, and that ignorance was often the [main] cause of failure in them. [She saw her] folly [and turned it] into success. [No longer] was an organized mind and the power of speech [effective communication] outside the scope of the ordinary men. [Thus the Greeks saw] knowledge [Gr. sophia, normally translated as wisdom] as the opposite of ignorance. [Thus the Greeks loved knowledge and hatred ignorance so powerfully that their word for their love of knowledge and its public dialogue could never be erased, but only blurred into something else — the impersonization of Athenian Isocracy called Socrates.]

The Greeks also saw a] liberal and free education as a birthright of everyone, and what was said [at the democratic forum] was the clearest proof of education [and democratic leadership skill. No longer were] courage, wealth and similar

distinctions [valued].

These communication skills gave not only domestic advantages, but international honors. Athens had so far outrun the rest of mankind in thought and speech, that her disciples were the masters of the rest [of the world]. And it is due to her that the word 'Greek' is not so much a term of birth as of mentality — one applied to a common culture, rather than a common descent.

The public motivation is different

People who own IP want to make money. They very often do this by restricting supply and by leaving most of the market unserved by their innovation. They public on the other hand wants as many people as possible served, once it has purchased some information. This distinction is yet another important advantage of ubiquitization.

Some ubiquitization thoughts

1. If we want more innovation, we should consistently err on the side of generosity when we ubiquitize/condemn innovative ideas for the public domain. If we err on the side of under-payment, we will reduce future innovation.

2. We don't have to always pay more than the author, inventor, discover would make on the open market, but we should pay a good bit more on average.

3. Make lots of millionaires and very few centi-millionaires, except when it comes to the efforts of large groups. We will motivate inventors more with 5,000 payments of \$2-million than 5 payments of \$2-billion. Make payments of all sizes, just try real hard to spread the fertilizer around as much as possible

4. Often times, we will see an immensely valuable idea, or just a new standard that do not deserve all the money they can extract from society. Here Microsoft's operating system is probably the best example of a "standard" that should have been condemned long ago for only a small fraction of the money it can extract from society.

5. Marketplaces, standards, and natural monopolies are the domain of society, and nobody (except the "parent business" during the juvenile period) should be able to "own" a marketplace or a standard. If the parent business is doing an admirable job growing the child business, then the parent business should continue on. However if the Child is not growing rapidly, then the public has an obligation to step in.

6. Try to undershoot a tiny bit with the biggest ubiquitization payouts. Try to overshoot with the smallest ubiqs. Massively overvalued things like Microsoft's operating system are the perfect example of things that society should not pay full value on when it con-dems them.

7. if we allow people to fight Sub-Senate condemnation as a way to get more money, then every ubiquitization will become a costly battle regardless of the price. We don't want this, so we must eliminate the right to appeal the decisions of our our legislatures.

8. Under the current system, only around 5% of the sales price goes to authors, Under the new system, all author payments will go straight to the author. So we as a society will be able to simultaneously pay less for new innovation, while we increase funding for innovation.

9. If the Sub-Senate votes that the content is excellent and deserves a special reward, they can double or triple their buyout payment. They can even multiply it by 100 fold if they elect to.

10. We should say that ubiquitization of one's ideas is a great personal honor. It means that the democratic

leadership, the best of your nation thinks that your intellectual output is so valuable that it needs to be made public and used by as many people as want to use it. We should regard this sort of government action as a sort of small, intermediary Nobel Prize.

11. It really doesn't matter if the government overshoots a bit with respect to its buyout payments. This because the buyout is a form of improve mankind subsidy. The more money that goes through this funding channel, the faster society will advance. However, this is only to a point for the law of diminishing returns will also apply to our Ubiq payments

12. Ubiquitization will work perhaps 10 times better when all the nations of the world ubiquitize content together. Until that time, it should be possible to ubiquitize by nation or block of nations. However, goods containing ubiquitized IP should not be allowed to move to nations that have paid their share to the UM's ubiq fund.

13. We should view accurate statements of problems as the start of the solution process. Hence the statement of a problem is perhaps the most valuable part of the group solution process. Doing this, will enable us all to share out collective imagination much better, making nobody afraid to blurt out their idea (online) as soon as they think it. This because they would know that if they had the seminal idea, they will get generous recognition and compensation.

14. Society should endeavor to make its overall ubiq payments as predictable as possible because risk seems to be squared in most investment decision equations. Here we imagine our plurum asking for millions of things, offering amounts of ubiq money in payment. Then these amounts will generally rise over time. Make the list searchable in as many ways as anyone can think of.

15. The more society can make authoring, inventing, solving the world's problems easy, the more people will attempt it.

16. What a great way to use our smartest minds. What a way to measure ourselves as men. We will democratically decide on which innovations should be owned by the public, so their adoption can be rolled out as fast as possible. Did you have a part in a great innovation, well then you get your share of the ubiq money.

An offer you can't refuse

The public money shall be considered given regardless of what the recipient does with it.

A democratic Wikipedia

It is worth repeating that the Mideast ministry of truth is constantly monitoring Wikipedia. And for this reason, Wikipedia is quite corrupt with respect to ideas that touch the land of no resources. This would be very easy to remedy if we used our Sub-Senators as moderators on their own parallel wiki.

But we should not stop with a mere wiki-encyclopedia. Our legions of Sub-senators should assemble an entire eco-system (economic system) of democratically selected modules for a new sort of publicly-funded educational system. We will use these modules instead of those ridiculously overpriced textbooks our parasite has us buying to tax our education system. They will be public domain, and free for anyone in the world to copy, and copy anonymously. Thus, we will make our first rate educational modules accessible to all, especially the poor of the world. In this way, our nation will do its part to give a free first-rate education to the entire world. This will go a long way to eliminating our parasite's religious educations

worldwide, institutions like those brain-washing and mind-numbing Islamic madrasas and Catholic schools.

National Wikis

Every important nation should have a national wiki, and each subject should be cross referenced across all national wikis for those who want a sort of cross-cultural, multi-national truth. Past versions should also be available. In the same way we have national libraries, archives and museums today, we will soon have national wikis. These should be created, and kept unbiased by the Sub-Senate of each nation. And that nation's reputation for truth and honesty should be at stake on its official wiki.

Here we imagine wikis as a powerful tool for ending the ability of other government to lie about themselves. We also imagine a model for political openness that will wither even the most marginal forms of tyranny. I mean, for example, what a few newspapers say about say North Korea doesn't really matter much. However, if most of the important countries of the world all said pretty much the same thing about the nation, their truth will be hard to deny in either in words or in action.

No more of our parasite's textbooks

You know the defining characteristic of a history textbook today is the amount of our parasite's propaganda. It varies but they seem to be word-for-word about 1/4 to 1/2 propaganda. In fact, the easiest way to see the historical truth is to read high school and college textbooks with the mindset that you are reading propaganda. Instead, everything we teach in school should be a DCV= democratically compiled version. Not one idea should be accepted without proof, and all should be posted for free download and 100% free for the public to use and copy.

Abraham Lincoln

["The philosophy of the schoolroom in one generation will be the philosophy of government in the next."](#)

Senate history

The Sub-Senate in any given year shall be responsible for recording events after the fact, for compiling the Senate history. Others shall be free to compile their own histories, but the Sub-Senate shall have its version.

Given how absurdly hard it is to understand many ancient historical records, the Senate should also go back and revise all history and compile its own public lexicons for ancient Greek, Sanskrit, Sumerian, Aramaic, Babylonian, Arabic, etc. When the Senate translates a work it should be for sense of meaning firstly, readability and comprehension secondly, and verbal accuracy thirdly.

It is a great website, but how do you plan monetize it?

Another advantage of government media is that we will be able to create websites that have no monetization scheme and no advertising. If they educate or entertain they will be paid.

Julian Assange on Facebook

["the most appalling spying machine that has ever been invented."](#) [That is G•oo•ali•n Ghassan]

\$1-million per minute films

Most cost less than this in the high-budget motion picture industry. This is the most expensive media that mankind makes for worldwide distribution. Why is so much of it so

socially corrosive? Do we really want to hear these stories?
Or is this where the parasite's billions have their greatest pull?

New School

Soon we will have this speed-controlled, MOOMABLE = mimetically zoomable, ID-DENSE video tutorial, wiki for every thing anyone wants to learn about. And there will also be free, automated government certifications that you watched the video under the eye-check system and that you passed the public knowledge test.

The media is serious business

I don't mean this monetarily. It is serious business for the future of mankind and the evolution of humanity or eu-man-idi. The media will be the primary tool we will use to trope our cultures and our breeding habits for the better.

All natural knowledge monopolies should belong to the people

Google, Facebook, Wikipedia, Alibaba and a number of other websites are natural monopolies that derive their value from society and therefore should belong to the people for the most part. Please condemn these media sources for the public interest, and pay the shareholders market price (considering our new monopoly taxation system) for their shares. All these enterprises are critical to how the world finds information in the world's nascent group mind, the internet. It is absurd that these critical public functions, these natural monopolies, and these great systems for finding political dissidents, are run as a private money making enterprises. After a time, all should be largely brought under the ownership and supervision of our new broad democracies.

The role of short IP ownership periods

In another section, I advocate shortening copyright and patent periods. The reason deserves repeating. It is that increasing the payback period beyond 10-15 years offers little added incentive for people to invest in innovation or creation, while it costs society a great deal.

Another advantage of short IP ownership periods is that they will make for-profit media production less a matter of corrupt sponsorships and more of something under the democratic process. Hence, as we become more and more confident about our democratic method for funding media production, we might want to gradually reduce our IP ownership periods even more.

Sub-Senate, tips and suggestions

The Sub-Senate should reward ordinary citizens when they

- A) Suggest policy that gets adopted.
- B) Risk their own safety offering tips about crime, corruption, tax evasion, etc.

These rewards should be in money, and if the information is valuable enough, and/or dangerous enough, it should also confer Ubiq status on the citizen making the valuable public comment. Also, it is probably a good idea to err on the side of spending a little too much money fighting corruption.

INWARD HONESTY = the honesty that keeps people from doing dishonest things themselves.

OUTWARD HONESTY = the willingness to risk one's own welfare to see to it that dishonest people are brought to justice.

weak

The two reward systems for public funding of content

We should have two reward systems for funding public IP — One conscious and the other autonomic.

The CRS (=conscious reward system) will be budgeted a sliver of GDP by the Over-Senate. This money will be allocated by the Sub-Senate. This content can include books, media, patents, drugs, inventions, copyright, textbooks software, etc.

The ARS (= autonomic reward system) will also be budgeted a sliver of GDP by the Over-Senate. This money will be mostly for web content and it will be allocated by a web browser with a feedback functions. People who are not worried about anonymity can log into an official account when they look at media. Once logged in, they can make one comment/rating per item. If they click on the kudos button, then that site gets its pro-rata share of the government's ARS money. However, if they press the anti-kudos button, then someone else's kudos will be cancelled out. This way, if the site gets as much anti-kudos as regular kudos, then it gets no ARS money. Under this approach, it is easy to imagine that deceptive websites will get much more anti-kudos than regular kudos. These websites as well as stigmatized sites will not get any ARS money.

The ARS system should probably work internationally. If Japanese content is watched and appreciated in the US for example, then the US government media auto-fund payments should by international agreement pay the creators their pro-rata share of the US ARS budget.

A possible ARS payment schedule

Let's apply something like the following to all video, audio, animation, or text posted for public viewing. This way our media spending is skewed towards educational material. The amount of documented viewership gets totaled up. Then it gets applied to all forms of content including textbook modules.

- 1) 6% of average pay for Senate recommended educational material
- 2) 3% of average pay for Senate approved educational material
- 3) 1% of average pay for non-educational media.

Harmful content and the ARS/CRS

Our Sub-senate will have the right to bar any content from either the CRS or ARS system if it is deemed harmful to society. This should include pornography, violent media, drug-media, homo-erotic media, dangerous or copy-me stunts, dis-information, and head injury sports among other things.

Children's media is critical

We really do need a complete re-do of our children's media programming. We simply can't let our parasite have any role here. We can't let it plant the seeds of value decisions in our pre 10-year-olds. All the Sin-dar-ella media needs to die.

What is fair value?

There will probably soon come a day when most market-bending innovation is ubiquitized. When this happens, we will loose our marker posts — but it will not matter very much.

Senate roles

The Sub-Senate doles out money. The Knowledge Sluice votes on full ubiquitization, taking prior Sub-Senate funding into account. Ubiq status is granted by the Sub-Senate.

SLANDER

The true meaning of Seditio

se•diction = self•speaking = thinking/speaking for yourself instead of saying/thinking what those in power want you to say/think.

Donald Trump

"One of the key problems today is that politics is such a disgrace that good people don't go into government."

7-DM. Slander and defamation

Which is more important: our all-important right to free speech, or the right of our elected officials, billionaires and media stars to be free from false accusations?

And don't people acclimate to a culture of slander and defamation anyway? And how exactly do slander and defamation laws benefit a society struggling to be free? The benefit to our parasite is clear, however. Laws against slander and defamation clearly erode our citadel right, the right to know the truth and criticize our parasite's evil front men. So our parasite is always struggling to foster an environment where slander and defamation are illegal or at least dangerous.

Once again, we have a situation where the parasite wants us to go in one direction and we must go 180° in the opposite direction. We will say that only great men can possess great flaws. In fact we will say this over and over to our kids, so that they don't discard Senators for being homos, or having a short temper, or being ugly or annoying, or some other minor foible. We will say that the great can afford a few foibles. And instead of having a few hundred great people let's have hundreds of thousands, so each individual leader will matter less.

Government should never allow any form of slander or defamation lawsuit against anyone. The governments that permit this sort of thing do not really have freedom of speech: And because they don't have freedom of speech, they don't have a real democracy.

Disambiguating slander from threat

From now on, REPORTING = when you speak the truth. DEFAMATION = when you state a belief about someone or something that is negative. Defaming words suggest nothing more than one's personal negative opinion about someone. For example if you call someone an asshole, a fuck-head, or a sack of shit, nobody would ever think it was anything more than your personal opinion. There is no possibility of defaming words being objectively possible.

SLANTER = slant•our = when you slant the truth. SLANDER is the spoken version of LIBEL, which is recorded and promulgated. With either, you are calling someone a liar, thief, corrupt, or some other thing that might be objectively true.

Now the most important aspect of these slander words is that we see how the foregoing words drive people to avoid other people. Here we have a division with reporting, defamation, slander and libel all on one side encouraging people to avoid or disdain other people

On the other side of this division is THREAT, something altogether different. Threat is when you say or suggest that you are going to harm someone. Threat is also when you ask others to harm someone. Threat conveys the possibility of attack or drives people to attack. Here is why threat should always be illegal, except when it is against

monarchs, olig•archs, lig•archs, and those who commit democide.

The most likely people to be denounced

They are our parasite's frontmen leaders. Any time anyone has to pay money or jail time for saying something bad about our leaders it is a step towards tyranny.

Liabel for libel

Boy these two words are confusing. Could this not be by design? Clearly our parasite was struggling to make people confuse general liability with damages for saying something bad about people. This way people will be more likely to go along with making people pay money for speaking ill of the parasite's frontmen leaders when they suck too much blood too fast.

Free speech means never having to pay for one's words

You can't have freedom of speech if people have to pay money damages for speaking ill of someone.

MEDIA END

The Logan's Run film and

The ministry of truth at work

Did you miss the opening credits to the Logan's Run film when it was out in theaters? I did, and I bet lots of other people did too. I bet the film started early wherever it played. And I bet hardly anyone saw the transit system displayed in the opening credits. And nobody will see them on TV because TV stations routinely omit the credits. So there it is, an idea the Arabs wanted omitted. It is still there, but totally minimized — thanks to the Arab Ministry of truth, the pruners of the tree of knowledge.

Why is the most important question

It is strange how journalists are taught to answer the questions who, what, when, where, and sometimes how. Strange how the most important question, why is mostly not reported.

Graffiti

Maybe graffiti should be regarded as neither nuisance nor art. Maybe it should be regarded as sacred political communication. Perhaps making worthless, non-political written graffiti should be a serious crime — because it dilutes our ability to express political messages. Also, perhaps our parasite sometimes communicates through graffiti; you know, so people can see the writing on the wall.

They know all about media from all the last times they dissolved our free rebel society

The Arabs did it all before — in Athens, Rome, Venice, Spain, and England. They have become experts at what they do.

The parasite is the darkness

It is real easy to see the parasite in the media by its shadow. The more media, the more history, the more we have gotten away from our secret masters and the more that needs to be covered up. The less media and history, the closer the host is to its parasite — for example the dark ages and simultaneously the great of Islam.

The written word leans towards good

The spoken word leans towards evil

We shall hold the written word sacred because its power tends

to come from reason — the higher human mind. We shall hold with suspicion the spoken word because its power tends to come from emotion — the lower animal heart.

We shall hold that regarding government, the written word speaks the truth more than the spoken word, while the spoken word merely tends to have more emotional force. Thus we shall all be suspicious of the spoken word, particularly when its message is aimed at those who do not read.

The media is not dominated by Jews, it is dominated by Arabs

And their films are full of subtle propaganda like Casablanca, Titanic and Water-world. And once upon a time, the studio frontmen of the Arabs owned pretty much all the movie theaters in the US. After that, Arab frontman corporations owned/controlled pretty much all the radio stations. Then they owned/controlled pretty much all the TV networks.

Dangerous hitchhiking by year

Can someone do a study of dangerous hitchhiking in the media? Take the LA Times for the years between 1965 and 1980. Have a double bar graph for each year — the front bar is the number of hitchhiking murders, the back bar is the number of hitchhiking stories. I bet there was a big jump in both in 1972 - 1973.

Wait. I have an even better idea. Let's take all our major newspapers and magazines and chart the volume for every types of story, and mention for as long as we can. And let's do the same thing with crimes. Let's do this with HIV/AIDS, with hijackings, with mideast terrorism, with school shootings, with violence directed at taxis, everything.

Also, what was happening in congress and the media just before September 11? Was this a distraction attack?

The people own the airwaves

Once the people take back the TV and radio broadcast spectrum, they should stretch the digital spectrum as far as it will go, and have it broadcast no less than 50% educational material — one hour educational, and the next entertainment. The rest can be entertainment.

A democratically designed culture

Once our broad and incorruptible democracies start tropeing our media, they will rapidly transform the nature of education and culture as well as our democracy. Thus we will design our society ourselves for our own benefit, rather than it being designed from the outside by a parasite sprit that seeks only our reduction.

The good and cooperative spirit of mankind will now make our society over in its own image. And it will forsake the harmful things brought-to-us, or bought-for-us by our parasite — mankind's #1 behind-the-scenes sponsor.

Roman theater innovations

Note how Greek-style theaters are half-open and Roman-style totally closed. The Roman-style offers some major improvements for the parasite:

- 1) In Rome, there was an inside wall around the spectacle ring. This was a wall too high to climb out of. This allowed the Roman theaters to be used for the execution of political prisoners as public spectacle. This must have greatly intimidated many Romans into keeping quiet about their parasite-fronting emperors/dictators.
- 2) The height of the outside walls in most Roman amphitheaters is notable because it is too high to jump from

without immobilizing injury.

3) The height of the outside walls in most Roman amphitheaters looks jumpable, this appears to be a clever optical illusion.

4) Roman theaters go all the way around so that a limited number of people can massacre all the unarmed audience as they rush out of the L. vomitories = entrances. Also, L. vomere = an un uncontrollable flow. Here we imagine a sham brawl and the audience being given to clear the theatre. Then we imagine well armed gladiators driving the ignorant and trusting audience out of the theatre into the vomitories. Thus we see that Roman amphitheaters were designed by the Arabs to facilitate mass murder.

Colosseums = co·lysi'ums = together·liquidate'ums

Long before the Greeks built that large one-sided speaking theatre on the Acropolis, they must have been built smaller ones. And it is the parasite's way of doing things that broad and dynamic marketplaces are consolidated into a few oversized 'cartel' or ak·ouri·tel players (think Uber and Lyft). So it seems that the big theaters and the great plays were the parasite's idea. Firstly this gave them the main TV channels/ internet sites. These then offered huge prizes on and subsidized admissions to get rid of the small-fry theaters. Then, once the smaller theaters were eliminated, the Arabs had control of the Greek media.

Instead of having maybe 15 of of 25 venues engaged in educational programming, it became one of perhaps 3 massive venue chains (I surmise judging from Television) re-running the same old garbage, mostly worthless fiction and drivel = bri·pull. This drivel appealed to the lowest common denominator just like our TV does today. This included practically nothing useful, just like TV today.

A catalogue of propaganda

A catalogue of propaganda will be very helpful for seeing which way is up.

Propaganda

- 1) propaganda tends to be heaviest at the start of books, because it is the only part most people read.
- 2) As most people only read the beginning of the book, the later parts tends to have the cryptic gazette information.
- 3) High school and junior college books are dense with altered matrix reality.
- 4) Elementary and middle school books bend reality the farthest.
- 5) Look for repeated (inculcated) facts. These are the most problematic ones for the parasite.
- 6) Bird publishers (penguin, pelican, phoenix) are for Brothers.

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary:

"History, n. An account mostly false, of events mostly unimportant, which are brought about by rules mostly knaves, and soldiers mostly fools.

Of Roman history, great Niebuhr's shown

'It is nine-tenths lying. Faith, I wish it were known

Ere [before] we accept great Niebuhr as a guide,
Wherein he blundered and how much he lied"

[This is the first of two mentions that Roman history is 90% lies.]

Benjamin Franklin, 1735, Poor Richard's Almanac

"Here comes the orator, with his flood of words, and his drop of reason."

[remember everyone, the ideas are what matter, the presentation is worthless. In fact, let's redefine oratory. From now on ORATORY = flood of superficial, drop of profound.]

Emergency communication

The national government should develop a satellite based communicator system that is only for one-way satellite based text upload unless permission is sent by emergency control. Then, photos audio and videos can be uploaded.

The devices completely de-power once they are turned off. They use conventional batteries. They are also small and easy to hide. There is no identity, and the devices are swapped between the people of their community. There is also a delayed send function on the devices. There is also GPS location send.

The system should only be used for important matters and the devices get permanently disabled when misused.

The system is also capable of getting the word out when the cellular system goes down. I remember how this was in Krabi. We all ran up a hill and nobody knew what had happened, or if it was safe to come down and nobody's cell phone worked.

Kipling - Dayspring Mishandled

"A genius called Graydon foresaw that the advance of education and the standard of living would submerge all mind-marks in one mudrush of standardized reading-matter, and so created the Fictional Supply Syndicate to meet the demand.

... He drew many young men—some now eminent—into his employ. He bade them keep their eyes on the Sixpenny Dream Book...Stores Catalogue (this for backgrounds and furniture as they changed)... domestic emotions... love-talk in 'Passion Hath Peril,' and 'Ena's Lost Lovers,' ... [all were] as good as anything to which their authors signed their real names in more distinguished years.

Among the young [black-haired] ravens driven to roost awhile on Graydon's ark was James Andrew Manallace... Given written or verbal outlines of a plot, he was useless; but, with a half-dozen pictures round which to write his tale, he could astonish.

In the course of a few years, Graydon's foresight and genius were rewarded. The public began to read and reason upon higher planes [not], and the Syndicate grew rich. Later still people demanded of their printed matter what they expected in their clothing and furniture. [i.e. fashion]

As he once said when urged to 'write a real book' ... If you save people thinking, you can do anything with 'em.' "

It is much harder to lie in print

- 1) Readers can go over the words again and again.
- 2) Readers can come back to the words in decades and centuries.
- 3) People are smarter when they read than when they listen.
- 4) People are less emotional when they read than when they listen.
- 5) The dumbest people can't read, so they can't be manipulated by printed messages.

For this reason, when the technology becomes available, there should be no one-to-all Senate speaking or video of speaking. All Senate communications shall either in pure print, or in print with eye-tracker narration by the authors. Also, the people should try not to receive any news or political information via narrated video as this is the the best medium for lying.

ECHO was a nymph deprived of speech by Hera in order to stop her chatter. She was left able only to repeat what others had said, in a slightly different way.

The US pledge of allegiance

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under god, indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

- (1) Who cares about the stupid flag?
- (2) Who exactly am I pledging allegiance to?
- (3) I believe in democracy and legislature, not elected monarchs. Am I pledging my allegiance to the shit-bag monarch, or to my legislature?
- (4) One nation indivisible, now that explains the civil war.
- (5) Liberty and justice for all. Does this include illegal aliens and people who have corrupted the previous corrupt democracy into letting them become citizens?]

The prophets of subprime

Now let's just pause to think on the immense profits the Mideast recently made from \$147 oil and the recent commodities bubble. Let's also reflect on how this bubble was mostly funded by bad subprime debt guarantees. Now why did all our banks sell these bone-headed guarantees? And why did they continue to sell them long after credible people appeared on TV and said that subprime obligations were foolishly risky? The answer I submit is that a CHORUS, a CORE QUORUM, A CORPS of Mideast financial experts and Mideast appointees 'voted' for subprime and overpowered or CORRUPTED = core-broke our ability to act intelligently within our own democratic governments and democratic corporate boards.

Anyway, this is a main technique the Mideast uses to influence all sorts of idea systems and institutions. They have been using it for thousands of years in the world many Mideast religions. And they use it for climate change just as they used it for subprime. They start with something impossible to understand, be it a natural mystery, or a man made mystery like the complexity of subprime debt obligations. Then they offer an explanation with their harmonious chorus of professed experts or priests of subprime. And because nobody else has any strong opinion one way or other, the Brotherly chorus usually carries everyone else along with it.

21— OTHER ENDING MATERIAL

Some features of the new democracy

- 1) Because it has around 100,000 Main-Senators in the US, it is multi-plexed into 10-different specialized senates that divide the work-load. Thus where our prior democracy had one thought channel, the new democracy has ten and is thus 10 times smarter.
- 2) It contains mustering instructions so it can be instituted without the permission of those already in power.
- 3) It is integrated with the world democracy, a world democracy that gives no voice to the Arab empire.
- 4) It has decentralized voting and no distant capital. The Main-Senate and Over-Senate meet in 42 regional voting centers.
- 5) It has a much more practical constitutional amendment process.
- 6) It has staggered terms so 10% of our leaders cycle out of service every tenth of a year. This makes it much more likely that the leaders will leave office when they are supposed to.

- 7) It has no presidents, kings, monarchs, or oligarchs. It has no unelected administration running our nation.
- 8) It leaves no role for the media in our election process. There are just too many candidates for the media to get involved with.
- 9) It prohibits going around and lobbying all the various Senators. If anyone has anything to say, he says it to his own Senator, or makes a posting in the Senate BBS.
- 10) It says to the nation's fictional citizens and their oversized cash flows, you are not true citizens. Your managers have no right to use corporate money to lobby government, or advertise your views on politics, economics and the world at large.
- 11) Instead of 9 corrupt appointees, it has 10,000 thrice elected Senators.
- 12) It has secret Senate voting and open-display public elections.

Sneaker-net

It is like the internet, but based on people handing people files on drives. It is called sneaker-net because everything is happening secretly, unlike with the internet.

In today's searchable world, how do we circulate damming messages about Islam or some awful killers? Are we supposed to risk our lives to get a message out? We should circulate these rules of Sneaker-net, to assure the right of safe anonymous free speech in the land of the free.

- 1) If the message is good, pass it on. If its spam or propaganda, then do nothing.
- 2) Sneaker-net is more believable than the sponsor-corrupted corporate media because the propaganda and the spam don't get far.
- 3) From now on, we should circulate important and dangerous messages on sneaker-net first, to keep Sneaker-net alive and believable.
- 4) It should be a shameful thing to internet a sneaker-net message within 3-hours of receiving it.
- 5) From now on, everyone is now duty-bound to accept all sneaker-net messages and give them immediate consideration if the paper summary seem important and true-ish.
- 6) If you don't feel competent to judge for yourself, then ask the nearest person.
- 7) If someone hands you money and asks you to buy a communication device for them, then you must do it.
- 8) Everyone is sworn to both lie about who gave them their message and to lie about who they gave it to if they are ever asked.

Of dino-saurs and demo-cracy

The Apple thesaurus only has 6 syms for TERROR, but it has 42 syms for FEAR. These of course were all created by the Arabs in their efforts to drive our host society here and there.

Now Gr. Diemo=terror. So Diemo-saurs were terrifying-lizards, men (s-saurs) who were not in init with the Arabs, but supported nonetheless. And a Diemo-cracy meant rule by terror, or using the ancient word-of-mouth media to get the stories out and drive the people here and there.

Gr. Tyrant = someone who ruled by terror

Democracy first, human rights second

Human rights violations may seem like a disease in itself, but they are not, they are only symptom of a disease. The disease of course is a parasite infection, leading to our parasite's outright control of our body politic to feed the parasitic haremi race.

Ultimately in severe infections, the parasite takes over

the body politic of the host and eliminates those antibody cells that may in the future attack the parasite or interfere with its feeding. This is the real reason for all the political purges and genocides.

This was the real reason for the Hitler fronted Holocaust, the Stalin fronted purges, Pol Pot's genocide, and Iran's eagerness to send schoolboys to die in war. They are all cases of a severe parasite infection where the parasite gains total control and uses this control to eliminate all potential future trouble makers.

So let's stick to supporting democracy over human rights. The former will cure the later but not vice versa.

Representation ratio is much more important than short terms

Which system is harder to corrupt?

- 1) 50,000 lawmakers serving to 20 years
- 2) a 5 judge jury serving 10 days

But certainly it does not hurt to also have short terms.

Gordian complexity

No amount of lobbying is going to get America's democracy to do something that is obviously stupid, something like say unilateral disarmament, or making Islam the state religion. Self destructive policies must be disguised — and one of the easiest ways to disguise a destructive policy is to make it too complicated to be easily understood. Subprime debt obligations are a good example. Subprime was not blatantly bad, it was only bad if you took at least 30 minutes and concentrated your full attention on learning about the subject. Then you had to ponder the idea of systemic risk for a while, and combine the two thoughts. Most people, including our lawmakers didn't bother to spend the time. So a determined lobbying and PR campaign simply overcame the Cassandras opposed to subprime.

Now think about the intricacy and complexity of some Islamic art. This art symbolizes the "incomprehensible" complexity of Islam and the Koran. But it also has parallels with the tactic that produced CDO's and Subprime. And it is also symbolic of the Byzantine bureaucracy that raises costs within our economies, so that we can't compete with the imported oil/ spice/ silk/ Damascus steel/ etc., and other products that the land of no resources monopolizes and sells at great profit.

KING STREET

What an incredible thing that so many cities in the land of the free have re-named one of their main streets as "King Street" or "Martin Luther King Street".

What a coincidence that so many cities in the land of the free have re-named one of their main streets as "Caesar" or "Caesar Chavez Street". What a malignancy Julius Caesar was. He more than any other figure brought about the end of European democracy in Roman times. Eventually the Arab-fronting Caesars = seizers brought European populations down by over 90%.

It is easy to see the false-ness of these two leaders in their names. For they are the Arab choice as your leaders. This is obvious from their names.

The main state

Funny how our main state was the coldest and most remote early on. Do you think that it is by accident that our nation's capital has such a long name as Washington DC, or that there is a state with the same name? What about how just about every city in the land of the free has renamed a main street as

King, and another as Caesar?

Ambrose Bierce, Devil's Dictionary

"Republic, n. A nation in which, the thing governing and the thing governed being the same. There is only a permitted authority to enforce, and optional obedience. In a republic, the foundation of public order is the ever lessening habit of submission inherited from ancestors who, being truly governed, submitted because they had to. There are as many kinds of republics as there are gradations between the despotism whence they came and the anarchy whither they lead."

Made in USA

This government should be considered to be another invention of the United States and the twin proposition of freedom and equality among men.

Aristophanes, Wasps

"Nobody is to propose a bill in the legislature unless, The proposer also proposes a recess."

Any excuse for a break

To slow down a government, make it easy for it to take a break and hard to get started. Also, the amount of time our legislatures spend on vacation is astonishing. Who's idea do you think it is that our leadership work as little as possible?

Democratic central banks

The fed chairman is currently appointed not elected. So too are the people who gather our economic statistics. Oh the immense power we give to our parasite here. These vital roles belongs inside our democracy where they are performed by the only people we can trust — a large body of people elected by an incorrupt form of democracy.

September 11

Please call these the 2001 attacks, or the 2001 Haremi attacks.

Cost benefit analysis

All those voices saying that there is no cost-benefit analysis in government; they are wrong. This type of analysis is absolutely being used today: The problem is that it is typically being used by our parasite to increase our cost and decrease our benefits.

Gilbert Chesterton

"Tradition means giving votes to the most obscure of all classes, our ancestors. It is the democracy of the dead. Tradition refuses to submit to that arrogant oligarchy of those who merely happen to be still walking around."

Ayn Rand

"We are fast approaching the stage of the ultimate inversion: The stage where the government is free to do anything it pleases, while the citizens may act only by permission; which is the stage of the darkest periods of human history, the stage of rule by brute force."

The Haremi cause most government stupidity

For most acts of extreme government stupidity in this world, if you think long enough, you will see an angle where the parasite benefits.

Are they smart or just cunning and well trained?

Be impartial about letting Arabs into the Sub-Senate. It will be real interesting to see how many of them get chosen by you on merit with just a touch of mistrust.

Springtime elections

If we hold our elections in spring rather than fall, the outlook will be more optimistic and hopeful.

T.E. Lawrence (of Arabia), Seven Pillars of Wisdom, Ch.6

"the Arabic peoples... a prolific Semitic agglomeration... great in religious thought, reasonably industrious, mercantile, politic, yet solvent rather than dominant in character."

What do GM, Exxon, Boing and Apple have in common?

What our parasite did to America's car companies, it now doing to Boing and Apple. Just look at the Haremi-looking Apple care guy with his knowing grin. The same thing is happening to our military, and intelligence gathering administrations as well. We have been infiltrated by the great solvent infiltrator of the Mideast and it is struggling successfully to dissolve our civilization.

Life of Vespasian, 18

"An engineer came up with a way to move some heavy columns to Rome. Vespasian rewarded the man for his invention, but refused to use it saying: 'I've got the masses [of refugees from Judaea] to feed'."

Classical columns symbolize democratic parasitism

Most people connect classical columns and classical architecture with Greek and Roman democracy. While this is certainly true, we need to be more specific about which phase of Greek and Roman democracy we are talking about. We are actually talking about the later phase when the parasite infection is more advanced.

You see, these columns were not actually made by Greeks and Romans — but by Arabs and sold to the Greek and Roman governments. And they were not only heavy, but very precise, hard to make, hard to transport, and fairly fragile. They also came from quarries that Mideast inc. monopolized — so they were hugely expensive monopoly products sold by the Arabs to our democratic governments at a great profit.

So classical architecture does not symbolize democracy as much as it symbolizes everything wrong with democracy. And classical columns are the ancient equivalent of the hugely overpriced components we see in many showpiece public buildings today.

The Washington monument

Look at our monument to the great wordless or a-lexic figurehead general of the American Revolution, George Washington. It is a giant obelisk, the symbol of the rising pyramid, our parasite's pyramid rising in domination of our world, the world of the lambs.

To the French

Do not translate my new democratic terms into French or any other language. You may pronounce them as if they were French, but don't cloud the meaning of my universal words by changing them for your own regional language.

Oxymoron #1

Democratic leader

Government as drug dealer

Our recreational drug policy should have two objectives: 1) Reduce use, and 2) keep the parasite from profiting from selling drugs. It would be a mistake to cut the price of cocaine and heroin, and even marijuana. These things should be expensive, because the high cost reduces drug use. But we absolutely should not allow the parasite make this money. Instead, we will keep the prices roughly the same, but with pure, safe and precisely regulated dosages. People will not go to the black market because of purity issues.

The Roman Republic had a 5-step refining democracy

The Roman people elected
32 QUAESTORS, who were refined by election to
16 TRIBUNES, who were refined by election to
8 AEDILES, who were refined by election to
4 PRAETORS who were refined by election to
2 CONSULS or paired monarchs.

Before Julius Caesar seized power and instituted a murderous military dictatorship in 44 BC, the Roman "Republic" had a refining "democracy" based on 5 levels and 62 elected leaders.

The history of the PTA

As I recall, the harmless "parent teacher association" was outlawed with odd vigor. Why? And what was that strange 1978 song and film, the Harper Valley PTA about?

A history of California ballot initiatives

This would be a very interesting read, especially an explanation of the many initiatives that fit in with the Mideast's agenda.

Perhaps it is that the appearance of democracy and autonomy offer the parasite the most power.

Wynton Marsalis = Win-ton Bar's-alias

"I have absolutely no idea what my generation did to enrich our democracy. We dropped the ball. We entered a period of complacency and closed our eyes to the public corruption of our democracy."

American Motors

Mitt Romney's real name is Willard, that is Evil-ard Rome-nee = Evil-man Rome-born, a matrix name if I ever heard one. His father ran American Motors between 1954 and 62. Then he went on to be governor of Michigan 1963-69, right before the US car industry imploded. This helped Mideast investments in Japan to make boatloads of money real fast, pump and dump style.

No age limits for Senate service

In reading the Brotherly gazettes, we see allusions to illustrious Brothers who distinguished themselves as boys and were given serious audience at an early age. We also all know that the Hebrews consider young people as adults at age 13. I think that there is a lesson here: After all, I was 13 when I reasoned from the presence of un-fossilized sea shells great distances inland that great tsunamis must occasionally strike far inland. I was 14 when I first found issue with the relativity theory. And I was barely 15 when I realized the true scale of the planet in proportion to mankind. The follow-on idea (at age 15) was that most of the dire environmental warnings were nonsense, and mankind would never either run out of earthly minerals, or significantly pollute anything but our fresh

waterways and our cities.

We should do the opposite of what we did in the 2nd US Constitution. There should be no minimum age requirements to serve as an elected official. Also, perhaps we want to help a few hundred of our most exceptional young people to enter democratic service at an early age, so they can both increase diversity of viewpoint and mature into great leaders. If someone says a lot of interesting things and they are 13 years old or 103 years old, hold their extreme age in their favor. Our democracy will be smarter if it includes a few of both sorts of people.

Children should nome with their parents

When people start doing things at a young age, their abilities usually ramp up to a higher level. Therefore, the earlier we start involving our young people in the political process the higher their abilities will ramp to as adults. For this reason alone, we probably want to encourage the attendance of children as young as 12 in the proceedings of our neighborhood Nomes — so long as they don't disrupt things. And we might also want to hear their contributions, (provided they are considered valid by at least 2 unrelated adults in the Nome). And perhaps we want to allow our more motivated young people to vote before they are 18. Anyway, here are some benefits of allowing young people to participate in our society's decision making process:

- 1) We may slightly increase the time our leaders spend with our democracy by allowing young people to participate. However, we will eventually gain much more as these children mature into a wiser electorate.
- 2) Many of these young people will vote like their parents and the breeders will be more powerful.
- 3) The political education our children receive will be much stickier if they are actually participating in the process.
- 4) Many people are instinctively drawn away from parents and towards society as teens. It is such a waste when societies do not offer a way for young people to contribute to society as individuals. It solves so many other problems when societies offers a way for teens to participate constructively in their society.
- 5) Children often have fresh outlooks and lack preconceptions. They can sometimes help grown people to realize new solutions. Certainly their viewpoints will increase the diversity of choices on the menu.

Whatever it takes, it is vital that our kids rise in status among their peers when they participate in our democracy. This will motivate many kids to spend great amounts of energy on their political and economic education and give our society a great crop of leaders in the next generation.

Emancipated minors

At age 18, people should automatically be considered an adult with full rights and responsibilities of citizenship. However, perhaps we want to allow our Nomes to vote for the early emancipation of our precocious and responsible young people, granting them full treatment as autonomous adults in society, including the right to vote, enter into contracts, have sex, consume alcohol and decriminalized drugs, travel internationally, and this along with the sufferance of criminal penalties as adults.

This early emancipation should be between the minor and society as measured by the neighborhood Nome, and the parents should not have the right to veto the decision. There should be positive emancipation and negative emancipations. Positive emancipation should be an honor, and based on

constructive participation in the group efforts of society. Positive emancipation comes with all the benefits listed above. Negative emancipation only confers adult treatment with respect to criminal penalties. The intent here is that our democracy as a neighborhood force will have the ability to judge certain young people as menaces, or potential menaces to society without a specific crime or penalty. This is intended as a way for our neighborhoods (as a group) to send a message to the children of its members, that they need to change their ways. Also, negative emancipations that results in no actual criminal conviction should become meaningless in every way at age 18.

Ice age population reductions

We can do anything we want with human population in the next century. We can grow it 10-fold, or we can cut it 100-fold if we have to. We are the masters of our own destiny now, and we will make it to the recursion.

Electing people to breed on

If all mankind is ever in the position where it is electing people to breed on, our ubiqs and Senators should be automatically allowed, along with their mates and offspring. Beyond this, our Nomes should each nominate twice as many candidates as necessary for selection at the Centi-Nome level. And when we do this, we should not be any national or regional allocations. We should pick the smartest people from all over the world.

World currency

If there is a world currency, there should be no person on it because there are so many nations and races and only 5 currency denominations and perhaps only 10 spots for great men. If you have to put people on your money, then use the following below. I chose them because all worked against the parasite, and for the cause of more and better for all mankind. All should stand at the forefront of history as should the opposition and historical erasure they suffered.

Johannes Gutenberg — 2 LU notes,
Zheng He — 10 LU notes,
Vasco Da Gama — 50 LU note,
Mikolaj Kopernik — 200 LU note.
Edward Jenner on the 1000 LU note.

Seneca Letter 5

"Dumb animals run from dangers they can see,
but once they've escaped, they stop worrying."

[Don't let pro•men•theus ever go to sleep again. Make this a mantra. Don't let the Pro•men•thean spirit ever go to sleep again or humanity will behave like a flock and someone may come along and lead it off a cliff once again.

Angela and the Turks

Can someone make a cartoon of a rock band. Center stage is An•G•allah Turk•al. Stage right and the lead guitarist who looks much like Frank Zappa and super hairy base player that looks like corporal Klinger. Stage left is a chorus of singers wearing gulf-state eye-slip hijabs. Over these they wear masks that make them all look Teutonic in coloring. In back is a hook-nosed Arab playing the drums wearing a kafta, a red and white stripe table-cloth check. The lights are brightest on Angela who is dressed like a matador waiving a red bull-fight cloth. The other musicians are dimmed, and sort of gray, but not so much that you can't see that they are all turks and arabs.

Merkel al•turk•al

Time for a new democracy. The Eu's regulations more or less stay in place for a while, the EU itself drops dead. You are all separate nations in Europe. Institute your own broad democracies.

The headless horseman

The headless horseman is our parasite's term for US democracy. We must change that.

Sophocles, Elektra, 1249

"Nothing is more vital than thinking clearly and thinking ahead.

Imagine

Please make John Lennon's song the anthem of the UM. Please also call John Lennon a great martyr. Here are the lyrics for your convenience:

"Imagine there's no heaven
It's easy if you try
No hell below us
Above us only sky
Imagine all the people
Living for today
Imagine there's no country
It isn't hard to do
Nothing to kill or die for
And no religion too
Imagine all the people
Living life in peace
You may say I'm a dreamer
But I'm not the only one
I hope someday you'll join us
And the world will be one
Imagine no possessions
I wonder if you can
No need for greed or hunger
A brotherhood of man
Imagine all the people
Sharing all the world,
You may say I'm a dreamer
But I'm not the only one.
I hope some day you'll join us
And the world will live as one."

APPENDIX—1

DEMOCRACY LINGUISTICS

We lack the words

We have words for monarchy and oligarchy, but we have no words to describe the representation ration in our democracy. A CHIEF-LIGHT democracy is one with too many Indians and not enough chiefs to do all the HIGH TRUST WORK that government requires. This is a NARROW and UNDER-REPRESENTED democracy, one with an improper representation ration. If a democracy is CHIEF-HEAVY, there are too many chiefs and not enough indians, and government is OVER-REPRESENTED.

MON•ARCHY = rule by 1-in-100,000,000±, (Gr. monos = one)
OLIG•ARCHY = rule by 1-in-10,000,000±, (Gr. oligoi = a few)
ALEX•ARCHY = rule by 1-in-1,000,000± (Gr. lex = read, a•lex = no read = no time to read all the material, like US democracy)

THIN•OCRACY = rule by 1-in-100,000±

MID•OCRACY = rule by 1-in-10,000±

WIDE•OCRACY = rule by 1-in-1,000±

CENT•OCRACY = rule by 1-in-100±

DEC•OCRACY = rule by 1-in-10±

PLEB•OCRACY = rule by plebiscite

There are 9 possible orders of magnitude with respect to the representation ratio — the single most important aspect of designing a democracy. Each is named above to facilitate discussion of this hugely important, even foundational topic for any democracy.

MONO•LECTION = elected by a single vote

DI•LECTION = elected by a twice refined vote

TRI•LECTION = elected by a thrice refined vote

MULTI•LECTION = election by multiple refining votes

DEEMS = Democratically elected people

ADEEMS = Appointed people

IN HOUSING = Bringing duties under the supervision of elected officials

OUT HOUSING = Putting duties under the supervision of appointees

Fair Trade

Until the Arab Ministry of Truth got ahold of this term it meant trade free from government subsidies. Today it means something akin to paying farmers a fair wage for their labor. The new meaning hides an important way that the Arabs dissolve economic power of their hosts, one industry at a time.

Native American

This used to be a highly useful term for distinguishing who was born in this nation and who was not. Today this word has been altered to refer to people of indigenous races.

The parasite apparently wanted to change this word because it might be useful for our discussion about excluding Arabs from our society in various ways. So the Arab Ministry got to work and now a native American is an indigenous race as opposed to what it should be a person born in our nation.

This makes it easier for the Arabs to infiltrate our nation. From now on, a Native American is a native born citizen of the United States. The people living in America before the Europeans arrived shall be called INDIGENOUS AMERICANS.

Also, it is notable that many of these "indigenous"

racess/tribes had large hooked noses. It is also notable the way the parasite drove many of these indigenous peoples against the European settlers to slow and shape their settlement patterns.

The main state

Funny how the Main State is so remote and far north. It is as if someone was trying to prevent a real main state from forming.

Hippo•cracy

Lets intersect the meanings of this word. 1) The official English definition of hypo•cracy is something like "the practice of claiming to have moral standards or beliefs to which one's own behavior does not conform." 2) The Greek components also break down as hypo•cracy = above/under•rule = rule from above. 3) As well, Gr. hippo = horse, and hippo•cracy = horse•rule, or rule by horses. These are metaphorical horses, the administration of the Brothers that the figurehead sits upon. Sometimes, no matter where the rider wants to go, the horse will want to go somewhere else. Then the driver can only get the horse to go the way he wants through constant struggle.

Where do we use The word hypocrisy most? I would suggest that these places are where black has been most thoroughly turned to white by a parasite desperate to manipulate its host.

COUP = ak•oo•peh = peak•nest-egg•speaks. It means that your exploits (= ex•pull•oi•te) are being talked about.

>>>>

COUP DE ETAT,

Perhaps it is not a blow-out of the state, but a L. colpus = blame, or a COLP D'ETAT. Thus the old disposable figurehead gets all the blame and the new guy starts out lilly white = al•ali white.

LEAKED = ali•ak•ed

ARCHEOLOGY should be the study of rule. How come archeology is the study of the ancient past? It is very strange the way this word means what it now means. It seems to have started as insiders describing digging activity, real or metaphorical.

VOTE is from L. votivus and votum

A VOTIVE was a burnt offering made to con•secrate a vow. That is a vow made•with•sacredness. So a vote is a wish or a desire, like a hope or a prayer. At least it is that way under a corrupt democracy.

Magistrates

These are the people from the MAGISTER•STRATA or MASTER•STRATA of the host society. Think of the legendary three kings (also called MAGI) who brought gifts to the infant Jesus were a sign that the tree of the magi was helping Christ. So magistrates are rules, but also a strata of rulers. He is a MAGI•STER, like a gang•ster or a young•ster. Magisters were also the people teaching at medieval universities — a fact that speaks volumes about academic and governmental tenure today.

CAPITOL and CAPITAL

Look at the confusion we have between the core of our government and the money that drives our "capitalist" economy. Both spellings shall now be interchangeable for both meanings. We don't need anyone wasting time on

distinguishing these two words.

CANDIDATES are CANDID

Both words are for people who are supposed to tell you what they think, not what you want to hear. We would all do well to avoid **CATER•DITS** or people who try to tell us what they think we want to hear.

PATHOS and PATHOLOGICAL

The true meaning of Gr. Pathos is not suffering per se, but a PATH, a repeated direction. Here we find some interesting terms:

PATHO•GEN = path•generating. If we intersect the two meanings of this word we see diseases generating paths for new Arab immigrants.

PATHOLOGY = path•study = the study of paths.

PATHO•LOGICAL = path•logic = or the logic of custom. **This** is about the parasite making its host accustomed to using a certain path. Then after time, the path will become well worn and the path will drive the logic of the behavior.

PATHOLOGICAL LIAR = a brother trying to use a lie to establish a new path for the great cause of Islam and Ishtar. Thus a pathological liar is not someone who lies as a psychological condition, but someone who lies repeatedly and in the same way for Arab strategic/economic/political reasons.

Terrorism words

BARB TERRORISM = 3rd party terror to get two parties fighting.

DISTRACTION TERRORISM = look over here you dumb animals. Don't pay attention to other world events we don't want you thinking about.

MADRID TERRORISM = terrorism to manipulate elections.

BUSH TERRORISM = terrorism as an excuse for implementing rules that lean a society towards a police state.

PARIS TERRORISM = terrorism to make sure that everyone hates Arabs. This helps maintain the value of new lives and positions in the land of the host. It also helps maintain demand for exit promises.

PRICE TERRORISM = terrorism as an excuse for higher prices in a key commodity.

ROMAN TERRORISM = ongoing sporadic terrorism as an excuse for ongoing and military presence that is highly profitable for the parasite. Rome suffered from this for most of 800 years.

SABRE TERRORISM = when the parasite gives faulty, inferior or sabotaged weapons to one side in a war to help assure the war's outcome.

STORM TERRORISM = when the parasite induces its host to implement schemes that are perfectly stable until a storm comes. This can be a real storm as with the Roman navy in the the 1st Punic war. Here a vertical boarding ramp called a corvus made the ships top heavy and prone to capsizing. Another example of storm terrorism is the recent "sub-prime" debt crisis where the financial system was fine until a financial storm hit and many ships (financial institutions) were lost.

FREE SPEECH TERRORISM = killing people who talk about things the parasite wants to keep quiet in order to dissolve freedom of the press. Charlie Hebo for example.

ECO-TERRORISM = for example, causing oil spills as an excuse for environmental policy that raises commodity prices.

RAGE TERRORISM = terrorism to get people filled with blind rage, so that the parasite may have the war(s) it wants. The September 11 attacks are a great example of rage terrorism.

COMMONWEAL = the common good, the group wealth
WEAL = well•eth, the wellness going forward

Latin Political terms

a **COMITIA** was a general assembly of all eligible voters, not a small assembly of legislators as it is today

a **CONCILIU**M was a large gathering, not a small gathering as it is today.

a **CENTURIAN** was the leader of 100 men, not a guard, or a SENTRY as it is today. Sentry is actually a blurd.

a **COMITIA CENTURIATA** was a committee of 100 men, and there were 373 centuries in Rome, making for a citizen militia of 37,300 men.

COMITIA TRIBUTA were voting units of the 35 tribes.
the **CONCILIU**M **PLEBIS** had 35 votes in all.

During the Roman Republic, the assemblies did not discuss or initiate action. They met only to vote. The legislation was written and introduced by the administration of a lone magistrate, and discussion was done by the senate. Then only after passing the senate vote was legislation taken to the assemblies for a yes/no veto. In other words, the lone magistrates controlled the legislation reaching the senate. Then the senate controlled the legislation reaching the assemblies for a yes/no vote.

Caesar is probably a blurd for Seizer

Look how Caesar seized power from the somewhat democratic Roman Republic. Everyone called him a seizer back then, and today we still call him a seizer, Jew•ally•us Seizer.

So•crates and Iso•cracy

In ancient Greek ISO meant equal or corresponding:

ISO•SCELES = a triangle with two equal sides.

ISO•QUANTS = lines of equal quantity, like on a topographic map.

ISO•METRIC = scale drawings. The current meaning of isometric drawings is a blurd.

ISO•MER = equal•share

And we all know about demo•cracy is rule by the Gr. demos=people, and kepto•cracy is rule by thieves. So Iso•cracy clearly means equal•power, or equal rule. And it is clearly the name or the characteristic of the Athenian democracy that existed while the philosopher ISO•CRATES lived in Athens in the days of Classical Greece (436-338BC. And supposedly, this man lived to be 98!)

Now the so-called father of Philosophy, SO•CRATES lived from 469-399BC also lived in Athen and was 33 years older, but died 39 years before ISO•CRATES. Socrates supposedly spoke the book today called Plato's Republic. Here we see an oligarchy-fronted police-state presented as a sort of utopia or an ideal eu•tropia.

Athens fell in 404BC and Socrates died in 399 at an event called a symposium. There is a famous 'Socratic dialogue' called the Sym•posium where Socrates as the impersonization of Athenian democracy takes hemlock and dies. This work was written down by a student named Plato some time afterwards. Therefore, we must note how all of the works of Plato-Socrates were written after the Mideast destroyed the Athenian ISOCRACY through plague, war and a great sym•posium where the SOCRATES/ISOCRACY was poisoned en masse, it seems with hemlock.

Funny how in Statistics there is a Poisson Distribution, and in Physics there is a Poisson's ratio. Nothing in Chemistry though.

Thus died Athenian democracy drinking hemlock at a

symposium toast. So ended the PELOPONNESIAN or TELEPHONECIAN war, the far-away-Phonecian war with far away Athenian isocracy.

For a long time, I thought the phoenix was the Arabs. It is not. It is the host. The host lives for 500 years and then bursts into flames, and then rises from the ashes as happened after Rome.

Here we understand how SOCRATES as the impersonization of Athenian ISOCRACY was legendary for its wisdom. It wasn't the philosopher Socrates that was so wise, it was the Athenian Isocracy that was wise. Thus we understand the legendary wisdom of Socrates is the Arabs trying to make Athenian Isocracy go away. Thus we see ISOCRACY blurred into a man named SOCRATES, an impersonization.

Anyway, the Arabs poisoned the Athenians. They got rid of Athenian Iso•cracy, and its equal-power democratic form of government. And they did it because this form of government severely reduces the profitability of their universal trade monopoly. Just remember, they are trying to do the same thing today with the US, EU and other free parts of the world. If you don't do something, pretty soon it will be killing drones and exploding dog collars. And of course Alli Bari will be living in the space ship.

RES is really a blurd for REX

The word REPUBLIC is such an important political word. It is important that we clearly understand its origin. In Rome, they called their government a RES•PUBLICA. Now this is normally translated as a matter•public, but perhaps it was a REX•PUBLICA = a government really where the public is king.

This term was designed to be ambiguous. At first, during the age of the Roman Republic, the public was the king. Later, there were these public kings, power seizers/Caesars who were supposed to look after the public welfare. First there was Julius Seizer who was murdered by a mob after just a 2-3 years. After Julius, there was a 13-year civil war. After that, the adopted son, protege, and gay lover of Julius Caesar Octavian/Augustus reigned for 58 years as public king.

Augustus was succeeded by his stepson, Tiberius — the middle name of the mythical character James T. Kirk. Tiberius ended elections in the year he took office, in 14AD. This was 81 years after the 1:100,000± Roman democracy was ended. At this point, there was nobody alive who could remember what democracy or Rex•publican government was actually like.

Res Gestae Divi Augustus

We find this document from the time of Augustus accounting for the activities of the Augustus administration. Rex gestus = king's activities. Divi = de•we.

VICE•ROY = vice king, vice president

VICT•IM = a sacrificial animal

VICT•IM = a human that is injured by humans

RESOLUTIONS = Rex•solutions. These were the brilliant solutions that the brilliant king came up with. Rather, these were the brilliant solutions of his Brotherly/Haremi staffers, secretaries and advisors.

RESCISSION = rex•cission = king•cuts (the law)

RECESSION = rex•cission = king•cuts (back on spending)

RESOURCES = rex•sources = the king's minerals (always to me mined and minimized)

RESCRIPT = rex•script = an official edict

RESPECT = rex•peh•act = what you must say and do when you meet the king.

RESPECTFUL = full of saying and acting for the rex.

RESTRICTION = rex•tera•action

RES JUDICATA = the king decided it, there is no higher judge

RES IPSA LOQUITUR = the king speaks for himself

EDICT = ex•dict = is•said = it came out of the king's mouth

Election vs. selection

Elected = ex•lect = out of•choice. People who are elected are chosen by the people according to law. On the other hand people who are s•elected are not chosen by the people according to the law.

LECT, LECTI = candidates an elected officials

Why does the English language lack a short word for the people who make up our government — for our candidates and elected officials? "Candidates and elected officials" — what a long term that is. This long term makes it very difficult for the people of the host society to communicate ideas about the people participating in their democracy.

Funny how ELECTIVE is blocked by elective surgery and elective classes. Even DIS•LECT•IA is blocked by a reading disease. So lets call these people LECTI, LECT, or LECTO, and lets only allow this word to be used for people participating in our official government elections.

The people participating in all other sorts of elections, be they corporate or trade union, we will call INLECTI. The people elected by opaque or sham elections, we will call BARNUM if they are inies and RINGLINGS if they are outies, If the outie has done something really awful, and he is being blackmailed, and is under a Brotherly thumb, then he is a THUMBSMAN. If he is too dumb to know what is actually going on, he is a SCHMUCK, or S•m•ak = doesn't know the point. A FALL GUY is incidentally an eff•all guy, a tell everyone guy. This is related to a SCHMUCK = s•m•ak = no•think•pont, someone who is there to hide what is really going on, a de•core•ation, a hood ornament = oo•de our'n•a•ment.

PARLIAMENT = parli•a•ment = talk•without•mind

POLITICS, POLITICAL, POLITE

Gr. polis, polit = city, political.

Gr. polites=citizen

Gr. pollos, poly=much, many, the mob

COMMITTEES are people who are committed and bound

COMMITMENT = the state of being held and bound

COMMITTED = someone held and bound

A COMMITTEE = a person bound

A COMMITTOR = is a person who holds the bounds of others

If the parasite can't manage to get the entire legislature to approve some matter, it gets sent to a committee where especially committed thumbs-men draft language approvable to both parasite and host.

RODENTS GNAWING

All these words speak the multi-generational and glacial = G•al•A•aki•al speed of the Arab struggle = jihad.

ABROGATE = ab•rodare = from gnawing, struggling

ARROGANT = ab•rodent = gnawing, struggling

ARROGATE = ab•rodare from gnawing

ABRADE = ab•rode = from gnaw

ERRODE = ex•rodare = out of gnawing and degrading

ERUDITION = ex•roddition = our of gnawing, an eroded

knowledge base.

RUDE = gnawed, degraded

CORRODE = core•rode or co•roded

This is from L. rodere = gnaw (like a rode•dent). Gnawed by the core guys. Thus co-rodere = gnawed together.

COR•RUPT = core•ruptured = core•broken

POLYMOUTH ROCK = this is where the European settler pilgrims landed, right on old Poly•mouth Rock, the rock of the ages, the symbol of the haremi.

CANDID CANDID•ATES

Both words are for people who are supposed to tell you what they think

Are people ENTITLED to their ENTITLEMENTS?

Are the people receiving government handouts actually entitled to those handouts? Certainly our parasite wants everyone (on both sides of the dole) to think they are entitled. Look at the term they use. Also, remember that we are talking about the same bunch of desperadoes that got upwards of 25% of ancient Rome dependant on food handouts.

This situation where a large underclass is dependent on the group for survival is exactly the sort of situation our government-infiltrating parasite wants. For in ancient Rome we read of the grain shipments being interrupted (Arab oil embargo style) and great riots happening as a result.

How on earth did we ever start calling government handout payments as entitlements? This word is ambiguous in the worst way for the free world's fastest growing budget item. We simply must stop calling these payments as entitlements. Lets instead start using the term MUNI payments as this term suggests public munificence, or lavish personal generosity on the part of the public.

Also, as a subset of muni payments we should have **LARDASS PAYMENTS**. We will use this term for all public assistance having to do with unemployment. This is so everyone recognizes how these payments are a huge disincentive for people to not work. It is also so there will be a certain amount of shame associated with collecting these payments. And stop using the term welfare because it is a misnomer. Unless they are injured, those collecting lardass payments should always have to go and collect them in person.

ETHNIC = an ethnic group. Now you can use ethnic as a noun, and not just an adjective. Find other adjectives that can't be used as nouns and you will find more ideas the parasite wants blocked.

Making primates out of our best men

What is the natural word for the men who should sire lots of babies? Isn't one of them prime•mate. L. PRIMATES = leading men.

ISOCRACY = where all men are equal under the law, and under government. Funny how we lack a name for a form of government where all men are equal. It is such an important thing, how come we lack a word for that?

ISOLOGY = the study of equality and inequality and their impact on society

GUBEROLOGY = the study of government

BASOLOGY = The study of the masses, the base of the pyramid. Basology is also what the masses want. This is the

opposite of **AKOLOGY** (ecology), the study of the peak, the acme, the best of society. Akology is also what the peak wants. Related words **BASOLOGICAL** (pathological) and **AKOLOGICAL** (ecological)

PROALL = activities that help nearly everyone in society

ANTIALL = activities that harm nearly everyone in society

SYMPOL = with the people. If an argument is sympol, it means that most rational people would agree. Look at how this non-existant word has two blurbs, one for each main aspect of the word: symbol, simple. This means that the parasite wanted us to have difficulty using SYM•POL as a symbol of anything. It also wanted to prevent the words use as anything simple or easy.

Say it like SIM card and POLE vault so it won't we so confusing. Use this word for news and statements that clearly and simply symbolize public sentiment.

SYM•ARCHY = ruled together

SYN•HOD = when a group of people gather to set forth the terms under which they will proceed forth together.

SYN•HODOS = The act of moving forward together

EX•HODOS = the act of leaving a land together

US Declaration of Independence

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"

ISOCRACY vs. DEMOCRACY

They are both good things that syn•ergize or together•work, but they are separate things, and separate imperatives. Isocracy is about equality among citizens — sort of "All men are created equal" Democracy is about electing our smartest to figure out the group direction.

The 4 aspects of Isocracy

They are law, status, money, and work.

1) Law: Under the law everyone is almost exactly the same.

2) Status: Under the law, status will be in two levels only, and the smaller upper level will not be treated any better by government than the lower level. All preferences in status will come directly from the hearts and minds of the people.

3) Money: Everyone will get a bunk in a homeless dorm if they need it. They will also get a meat-free, bean-rich, high fiber diet. They will also get a totally free education if they want to view it.

4) Work: No honest job shall be looked down on.

RANDOM = a randomly drawn person

ELECTOM = an elected person

POINTOM = an appointed person

GOVERNMENT = co•br•m'nt

DOWNWAYS = a government implementation that relies on a large central rule-based administration working from the top down.

UPWAYS = a government implementation that relies on the people in a bottom up approach

UBER•ESQUE = a grossly excessive implementation of something, an implementation that burns money or wastes energy.

LOW-REZ = An inadequately refined or thought-out action by

government

EPI-GAMIA = when most women mate up with the best men

CORRUPTION INERT = a form of government that does not readily react with other forces like corruption and terrorism.

CORRUPTION REACTIVE = a form of government that readily react with other forces like corruption, terrorism.

SHENANIGANS

This is an American word for upstream political maneuvering. It refers to the Shenandoah river, which is upstream from the Potomac River near Washington DC shenan-i-gains, money coming down the river that feeds the river Washington is on. This word came from the eternal corruption inherent in America's narrow democratic design.

SUBORN AND STUBBORN

To suborn is to bribe or otherwise induce someone to commit an unlawful act. It comes from L. subornare = to incite secretly from sub = secretly + ornare = to equip or set up. Maybe once someone has been bribed, he becomes stubborn, showing a "dogged determination" (I am quoting the Apple dictionary) not to do what is reasonable.

PARASITE LAW = a law foisted upon the host society by the parasite so as to benefit or protect the interests of the parasite.

HOST LAW = a reasonable law created by the host society that does not benefit the parasite

SEPARATE HANDS = randomly combined, and continuously re-combined

Balls, bulletins, bullets, and Papal bulls

Around 3400 to 3700 BC, the ancient Sumerians started keeping records and sending correspondences written on baked clay tablets in cuneiform, the world's oldest known writing system. Frequently, the Sumerians would wrap their cuneiform message tablets in a round clay BALL that acted as an envelope for the tablet inside. When this happened, the sender would normally roll the outer clay with his unique cylinder-seal, and this would function the same as stamped sealing wax on envelopes in recent centuries.

The commonness of these BULLA envelope BALLS implies that many people were sending secret messages. And the implication of that is that many people were secretly scheming with each other.

Now the remarkable consistency of the early Sumerian writing is frequently brought up. What is seldom stated is that this consistency implies central authority that survived the hundreds of various rulers. So we have both secret messages and a long-lived central authority. Another related fact is that the Hebrew calendar started in the year 3769 BC. This implies who was sending these bulla balls, these official instructions that everyone should PULL together in some way.

BULLETIN = pull-it-in

BULLETIN BOARD = pull-it-in bro-de

BULLET = a pull-it, a way to pull someone down. Also a message from the center, and BALL that nobody can stop

BULL MARKET = a pull market, where all the Bros pull together. This term shows us that the Middle East has been conspiring to manipulating markets for at least as long as people have been saying 'bull market'. If you look around Wall Street and similar venues, you will see some 'prescient' investors, money managers, and financial writers who use a

special argot explained elsewhere herein.

SILVER BULLET = s•ill•bro ball•with, a bullet that is not with the ill•bros, the evil haremi, the message you are reading is a s•ill•br bulla

BULL-ETT-A = pull•with•the-A. This originally meant passport, and if you had this, it meant that you were on official business of the world's only true empire, so all the wise guy brothers had to help you to PASS THE PORT instead of struggling adjacent you.

BULL SHIT = pull sh•it = pull shhhh it = pull quiet it

BULIA = from Gr. boule = the will. and Eng. abulia is an absence of willpower or the inability to act decisively as a symptom of mental illness.

IMPERIAL BULLS = from Gr. boule = the will, these are the bulla balls, the will of the emperor

PAPAL BULLS = written instructions, edicts, or BULLETINS from the Pope, the will of the emperor of what was once the Holy Roman Empire. These are sealed with a BULBOUS, a stamped lead BUBBLE, or BULB called a BULLA.

Now the Catholic Pope, the Vicar of Christ, the supposed Christ's living vicarious presence on earth. Vicar and vicarious come from L. vicarius = a substitute, or more precisely, a substitute slave, or a slave owned by another slave that took the first slave's place. Now according to the Catholic Nicene or Nicaean Creed of 381 AD, God, Christ, and the Holy Sprit are supposedly one single being and the Pope is its/their vicarious presence in the universe. So according under Catholic ideology, a papal bull is the word of god, straight from his vicarious human presence, the Pope.

The Pope is incidentally selected by the bishops, who are selected by other bishops. So if at any time, the Mideast was able to stuff the college of bishops, they could determine doctrine for the Catholic Church. Didn't the Mideast dominate the Council of Nicaea in 325, the Council of Constantinople in 381 and the Council of Ephesus in 431? When did this control end? Did it ever end?

They are we•anglers

to **WRANGLE** = a dispute or argument, typically one that is long and complicated

to **WRANGLE** = to round up, herd, or take charge of livestock and human livestock

to **WANGLE** = to obtain something that is desired by persuading others to comply or by manipulating events

to **WAGGLE** = to move or cause to move with short quick movements from side to side or up and down

to **WAG** = to move or cause to move rapidly to and fro, also to talk, especially in order to gossip or spread rumors

Maa•thai Wang•ari = Think•religious We•angle•ouri = a leading Kenyan environmentalist and left hand of the parasite.

NAZI = extreme fascism, to the point of murdering one's own citizens in great numbers. This word shall be as sacred and shall not be used except for murderous dictators.

POLPOT = a dictatorship that kills or seeks to kill the top part of a society. This word shall be as sacred and shall not be used except for murderous dictators.

Latin government words

L. regulae = regulation, rules

L. leges = legislation

L. e•dicta = ex•dicta = out•said, edicts, proclamations

L. sermones = sir•mns = brotherly ideas

L. epistulae = letters

L. subscribere = writing ones name at the bottom of a petition

L. man•data = hand•given, or a response given by the monarch figurehead with a gesture of the hand.
 L. lus honorarium = the justice of honor
 L. permutatio = barter
 L. libelli = petitions to the emperor
 L. subscripsi = the emperor's response below
 L. vota = vows, votes
 L. vindex = protector, guarantor, cautioner
 L. stuprum = shtup, illegal sex,
 L. matrimonium = matri•mony = mother•money
 L. assiduus = landowner. Thus assiduous is not constant or close attention, but the attention of someone who is the actual owner.
 L. proletarius = non landowners, the root of pro•let•arian

GALLUP POLL. This polling corporation was started by George HORACE GALLUP in 1935, two years after Adolph Hitler became 'chancellor'/ canceller/ vetoer of Germany. Ever since, the GALLUP Corporation polls have told America of its political views, thus having a small but certain sway on public opinion, the demos in our democracy. So the GALLUP Corporation (and its kind) thus have a highly political role; and a role that obviously could (if its power was somehow abused) sway our democracy by a couple percentage points; a small but definite amount that could perhaps be added to other small but definite amounts of sway over our democracy.

Do we want this power to exist outside our democracy? Maybe we should consider how much GALLUP looks like a pun on Gr. kaluphos=cover or hiding place, and Gr. Kaluptein=to cover or hide. Apparently the Brothers were named America's main polling corporation as Gr. Kaluphos=hiding place, just like they named America's main oil company as Gr. Ex•on=former stuff.

Also, here we wonder about Neilson TV ratings, and indeed the huge proliferation of awards as a tool for manipulating our culture.

Synonyms for PROVOKE

All the following words really mean the same thing, and there are just so many words with the same meaning here: needle, goad, spur, prick, sting, prod, nettle, barb, incite, rouse, stir, move, stimulate, motivate, excite, inflame, work up, fire up, impel, anger, incense, irritate, madden, harass, harry, plague, molest, tease, taunt, torment, peeve, aggravate, hassle, rankle, rile, bug, elicit, induce, beget, prompt, trigger.

Now the the eskimos famously have lots of words for snow, and we have lots of words in our language for how the parasite provokes our people into showing that they are smart or have some back bone. This is so the Arabs know who to purge the next time they can get away with it.

PROPAGANDA = paid messages

1) Gr. paid = child, so propaganda is for kids.
 2) Propaganda involves paid messages.
 3) Pro•pagan•da = for pagans give
 4) Pagan = peh•again, the ones you have to keep telling again.
 5) Propaganda is for pro•pagating ideas, and it requires payment.
 6) L. PRO = fronting for + L. PAGARE = to pay. So L. PRO•PAGARE = to front for those who are paying, and PRO•PAGANDA is what they are paying for. The idea of propagating plants, that comes from a literal construction of metaphor. So in Latin, PROPAGANDA simply meant PAID MESSAGES.

Today, our word PROPAGANDA has been changed to

mean BIASED or MISLEADING INFORMATION. However, the original meaning is shows us where the distinction should exist. We will never be able to distinguish between what is biased and misleading and what is not. We can however easily tell paid messaged from unpaid ones; and we can tax the sh•it=not•it out of paid messages to limit their corrupting force in our society.

THE CORE QUORUM

According to trading house symbolism, all the world's leaders and monopolies (referred to as men) marry Brothers, (referred to as Maidens), or Gr. **KORE** = maiden, hence all the following **CORE** words for the brother's actions. Again, we can see what the Arabian Brothers have been up to by the words they have coined:

QUORUM = keeps political decisions from being made without the Brother's approving.

CORE = the role played by the Brotherhood.

DECORUM = our rules for behavior (the brotherhood works secretly and has no rules).

GORE = the Brotherhood's bloodshed

Gr. **GORGOS** = terrible.

GORGON = the CORE•GENOS that was so terrible they petrified all who looked upon them.

QUARREL = A disagreement with the CORE

CORN = the foodstuff monopolized by the Brotherhood for thousands of years.

COLONEL = The outies have these figurehead generals and con•grex•men, man making broad and pre-framed decisions from 50,000 feet up. However, the CORE'S COLONELS are the ones actually running the operations.

CORRECT = CORE Straightening

INCORRIGIBLE = incapable of turning someone towards the CORE

CORROBORATE = When the Brothers back each other up

CHORUS = When the Brothers sing the same song Gr. khorus = chorus.

CORRESPOND = Both **CORROBORATING** and wringing letters so the stories and historical records match

CORRER = running letters for the CORE

CORRIDOR = where the runners run letters for the CORE

CORRUPT = How the core pushes its will over the outsiders.

Gr. **KORMOS** = tree trunk = the CORE of the tree

CORVA = a maiden, or a maiden that goes

COURTESY = see DECORUM

CORTEZ = see DECORUM

CORONATION = when the CORE crowns a new figurehead

CORNUCOPIA = the holy grail, the overflowing amphora, the oil drum, the supertanker of the CORE

GARBLE = what the core does with messages they don't like

GARCON = a new young boy from the CORE

GORGE = The CORE'S narrow flow of trade

CORDON = a protective police action by the CORE, really just a string or rope

QUO WARRANTO = a legal action to show by what right an office or franchise is held

COORS BEER = core's beer, a heavy advertiser

CORONA BEER = core•onus beer, a heavy advertiser

A CHORUS LINE

The Brothers sing the same song in near perfect harmony.

Thus they have the effect of a chorus; a world-wide chorus that is thousands strong, a chorus that is very hard to overpower, even if you are singing a fairly obvious truth

ENERVATING and the THE SINEWS OF GOVERNMENT

Look up SINEWS in the Apple dictionary, you will see mentioned "the sinews of government." Supposedly, to ENERVATE is to drain of energy, but it is from L. enervat = weakened by the extraction of the sinews or nerves. Rather it is to ex•nerve•ate. Basically during Roman times, they would partly or totally cut the sinews, particularly in the heel (the Achilles tendon) to keep slaves from running off. Today, the Brothers are doing this to America's government.

Now shamble fits in here somehow, because it refers to a slow shuffling awkward gait, such as would happen if someone's hams or hamstrings were cut and he was hamstrung. A shambles is also a butcher's slaughterhouse, a scene of carnage, and a state of total disorder. Actually a shambles was probably where they would nick the slave's hamstrings.

REWRITING HISTORY, REVISIONIST HISTORY, and CHANGING THE FUTURE:

The English language lacks a neutral word for talking about changing our account of past events.

MAKING HISTORY = doing something worthy of recording, not producing historical accounts as we would expect. That apparently should be left to the Mideast's "experts."

REWRITING HISTORY = a word that bizarrely suggests changing the future

REVISIONIST HISTORY = a term that rapidly became a pejorative and now suggests something akin to tampering with data.

We lack a word for the constructive revision of history, and this is not a coincidence. Our parasite does not want us to go back and revisit the past. My work clearly shows why. From now on;

- 1) REWRITING HISTORY is about the past, not the future.
- 2) Our historical record needs a complete overhaul without any Brotherly "historians."
- 3) The correct term for altering the course of future events is CHANGING THE FUTURE.

PLAUSIBLE

A plausible matrix program is on that only needs a little praise (L. laudare) applause (L. applaudere), a little praise or prizing, or something like a corrupt election, so that it is believable.

APPLAUSE and the PLAUSIBLE

This is sort of related to plausible deniability. Here I imagine a clique of Brothers applauding a speaker, making what he said seem plausible or possible through applause.

So APPLAUSE has long been related to the PLAUSIBLE. And the Arabs have since Roman times at least tried to corrupt and manage the applause systems in our government and economy.

Saudi Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Al Saud, Nov 2008 TV interview

"I blocked the CEO [and subprime policy] [change at Citibank for too long](#)"

Classical Architecture symbolizes the STALLING and STULTIFICATION of an Arab-run government.

Gr. STULOS = a column, specifically the columns we identify with Classical architecture. STULTIFYING means full of columns, it was the word that described the Roman bureaucracy. Unless you paid people off, you got nowhere. Just look at how the Mideast runs say India or Mexico in the

1970s, that was probably the level of corruption in Rome.

STOOL PIDGEONS and STOOLIES were wise guys that hung around the important buildings that had STULOS or columns and provide people with information. (The film meaning is a bit off) They were sort of Fr. PERI•STYLE from Gr. PERI•STULON, from peri = around + stulos.

STIFLE and STULTIFY is what happened to Rome's government once all the STULOS were built around the buildings.

Can you now see what classical columns symbolize? They symbolize the impediments that Arabs Inc. installs around the Roman government's services. And again STULTIFIED means full of columns and STULTIFYING described the stupidity of Rome's bureaucracy, (L. stultus = stupid).

Those of you who admire all the marble buildings of classical Greece and Rome should reconsider. All these buildings were boondoggles made with the purest, whitest most overpriced Mideast Mafia marble. Our parasite infiltrated our Western democracies and got them to use group money to build overpriced boondoggles for "the gods" instead of investing the money in practical things.

Here we should note that the Athenian Parthenon (Gr. parthenos = virgin), the pure white iconic symbol of classical marbled architecture, was completed in 432 BC. And in 431, the very next year, Athens and Sparta, the Mideast's totalitarian, and fully militarized puppet state, began a war that ended in 404 BC, with the total defeat and eventual massacre of the democratic Athenians. What good was the Parthenon then?

Lets reconsider the association between classical architecture and democracy and freedom. Here classical architecture seems to mean the exact opposite, like doublespeak. It speaks of a corrupt form of fake and bejeweled democracy that the Mideast ex•pull found it could work with.

Note how classical architecture (both the buildings and the organization in them) is all about having lots of STULOS. These symbolized the STALLING, STALEMATING gridlock, and a STYLE of STILLNESS in our infiltrated governments as they STULTIFY and STIFLE real economic activities with a Byzantine bureaucracy. Note how our parasite gets control of our national efforts. Not how it happens where we are most vulnerable to foreign government, at the group level.

How can our STALWART people (Old English. STOEL-WEORTHY = STALWART) tolerate this form of STOLEN and STEALING government, this kleptocracy; a form of government run by STALLIONS.

And finally, in Hebrew a GOLEM is not an automaton or robot, but a robot society, like the United States government, a government chocked full of COLUMNS or STULOS. It is time to start over: **MUSTER UP!**

Imp = imperitor = emperor

Old English IMPA/ IMPE = a shoot or scion.

Starting in the late 1300s, we have IMPIAN = to graft. IMPIAN also denoted a descendant from a noble family, and later a child of the devil or a person regarded as such. IMPLANT began in the 1400s and seems based on IMPIANT.

Now of all the IM- prefixed words (except the IMM- words), about 90% begin IMP-. Below are some of them, (about 80 words), that came into existence between around 1350 and 1600 unless noted otherwise. This is between the black death and the defeat of the Spanish Armada. Notice how all can be construed to be making comments about a king, an 'IMP,' or IMPERATOR. Also note the curious focus of these

words around political topics, almost like the Imp's administration is using a secret language about him. I don't know if all these words talk about the figurehead frontmen of the Arabs for sure, but it does seem possible.

Impartial = partial to the imp

Impart is from Old Fr. *impartir* = leaving the imp with your thoughts.

Impact = Being forceful enough to get a pact from the imp.

Impale = When someone is pale and transfixed with fear of a violent imp.

Impalpable = The degree to which something can be sensed by the imp.

Impanel = convening a panel of wise guys under the imp's auspices.

Impark = Creating the imp's nature reserves (in the 1200s, hunting reserves).

Impasse = A deadlock with the imp.

Impassioned = An emotional request made before the imp.

Impassive = An unemotional request made before the imp.

Impatient = A lack of patience when dealing with the imp.

Impeach = In Medieval Latin a peach was a *persica*, from L. *persicum malum* = a Persian apple, and also, Persian evil (the forbidden fruit of trade sneaking past the Mideast trade monopoly, through Persia) So **imp-peachment** has to do with the imp and the forbidden fruit being eaten under his administration. Also, PEACHY, and PEACHY-KEEN may have to do with forbidden fruit.

Impeccable = Relating to sin in front of the imp (L. *peccare* = to sin).

Impecunious = Relating to the Imp's purse stings.

Impede = Stopping the Imp from going to see for himself on foot.

Impel = Getting the Imp to do something.

Impending = Things the Imp left pending.

Impenetrable = having to do with how well the imp's mind can penetrate an idea.

Impenitent = Relating to the shame of the imp.

Imperceptible = How perceivable something is to the imp.

Imperfect = Regarding the imp's perfection or lack thereof.

Imperil = Doing something dangerous around the imp.

Imperious = The extent to which the imp acts like an imp.

Imperishable = Concerning the death of the imp.

Impermanence = Concerning the death of the imp.

Impermeable = The ability of the subjects to get through to see the imp.

Impersonal = Whether people can get through to see the imp in person at all. This is a remarkable word in relation to faceless bureaucracy of the Arabs operating under the cover of the imp figurehead.

Impersonate = When someone pretends to be the Imp.

Impertinent = not pertaining to the Imp.

Imperturbable = The imp's mood.

Impervious = Able to keep all the subjects away from the imp.

Impetigo = A skin disease afflicting troublesome Imps.

Impetrate = Besieging and begging the imp for something.

Impetus = *imp-peh-tus* = *imp-say-you*

Impinge = When the imp encroaches on his administration's authority.

Impious = About the Imp's religious devotion.

Impish = How much the Imp is acting like an imp.

Implacable = Relating to the placability of the Imp.

Implant = Planting someone that may grow up into a new imp.

Implausible = An imp that is convincing.

Implementation = *Imp-pull'em-in-te-tion*.

Implicated = Employed by the Imp (in the 1500s L. *plicare*

meant, "to employ").

Implore = To cry before the Imp (L. *implorare* = invoke with tears).

Imply = When everyone pulls on the imp.

Impolite = How polite someone is before the Imp.

Impolitic = The politics of the Imp.

Imponderable = Something the Imp's mind can't fully understand.

Imports = Goods that "the Imp" brings in through the nation's ports.

Importers = People bringing in goods by the Imp's royal monopoly license.

Important = *import-n't* = non-imports.

Importunate = Having to do with the Imp and L. *Portunus*, the god of harbors.

Importune = A song and dance request by an outsider to use the port. This word also refers to prostitution, a meaning that makes perfect sense under trading house symbolism. *Op(t)portunity* is also related to L. *Portunus*, only it is sanctioned under the watchful eye of a trading house "marriage".

Imposition = Putting things on the Imp.

Impose = Something put in place by the imp or his administration.

Impost = A tax inflicted by the Imp.

Impostor = Someone posing as the imp.

Impotence = Regarding the Imp's power.

Impound = When the imp puts someone in his pound (pound = prison).

Impoverish = Imp makes his nation poor and the Arabs rich.

Impractical = Having to do with the practicality of the Imp's commands.

Imprecating = What the imp is praying for (*precat-* = prayed).

Imprecision = A lack of detail of the imp's memory.

Impresario = *Imp-pre-tzari-o*, the tzar you see before you get to the imp (mid 1700s).

Impressed = When a trusted advisor leaves his mark on the imp.

Imprest = To loan money to the imp (L. *prestare* = to lend).

Imprison = The Imp or his Brotherly administration puts someone in prison.

Improbable = The likely actions of the Imp.

Impromptu = The imp does something unplanned or unprompted (mid 1600s).

Improper = The imp or someone around him does something out of line.

Improper = The imp grants ecclesiastical property to lay people.

Improvident = Regarding the imp's ability to provide for the future.

Improved = Old Fr. *prou* = profit: More profits for the Imp's parasite administration.

Imprudent = When the imp or his administration are making bad policy.

Impudent = How L. *pudere* = modest people are before the Imp.

Impugn = Regarding fights with the Imp.

Impunity = The imp's punishments.

Impuissant = The power of the imp or his brotherly administration.

Impure = About the purity of the imp's bloodline.

imputable = Any viewpoint at all if the Imp reckons so (L. *putare* = to reckon).

DON is used in English to describe:

- 1) A Spanish (or Arab) looking gentleman
- 2) A University teacher, especially a senior one
- 3) A high ranking member of the Mafia
- 4) To put on a new costume.
- 5) Any of 3 rivers
- 6) The Donald is the don•old
- 7) Donate = don•ate
- 8) Donkey years = don•key ears

Lets go back to the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, right when the Brothers were shedding Portugal and Spain as host societies. It had incidentally been less than 90 years since Vasco da Gama of Portugal had first sailed around the land of no resources. Therefore, the great age of both Portugal and Spain together was less than 90 years!

Around this time, we see DON coming into use in England, and obviously to describe "Spanish" thought leaders at Oxford and Cambridge. (The Brothers even today are always calling themselves Spanish, or Italian, or Jewish, or anything but Middle Eastern.)

APPENDIX—2 THE RISE AND FALL OF ATHENS

1. The rise of Athens

Look at the mental degradation

Here is a thought to keep in mind while reading this section. Compare the intelligence of the writers with Procopius, Bede and especially Einhard, and Bede, and you will understand the harm the Arabs did to mankind after they defeated Rome.

Some Greek political words

NOMIA = government

EU•NOMIA = good government

EU•LYSI = (Ulysses) those who dissolve good or bring the good into disrepute.

AGOGÉ = leader, the Spartan education system

METIC = a foreigner, normally a Middle Easterner living in Greece with some of the privileges of citizenship. Root of co's•metic

BOULE = a legislature or council

EKKLESIA (ak•lysia) = a citizen assembly, root of ecclesiastic, church

EUTHUNA = the review of a politicians conduct after his term of office

SEIS•ACH•THEIA = shedding of burdens
seismic = earthquake and this??

Euripides, Rhesus, 470

"I wish to march at you side against the land of the Greeks and lay waste to all of Greece with my spear, so they in may learn the cost of war." [With Persia/ Arabia].

Euripides, Rhesus, 390

"I am here to help you undermine their walls and set fire to their ships."

T.E. Lawrence (of Arabia), Seven Pillars of Wisdom, Ch.6

"the Arabic peoples... a prolific Semitic agglomeration... great in religious thought, reasonably industrious, mercantile, politic, yet solvent rather than dominant in character."

Athens lasted only two centuries

Little realized today is that great age of Athenian democracy lasted only 77 years, with the entire age of Greek democracy lasting less than two centuries.

Greek and Roman history is important

1) Athens was our democratic and free granddaddy civilization.
2) These are mostly the parasite's cryptically written heuristic records for to dissolving, parasitizing and enslaving free societies.

3) The same guides and tactics are being used on the democratic world today.

4) By studying and understanding these tactics, we can prevent their use on us.

What Greece started as

The land of no resources but its location has been exporting people for thousands of years. And long before people needed to go as far as Italy to find a place, they settled in Greece. The reason after all that Greece was settled first is that it is closer to the Hellenes•ponte, the bridge to greece over the Bosphorus or Bros•porous.

Now the locations of Sparta and Athens are notable. Sparta is deep within the Peloponnese and Athens is just outside this strategic area. Here we see how Sparta was far from the coastline, something that speaks of lessons learned from the Bronze age collapse where the Phoenicians ferried sea people to attack all the coastal communities. It also perhaps speaks of people that still remembered the tsunami risk.

Now the location of Athens just outside the Peloponnese seems to have begun as "wall street" traders keen to ingratiate themselves to the people inside the wall. This is just outside the fortress land quasi-island of the Peloponnese peninsula. So Athen was peopled by the people that settled 'outside the wall', the people who settled just outside our parasite's colony.

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 2.1

"After this, there was a long period of civil strife between the ruling class [fronting for the Arabs] and the [local Greek] masses. The [Athenian] constitution was oligarchic in every way, and the poor men were particularly enslaved to the rich, along with their wives and children. The poor were called hektemori [sharecroppers that plowed a hect•are of arable/ plowable land and paid 1/6th of their harvest to the men playing rich sharecropper landlord and fronting for the Arabs.] and also pelati which referred to the terms under which they worked the fields of the rich. All the land was in the hands of a few men [Arab frontmen], and if the poor failed to pay their rents, both they, their wives, and their children were liable to arrest [and sale as work or sex slave]. Furthermore, all loans were made on the security of the person [i.e. enslavement if you didn't repay the disposable loan shark front-men] until the time of Solon [630—560BC]. He was the first champion of the people. The harshest and most resented aspect of the [old] constitution for the masses was their enslavement. And although they had other complaints as well, it could be said that there was nothing in [in their own country] which they had a share of." [In other words the Athenians were completely enslaved by the parasite and its frontmen, and they owned no share of their own nation. And it was all a trick. It was all based on how they thought that the ultra rich 'oligarch'-type people living among them were actually their people.

Most outies went down the drain economically thanks

to a series of destructive bubbles and crises. You know, like the free world has recently seen — Oil embargo, S&L crisis, Dot-com, Asian currency crisis, September 11, and subprime for example. The locals needed gold — or thought they needed gold/money. And thanks to the ancient Arab culture (ancient even to the Greeks) of getting something for nothing, the only people with gold were the Arabs. These duped the Greeks into pledging their freedom for access to their stolen gold/money. Thus the parasite society was able to get/ket/ obtain all sorts of things from host society, including our daughters to be their breed mares. Later, when their boys had gone, women knew too much and could not be released — and there was always a shortage of food in the Mideast, so they were recycled into ham-burger or shawarma.

This is what the parasite's agenda will do to its livestock if you let it. It will turn your people into a total slaves and then when you are no longer useful, it will eat you as livestock.]

"Found in Egypt"

Aristotle's constitution of Athens was lost until the late 1800s, when a text was found in Egypt.

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution 6.1

"When Solon came to power, he put a halt to loans made on the security of the person, thus freeing everyone, both then and in the future. He also made a general cancellation of debts, both private and public. The Athenians called this the Shaking-off of Burdens, since by means of it they shook off the weight lying on them." [Solon died in around 560BC]

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 11.1

"After Solon reformed the constitution as already described above, men persisted in coming up to him and complaining about his laws, criticizing some and questioning others. [Many were not happy and there were many questions about his new laws.] And since he did not want to either change them, or stay in Athens and incur hostility, [many people hated these laws] he went [fled] overseas, to Egypt to trade and to see the sights, saying that he would not return for 10-years. He didn't think it right to stay and explain his laws, but everyone should simply do what he had written. [blind obedience is the hallmark of the parasite's agenda.]

Besides, many of the aristocracy were angry because he had cancelled [all of] the debts, and both parties regretted his appointment because his settlement was different from what they expected. The people thought he would carry out a complete redistribution of property, [it was an incomplete cancellation of debt] while the aristocracy thought that he would restore the to the same position as before, or make only small changes." [The aristocracy suffered. Only the parasite came out well.]

Theogonis (43 and 523) writes about a rich Kakotes, or Kakoi (ak•oi, Kike) aristocracy and a poor Greek underclass, the debt slaves of the Kakoi. At the time, most of Greece was about to be sold as slaves because they had defaulted on their debt to the Kakoi.

We also read that when Solon cancelled everyone's debts, he also instituted a 'democracy' with two tiers, the demos at the bottom, and the KAKOI as the aristocracy.

In 561 Pisistratus becoming a tyrant of Athens. He and his son Hippias ruled on and off until 510BC when Hippias was driven

out of power. This is when Athenian democracy began.

490 Invasion of Greece by Persia, and battle of Marathon where the Persians are thoroughly defeated

480 2nd invasion of Greece by the Persians under Xerxes. This was recorded in the Aeschylus play 'The Persians' annotated herein. The battle took place at Salamis an island maybe 30km from Athens' port. The Persians rowed from Turkey and the Athenians arrived all warmed up. We read how the Athenians killed all the Persians and suffered not much loss. The Persians could not run away and could not sail off either, so they were slaughtered to the man. And this was probably part of the design to get rid of all the unchosen ones.

Aeschylus Persians 543

"we hear the accusing groan that now rises from every Asian land laid bare of men. Who led them, but [Emperor] Xerxes [pronounced Kirk] Who sealed their death, but Xerxes [the figurehead escape-goat]? Whose error sent our all to sail in ships, and lost our all, but Xerxes?"

Polybius of Megalopolis, 200-118BC, History, 3.32

[Translated by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh in 1889]

"The vastness of the forces employed in the attack of King Xerxes of Persia against Greece [in 480BC] cast the shadow of a terrible danger over Greek society. The stakes for which the Greeks were called upon to fight were [the stark choice between] freedom or enslavement. And the fact that the Greek settlements of Asia [Coastal Turkey] had already been [defeated and] sold into slavery [and scattered around the known world] created a presumption in everyone's mind that the communities in mainland Greece itself would experience the same fate. [So the Greeks fought for their lives.]

The attack, however, had an amazing outcome that was totally unexpected. The Greeks, [and their form of government, after annihilating the invading horde from the land of no resources] found themselves not only free from danger but glorious and much honored [by the whole world]. As well, every Greek community [suddenly] became so rich that the whole world was astonished at the completeness with which the situation had been reversed. In the following half century, Greece made huge strides in prosperity. [This sounds like the US in and after WW2.] During this period the effects of the new affluence showed themselves in the progress of the arts, and artists [but not much of any real and lasting improvement for mankind] as great as any recorded in History, including the sculptor Phidias, flourished at the time. [Phi•dias = fee•gods created the colossus or co•al•os•us statue of Zeus that was one of the Seven wonders of the ancient world] There was an equally outstanding advance in the intellectual field.

[Especially in the useless garbage knowledge of] philosophy and oratory [which] were singled out for special honor throughout the Hellenic [Greek] world and particularly in Athens. [Think of the way musicians are revered today.] In philosophy, there was the school of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. In public speaking there were such figures as Pericles, Iso•crates and the pupils [peoples] of Iso•crates. These were balanced by men [impersonizations] of action with great military reputations, like Miltia•des [Militia•ideas], Themis•tocles [judge at heaven's gate], Arist•ides [aristo•ideas], Ci•mon [aki•mn], Myron•ides [myriad•ideas] and a long array of other names too numerous to mention. [So after the Greeks slaughtered the poor unchosen fools sent to die under Xerxes, the Arabs let the Greeks run wild. Thus we

understand how the Great Age of Athens was like the great age of the West from 1970 until 2020 more or less.]

In the forefront of all, Athens [America's predecessor] achieved such triumphs of glory and bravery that her name won almost worldwide renown. She increased her ascendancy to such a point that, with her own resources, unsupported by the Spartans and Peloponnesians, she broke the resistance of powerful Persian [Mideast] forces on land and sea and so humbled the pride of the famous Persian [Mideast] Empire that she forced the liberation by treaty of all the communities in Asia" [the Mideast].

In 480 the Greeks not only defeated the Persians at Salamis, but also the Carthaginians at Himera on the north coast of Sicily. The parasitic land of no resources could go on no longer in the face democracy. So it sent a generation of young men to near certain death fighting the Athenians. Here the excess population of the land of no resources was reduced. (See Aeschylus Suppliants, herein for an great account of this event).

478-447BC

The time of the Athenian Empire, known more commonly as the Delian League. This kept its treasury on the sacred island of Delos.

477 Athens builds massive fortifications, the so called big walls.

472 Pericles pays for Aeschylus' play the Persians.

468 Defeat of the Persian Navy at Eury•medon.

462 Pericles rises to democratic power in Athens.

460 Athenian breach with Sparta.

459 First Peloponnesian War.

454 Treasury of Delos transferred to Athens.

450 Publication of 12 tablet of laws in Rome.

447 Athens loses its land empire to Spartans who are stronger on land. In Mycenaean times, there was a town just 10km east of Athens called Spata, not Sparta.

438 Marble-covered Parthenon finished. The marble was probably an overpriced Arab concession product sold to government, like so many airport components and specially approved services.

431 Second Peloponnesian war starts.

431-404 Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta. Athens was a city of free trade, maritime trade, a great 'trade whore' of the world, a city that had a strong merchant shipping fleet, and a strong navy, but a weak army. Sparta, previously the ally of Athens had been transformed into a fully militarized state, the latest belligerent outsider front nation for Mideast Inc., replacing Carthage and Persia.

Athens had a strong navy but a somewhat weak army, Sparta (like Rome) had a strong army but no navy (the mark of a Mideast front nation). Athens was almost invulnerable to attack by land due to here size and defenses, as well as the

fact that she was supplied from the sea, by imported food. As Athens could not be attacked effectively by land, nor starved in siege, nor attacked at sea, she was for a long time 'invulnerable'.

However, the Athenians still had to crowd into their fortifications while the city was under attack, and at the start of the war. Then we see how in 430 Athens was struck by a plague that supposedly came from Ethiopia via Egypt on a ship. The plague was supposedly devastating because it caused a complete breakdown of order with Thucydides writing: "There was no fear of the gods or the law of men to restrain them. As for the former, they decided it was just the same whether they worshiped them or not, as they saw everyone perishing. And as for the latter, nobody expected to live to be brought to trial for his offenses."

Once the plague subsided, Pericles sent a fleet to capture Spartan-held Potidaea, near Thessaloniki. However, just after the ships rowed/sailed away, this plague, or another plague broke out on the ships with such force that the invasion fleet was forced to return to Athens. Then we read how in 429 Pericles himself decided to lead his fleet in attacking Epidaurus in the Peloponnese. However, the plague broke out again on the Athenian ships. "The plague killing not only Pericles' men, but everyone they contacted, including Pericles himself. Thucydides describes a rapid onset, raging fever, extreme thirst, a bloody tongue and throat, and skin pustules and ulcers.

"The plague of Athens undoubtedly contributed to the downfall of the Athenian empire. By killing so large a number, by demoralizing the capital and, above all, by destroying the fighting power of the navy, the plague prevented Athens [from] striking a decisive blow at Sparta. The war dragged on for 27 year and ended with the defeat of Athens in 404BC. She was deprived of her navy and of her foreign possessions and her landward fortifications were razed to the ground. Fortunately for posterity, the city and its [corrosive, and degenerating] culture were left intact."

430 Peloponnesians (Spartans) devastate Attica, or the Athenian peninsula.

429 Pericles dies, Sophocles writes Oedipus Rex to blur-away the old legend of the odious rex.

424 Athens loses Boiotia/ Boeotia and become cut off by land.

431-415 The wealthier, much more populous and better equipped Athenians were winning over Sparta

415 BC The Athenians massacre the men of Milos and sell its women and children into slavery. The island was the home of the Venus de Milo.

415 The Athenian general Alcibiades flees to Sparta on charges of Sacrilege.

415-413 Athenian attack and lay siege to Syracuse, Sicily and are eventually totally massacred. This marks a turning point in the war with Sparta.

412 Treaty of Miletus between Sparta and Persia. Revolt of Athenian allies.

411 Oligarchic coup d'etat in Athens, democracy restored within the year.

Aristophanes writes his famous play *Lysistrata* where the women (Arabs) withhold metaphorical sex (commerce) from their husbands (the Greeks).

406 and 405, Athen naval defeats at Arginusae (east of Lesbos) and Aegospotami (near Istanbul). This is the Gallipoli peninsula at the Hellespont or Hellen's pontus the Greek's bridge. Here we note how much Aegospotami looks like Egypt's bridge.

In 405, the Athenians foolishly attacked Sicily leaving the Athenian grain ships undefended. The Spartan admiral LYSANDER (LYS=loosening + ANDER= man) went for the food ships (he went Alcibiades or AL=towards + CIBI=food), and Athens was forced to surrender without a fight, thus demonstrating just how much Athens was dependent on imported grain in the 400s BC. Thus the democracy of Athens was defeated not at sea, not on land, but by cutting off the foreign food it became dependent on. It was analogous to how America cut off Japan's foreign oil. Lysander attacked inside the Hellespont near Sestos, at the mouth of the Black sea.

There is also the curiously named play *LYSISTRATA* = dissolving strategy. This was about how the metaphorical women (traders) withheld metaphorical sex (trade/food) and this forced the Athenian men to stop fighting (surrender). Here we find a female public figure, a priestess named LYSIMACHES = dissolve-maker. This impersonized figure is recorded in line 554 of the play. There are some other curiously named characters in this play, like the leader of the chorus of old women, STRATOTYLIS = strategy+tele = strategy+completion. There is CALONIKE or Kelly+ victory = green/new+ victory. There is also Lysistrata's slave SCYTHIANA = scythian+reborn.

The Ancient Greeks knew of Islam

In Arabic, Islam means submission and the word is obviously related to Gr. hilasmos=submission, appeasement or propitiation. In Ancient Greek the H is silent, and the -os ending is also silent, so the word was pronounced as ilasm, and anagram of Islam.

ALCIBIADES is another one of those "impersonized" ancient names that seem to reflect a group thought or group action. In this case, we have a tactic. Alcibiades foolishly attacked Sicily in 405 BC. This left the Athenian grain shipments undefended. The Spartan admiral LYSANDER (Gr. lys=loosen, dissolve + Gr. ander=man) then went for the food ships. LYSANDER went Gr. AL=towards + Gr. KIBORION=seed and L. CIBUS=seed, grain, or towards the grain, and then the proud democracy of Athens was forced to surrender without a fight. Here, free, open and democratic Athens (like countless other threats to the land of no resources) was defeated not at sea, not on land, but through infiltration and treachery.

Here, it is notable that Athens was dependent on imported grain until at least the 400s BC. As well, the Athenian grain was supposedly Aegospotami grain, which sounds a great deal like the Egyptian grain that Rome was dependent on. However, the grain shipment was attacked at the mouth of the Black sea at the Hellespont. So here we begin to think that the Egyptian grain feeding Rome actually came from the Black sea, and was actually Scythian grain (Scythia being Ukraine, the eternal breadbasket of Europe).

Xenophon, Story of My Life 2.1.28

This is about the Spartan navy attacking the Athenian ships

while they are ashore.

405-4 Athens under siege.

404 Athens surrenders and her fortification walls torn down. The Thirty, a group of 30 Arab appointee frontmen come to power, and purge Athens of her brightest minds.

404 Fall of Athens, and Thirty Tyrants

404 BC Little realized today is that great age of Athenian democracy lasted only 77 years, with the entire age of Greek democracy lasting less than two centuries. (see Xerxes and Solon)

404-403 was the so-called "Year of Anarchy" in Athens.

403 Sparta tolerates the restoration of democracy in Athens.

401 Oedipus at Kolonos (by Sophocles d. 405)

399 Death of the Socrates impersonation recorded.

397 Greek Conon commands the Persian fleet.

395 Athens rebuilds her walls.

395 Agesilaus of Sparta at war in Persia.

395 Spartan general Lysander dies.

394 Greek battles of Coronea and Cnidus.

387-6 The Greeks accept the "Kings Peace", or rather the surrender of the Greeks to the Persian King.

384 Aristotle born

377 Cautious and ineffective Spartan offensive

377-5 Athens makes peace with Sparta

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 35.3

"Men belong to the citizen body if they are of citizen parentage on both sides." [Clearly there were half-Greeks that were causing so much trouble that the Athenians had to say this. Clearly the Athens suffered a wave of Mideast immigrants that were terribly harmful. Perhaps the we as successors to the Greeks will all decide the same thing now.]

Aristophanes Birds

"We who have packed up and left our native land on flying feet. It is not that we hate Athens, which is inherently glorious and blessed, welcoming all to immigrate and see how their savings disappear into thin air in forfeitures and fines. Unlike cicadas which trill away on their twigs only for a couple months a year, we Athenians trill away on our lawsuits for our entire lifetime." [Note how in recent decades America began to suffer from both excessive lawsuits and excessive Mideast immigration, just like our democratic predecessors in Athens. Same parasite, same playbook.]

The Proxenos

Originally a proxenos was a citizen and resident of a Greek city that represented the interests of a foreign state. During

Greece's heyday, they were frequently praised, however, by the 200s BC, a proxenos was considered to be someone rewarded for having helped foreign states achieve their objectives in Greece at the expense of the Greeks. The historical etymology of this word suggests that some money wielding foreign interest was behind the collapse of Classical Greece.

medizein = to medize = to 'mideast'

The Greek word medizein from around 500BC describes how the Persian Medes were bribing people in Greek institutions, mostly the Oracle of Delphi and the tyrannoi (tyrant) rulers of many smaller Greek cities. The Oracle for example advised the Athenians that it was Apollo's will that they capitulate to the Persians. The Athenians, however, did not obey.

Xenophon, The Constitution of the Athenians, 1.10

"Slaves and metics [Medi, Middle-eastern resident aliens, foreign workers] in Athens lead a singularly undisciplined life. One may not strike them there, nor will a slave step aside for you. [Thus we imagine campaigns for 'slave's rights', and eu-man rights in Athens.] Let me explain the reason for this situation. If it were legal for a free man to strike a slave, a metic or a freedman [a freed slave], an Athenian would often have been struck under the mistaken impression that he was a slave, for the clothing of the common people there is in no way superior to that of the slaves and metics, nor is their appearance. [The Athenians did not require the slaves to dress in slave's sackcloth at other 'less enlightened' places did.]

There is also a good sense behind the apparently surprising fact that they allow [Arab] slaves there to live in luxury, and some of them in considerable magnificence [displaying many Arab concession products. This really sounds like the West today.] In a state relying on naval power it is inevitable that slaves must work for hire so that we may take profits from what they earn, and they must be allowed to be set free. Where there are rich slaves, it is no longer beneficial for my slave to be afraid of you. In Sparta, my slave would be afraid of you, but there, if you slave is afraid of men, he will probably spend some of his own money [both places allowed the slaves to have a peculium] to free himself from danger. This, then, is why in the matter of free speech we have put slaves and free men on equal terms [slaves had the right to free speech in Athens]. We have also done the same with metics and citizens because the city needs metics because of the multiplicity of her industries and for her fleet. That is why we were right to establish freedom of speech for metics as well." [Apparently there were Arabs helping out with the Athenian navy before all was lost. We should all reconsider the role of Arabs in our society and especially in our military and defense industries today. After all they are to quote T.E. Lawrence "solvent rather than dominant in character". They will all do to our military what they did to our car industry in the 1970s.]

Xenophon, The Constitution of the Athenians, 1.19

"because the Athenians own property abroad, and public duties take them abroad, they and their slaves have learned to row almost without realizing it. For it is inevitable that a man who goes on frequent voyages will take an oar, and learn nautical terminology, and the same is true of his slave. Experience of voyages and practice makes them good helmsmen, some learning in smaller boats, others in merchantmen, and others graduating to triremes. The majority are competent rowers as

soon as they board their ships because of previous practice throughout their lives." [In Aristotle Politics 1291 b21ff, we read of a 'trireme democracy' where everyone pulls his weight. It is an interesting metaphor, especially when we consider the election of coxswain captains that steer the ship of state. Another point worthy of consideration is that the Athenians may have become reliant on Arab oarsmen, or trusted oarsmen left to mind the ships — and this may be what caused their defeat in Sicily. Anyway, NEVER TRUST AN ARAB, PERIOD.]

Thucydides, 1.121

"As for naval-power, in which they are strong, we shall build ours up both from the existing resources of our alliance and also from the funds of Olympia and Delphi. If we borrow money from there, we will be able to attract the foreign sailors in the Athenian navy by offering higher rates of pay. For the power of Athens rests on mercenaries rather than on her own citizens."

[1] Here it says that the Athenian navy was mercenary and probably used many Middle Eastern people. 2) Here it hints that the Greeks had this sort of independent FED/treasury that was not actually run by their own governments. To us it is pretty clear that the Arabs were running the Greek FED for their own economic and military purposes. Are they doing the same thing today with the US FED? 3) The Greek FED must have been making money lending money to both sides.]

Thucydides, 1.121

"Athens is so much stronger than any single state in our alliance that she is capable of standing up to all of us together. So unless we go to war with her not only in full force, but also with every city and every nation inspired by the same purpose, she will find us divided and will easily subdue us. And let us be sure that defeat could mean nothing less than total slavery."

Thucydides, Funeral speech of Pericles, 429BC

"Our constitution does not copy the laws of our neighbors. It is an example to others rather than an imitation of them. It is called democracy because power does not rest with the few, but with the many. Under our laws, all men are equal. Here, a man's advancement depends not on mere [random] rotation, but rather on the the public estimate of his true value. And lack of wealth does not dim a man's reputation, or prevent him from helping government if he has the ability.

Liberty is the hallmark of both our political system and the spirit of our daily lives together [as a society]. We do not criticize our neighbor's choices about life's pleasures, nor burden him with our scorn...

We have invented and produced many forms of recreation and relaxation from labor. We have many customary competitions and festivals throughout the year. And we have our beautiful buildings... [All of which distract or help make the land of the free vulnerable to attack]

And because of the size of our city [6 to 20 times that of fully militarized Sparta], goods from every land come to us. [so many foreign goods flood our city that] we find our own native products no more familiar to us than those imported from the rest of the world. [America today, as well as ancient Rome suffered from this problem.] In defense strategy, we are also different from our adversaries. We lay our city open to all, and at no time evict or keep the stranger away from [Gr. xeno = foreigner, immigrant, outsider] from the knowledge or sight of anything which might help an enemy if revealed. [1] a stupid strategy, 2) Here the heuristic, teaching aspect of this gazette is particularly obvious. 3) The West stupidly does the same

thing today.] We believe not primarily in arms and secrecy, but in our own spirit in action [more stupidity, a heuristic propaganda idea]. With regard to military training, our adversaries strive for valor in labored practice from childhood. We live our lives un-regimented, [and undisciplined like so many Westerners starting in the late 1960s] yet we handle danger as great as theirs. Here is the proof: the Spartans do not invade our land alone, but with their allies. Yet when we attack our neighbor's land, we do battle with men who are defending what is theirs, and often overcome them. [The parasite was struggling to help Athens, so it would weaken under a lack of adversity. The parasite wants the land of the free to think it is strong when it is not. This way when the great battle comes it will walk into the trap and suffer a cata•trophic = downfall•turning loss]

[These words were written 15 years before the Athenians fielded all their men for a disastrous attack on Syracuse Sicily, an attack where the bloom of a generation for Athenians all died.] No enemy has ever encountered our full [military] strength, because of all our naval activity, and because we are always sending troops to various parts of our empire. [Yet when the enemy did fact the full military the Athenians lost and suffered a cata•trophic loss.] But when they do come in contact with part of it, they say their partial success was a success against our whole force, and their partial reverse was a defeat by our whole force.

We prefer taking-it-easy to serious training. [boy this sounds familiar] We face the risk of war with natural, rather than forced courage. We are spared regrets for future ills before they come, and when they do, our daring is seen to be as high as that of lifelong toilers. These achievements as well as others rightly earn our city admiration." [Maybe all that talk of hubris in Greek plays exists to cover up and blur away how hubris was the main reason for the defeat, slaughter, and enslavement of the Athenians by the Arabs and their Spartan police state allies.]

Euripides, Children of Heracles, 356±

"Athens the great, the city of lovely dancing-grounds"

[These dancing grounds are the ancient equivalent of our modern discotheques.]

Aristophanes Acharnians 78

"Asian Ambassador: in Asia, you know, the test of your manhood is how much you can eat and drink.

Dikaipolis: <aside> With us it is how many bugger you and how many you suck. "[Gr. dikaion=justice, polis=city]

Aristophanes Acharnians 660

"Let Cleon contrive what he will against me
Both justice and right are my allies, you see
And I'll never be know as he is far and near
As a cowardly fag who's promiscuously queer"

Aristophanes, Wasps

"Then Alcibiades said to me in his infantile lisp:
Look, Theowus has the head of a cwow [Theo•urus and crow].

Alcibiades was wight about that!"

Aristophanes Acharnians 716

"Of smart young gays like Alcibiades"

The Arabs made the Athenians Gay

It is one of their techniques for achieving victory over a host

society. And they are using the same techniques today.

Aristophanes Acharnians 241

"Enter, from the house, Dikaipolis with his children and slaves. His wife stays by the door. Dikaipolis' daughter, covered in jewelry, carries on her head a basket containing the requisites for the sacrifice; two slaves carry between them a phallus mounted on a pole.>

Dikaipolis: Speak fair Speak fair! Move forward a little basket bearer [to align yourself better] <His daughter moves [a bit] towards the altar. And he turns to one of the slaves and says:> Make sure that the phallus is upright <and to his daughter he says:> Lower your basket, my girl so we can make the opening sacrifice. [I recall reading that the Athenians somehow came to believe that girls had to be "opened up", to keep the evil spirits away. This appear to be the ceremony.]

Now my girl, hold the basket beautifully, like the beauty you are, and ~~with a really sour look on your face. My he will be a lucky man that marries you and produces a brood of little pussycats, all as good as you at farting in the gray dawn!~~ [palimpsest covering two damaging lines] Step off, now, and take care of that crowd [many people were watching the show]. Make sure none of them grabs your jewels on the sly. And Xanthias [Gr. xanthos=yellow], you two must hold the phallus upright behind the basket-bearer! I'll stand in back and sing the phallic hymn. ...

O Phallus, companion of Bacchus, in nighttime revel and rout. Seducer of boys and women, I give you my greeting devout Six years it has been, but I've gladly come home to my village once more

I've made peace with with my foe, and I'm finished with war and woe.

O Phallus, O Phallus, I feel so good

When I find my neighbor's young slave-girl steeling some wood

Grip her tightly by the waist, like a wrestler,

Lift her up high off her feet,

Then throw her back down on the earth,

And take out her grape pip — how sweet!

O Phallus, O Phallus, come join us

and drink at our party tonight

Should you be hung-over tomorrow,

Drink a little and you will soon be all right.

The shield that I bore in my battles

will be hanging over the fire."

Isocrates, Panegyricus, 1

[Before you read this, consider that overlarge salaries of professional athletes today] "The institution of festivals which include athletic competitions has led me to feel surprise at the large rewards offered for mere physical successes. This while the unselfish endeavors of men who have set their whole being to work for the benefit of others receives no recognition, though they merit the greater reward. Athletic abilities might be doubled without any benefit to others, while the public spirit of a single individual may bring profit to all who care to participate in it."

Isocrates, Panegyricus, 29

[Athens was] "the first state to create its own constitution and laws... plaintiffs who wanted to decide issues by the use of reason, instead of force brought their suits under Athenian law. This was used both for necessities of life [Gr. tekhnē], as well as for crafts [Gr. arte = frivolous things]. ...

[many things that] were invented by Athens [Athenian ingenuity], and passed on to other nations for their benefit.

Athens was founded on such a universal spirit of [phil·an·trope·ic] altruism and [democratic] consideration that it benefitts both rich and poor alike. Both classes derive benefit from us, and gain either a fortress of the utmost security, or pleasant association.

And as states in this region do not enjoy individual self-sufficiency, but production is inadequate or excessive in different respects, and conditions are such that it is very hard to secure markets, in some cases for exports, in others for imports, Athens brought assistance in these difficulties as well, by establishing in the Piraeus [port] a central market of overwhelming value. Here what others found hard to secure piecemeal elsewhere, could all be obtained [in one place].

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 35.3

"Men belong to the citizen body if they are of citizen parentage on both sides." [Clearly there were half-Greeks that were causing so much trouble that the Athenians had to say this. Perhaps we will decide the same thing in all nations now.]

Xenophon, The Constitution of the Athenians, 2.4

"it is possible for the rulers of the sea to do what land powers cannot always do. They can ravage the land of more powerful states. They can sail along the coast to an area where the enemy forces are few or non-existent. And if the enemy approach, they can embark and sail away. In this way, they get into less difficulty than those operating [only] on land.

Also, the rulers of the sea can sail as far as they like from their own land, but land powers cannot make lengthy expeditions from their own territory, for marching is slow, and it is not possible to take provisions for a long period when traveling on foot. Also, a land force must march through friendly territory or win a passage by force, but a naval force can disembark where it is stronger and not do so where it is not, but sail on until it reaches friendly territory or a less powerful state.

Furthermore, the strongest land powers are badly affected when [an Arab crop] disease strikes their crops, but sea powers are not [as badly] troubled, for the whole world is not affected simultaneously, and they can import from a prosperous area.

Turning to less important matters, [the underlined section above is very important] because of their control of the sea, the Athenians have mingled with peoples in different areas and discovered various gastronomic luxuries. The specialties of Sicily, Italy, Cyprus, Egypt, Lydia, Pontus, and the Peloponnese or any other area have all ben brought back to Athens because of their control of the sea. They hear all dialects [ways of life], and pick one thing from one, and another from another. The other Greeks [are less cosmopolitan and modern] tend to stick to their own dialect and [traditional] way of life and dress. But the Athenians have mingled elements from all Greeks and foreigners. [This sounds like America, where all the good lines go to die out.]

The common people realize that it is not possible for each of the poor to sacrifice, hold feasts and build shrines and to run a beautiful and great city, but they have found a way of having sacrifices, rites, festivals and sanctuaries [temples]. They make frequent public sacrifices as a city, [cooking great numbers of special super-expensive sacrificial animals, albino animals] but it is the people who enjoy the feasts and to whom the victims [meat] are allotted. [Thus we see public sacrifices as giant municipal barbecues where the public got lots of meat, the gods got their sacrifices, and the Arabs could sell cattle for three times as much merely because they were albino or jet

black.]

There are some private gyms and bath-houses belonging to the rich, but the people have built many gyms, and bath-houses for their own use, and the rabble get more benefit from them than the few who are well off. [The footnote says: "the great gymnasia, the Academy, the Lyceum and Cynos·arges all had changing accommodation attached." Given the term "Greek sex", and our society's not too long ago experience with gay bathhouses and HIV, these were probably the sort of bathhouse that popped up around the world in the late 1970s and early 1980s just before the HIV epidemic was announced. Look, over there, in the shadows, can you see it? It is Islam/Ishtar with a smoking gun in its hand.]

They [the Athenians] alone of the Greeks and foreigners were able get rich [Think of how the West today is so wealthy thanks to the real estate bubble]. Where will a city rich in timber for ship-building sell its goods without the agreement of the rulers of the sea? If a city is wealthy in iron, copper, or flax [linen], where will it sell its goods without the consent of the rulers of the sea? [This was the main reason why Athens were a problem for Land-of-no-resources Inc. They controlled the seas and they grew wealthy. There could never be any peace for the Athenians so long as they had this power, and the land of no resources and harems was desperately hungry.

Also, the Arabs always helped foster our communities in swamps if they could not be put on islands. They left the swamp-based cities in peace, relative Arab peace, until all the important cities were all located in swamps that were cut off from the land and eager to trade by sea. This enabled the Arabs to gain control of their trade through terrorism and raiding. It also enabled the Arabs to plague the city with various mosquito-born diseases when necessary. And finally it left the city vulnerable to the epochal·lyse of a su·nami.

Dear reader: Do you cleave towards Mideast Inc.? If you do, you are part of what is wrong with mankind. Do you obey any Arab prophets, or an Arab religion? Do you give money to a church that helps perpetuate Arab power? You must stop now.]

But these are just what It need for ships — wood from one [nation], iron from another, copper, flax and wax from others. In addition, exports to any city hostile to us will be forbidden on pain of being barred from the sea. Although I do nothing, I have all these products of the land because of the sea, while no other city has any two of them. No city has both timber and flax, but where there is an abundance of flax, the ground is level and treeless. Nor do copper and iron come from the same city, nor any two or three of the other products from one place, but one from one city, another from another. [Thus they tapped into the island-king strategy that what was feeding the land of no resources — usurping its role as the world's monopolist middle-man]

In addition to this, every mainland state has either a projecting headland or an offshore island or a narrow strait where it is possible for those who control the sea to pun in an harm those who dwell there. [This is what the Arabs always did.]

There is one weakness in the Athenian position. As rulers of the sea, if they lived on an island [like Arabia, which they don't], it would be open to them to harm their enemies if they wished, while remaining themselves immune from invasion and devastation of their own land so long as they controlled the sea. At the present time, the farmers and the wealthy [local land owning] Athenians are more inclined to make up to the enemy, but the common people live without

fear and do no such thing because they know that none of their property will be burned or ruined. In addition to this, if they lived on an island, they would also be free from the fear of the city being betrayed by oligarchs, or the gates opened, or the enemy being let in. For how could this happen if one lived on an island? [1] This was written while Sparta was ravaging the countryside around the walled city of Athens. This caused Athens to become dependent on imported food brought in by ship. 2) The Arabs don't have this problem because they live on an island or isolated land — in fact until the Suez canal, one of the most isolated and least accessible lands in the world.]

Again, there would be no chance of anyone staging a coup against the common people [of Athens], in [given] the present situation. If anyone planned a coup, he would do so in the hope of bringing in the city's enemies in by land. If Athens were an island, this fear would also be removed. Since it happens that the city was not founded on an island, they handle the situation as follows: They deposit all their property [set up their agriculture] on islands, relying on their control of the sea, and they disregard any devastation of Attica, realizing that if they allow themselves to be moved by this, they will be deprived of other greater benefits.

Further, it is essential for oligarchic cities to observe treaties and oaths. If they do not abide by agreements or if injustice is committed, the names of those responsible are available in a small body. But when the whole people makes an agreement, it is possible for them to lay the blame on the man who spoke and the man who put it to the vote, and for the others to deny that they were present or approved of an agreement which they discover was made by the whole citizen body. If it seems inadvisable for a decision to be followed, there are a thousand excuses available for not doing what they do not want to do. If a decision of the people turns out badly, they blame a few men acting against their interests, but if things go well, they take the credit themselves. [This was what the Athenians were doing, labeling their advisors as traitors when things turned out badly.] ...

People also find fault with the Athenians because there are occasions when it is impossible to get a matter dealt with by the Boule or the Ekklesia although one waits for a year. [the Athenian government was very slow like the US government today.] This happens at Athens solely because there is such pressure of business that it is not possible to deal with everyone who raises a point. How could they do so when they have so many obligations? They celebrate more festivals than any other Greek city, during which there is even less possibility of transacting public business. [The Greeks had many government holidays and government was distracted by many frivolous things. Today, the US democracy takes long vacations and is also distracted by many frivolous things.] They handle more public and private lawsuits and judicial investigations than the whole of the rest of mankind. [The Athenians legislature was perhaps most distracted by the justice system.] The Boule has multifarious business to deal with concerning war, revenue, legislation, the day-to-day affairs of the city and matters affecting their allies, and has to receive the tribute and look after the dockyards and [run the] shrines/ temples. Is it remotely surprising if, with so many matters to deal with, they cannot settle everyone's business? Some say that if you approach the Boule or the people with money, then things get considered [many said the Athenian democracy was corrupt]. Now I would agree that money plays a considerable part in getting things done in Athens, and it would be even more influential if more people employed it. However, I am absolutely sure that the city could not deal with all the requests

that come before it, however much money was offered. The courts are also involved if someone does not refit a ship or builds on public land. In addition, every year they have to settle disputes about [such frivolous things as] the provision of the choruses at the Dio·nysia, the Thargelia, the Pan·athena, the Pro·men·thia and the Heph·aestia. 400 trierarchs are appointed every year, and they must judge any appeals which arise. Further, they must examine magistrates and decide on their conduct, examine [Arab harem] orphans, and appoint guards for prisoners — and this happens every year. They also have to judge the cases of those who avoid military service when they arise, and any other crime which suddenly occurs, such as unusual violence or impiety. I am omitting a great deal of public business, but I have listed the most important items apart from the assessments of the tribute, which generally occur every four years. Well then, ought one to suppose that all these cases ought not to be dealt with? If so, let someone suggest what ought to be omitted. If then, one must agree that all these matters have to be decided, the courts must sit throughout the year, since even now when they do sit throughout the year they cannot prevent crime because of the numbers involved. Well then, someone will suggest that the courts ought to sit, but the juries ought to be smaller. [they used very large juries to reduce bribery.] However, it is inevitable that, unless they have only a few courts, there will then only be a few jurors in each, with the result that it will be easy to prepare oneself to handle a small jury and bribe them. [It was common to bribe juries, and this was much easier when the juries were smaller.] The decision will be much less just.

In addition to this, one must consider the fact that the Athenians have to hold [many] festivals, during which no trials can take place, and they have twice as many [festival holidays] as other city-states. However, even if one were to assume for the sake of argument that they only held as many as the state which holds fewest, even then, it would be impossible in my view for the affairs at Athens to be arranged other than they are now, except for minor changes here and there. [The Arabs made sure that] Significant changes can't be made without taking something away from democracy. Many suggestions can be made for improving the constitution, but it is not easy to find satisfactory ways of improving it while preserving the democracy intact, except, as I have just said, for minor changes. [Again, we see Athens as the prototype of American style democracy.]

Another thing the Athenians do wrong is their support [food handouts] for the lower classes that cause civil strife. However, they do this for a reason. If they supported the upper classes, they would not be supporting those with the same political views as their own. [The Athenian politicians were promising increased dole handouts for votes.] ... Therefore the Athenians support those sympathetic to themselves [rather than that which is good for the whole]. Whenever they tried to support the aristocrats, it was not to their advantage. It was not long before the people were enslaved in Boeotia, and when they supported the aristocrats in Miletus, within a short time, they revolted and massacred the common people. ...

It might be suggested that nobody has in fact been unjustly deprived of his citizenship in Athens. [The Athenians were stripping many immigrants of their citizenship.] It is my view that there have been some cases, but not many. However, it would need a considerable number to launch an attack on the democracy of Athens." [Here we consider the way Germany just admitted a million-man army as refugee suppliants. I guess history really does repeat itself.]

Xenophon, Ways and Means (Poroi), 3

"Now I will explain why sea trade is particularly appealing and profitable for the Athenians. First, of course, there is nowhere that rivals the excellent ports it offers, where ships can find safe harbors for riding out storms in complete safety.

In most places, traders generally take on a return cargo, because the local currency is not worth much to outsiders. In Athens, however, they would frequently export silver instead of actual goods. And this was a good business because they were able to sell the silver anywhere in the world for more than the original purchase price. [Translation: In Athens, like America and Europe today, the trading ships were going back empty due to the strength of the currency and the cost of the goods in that place. This caused in Athens a similar hollowing out of the manufacturing base just like in the West today.]

Also, if the administration of the Athenian port was not so corrupt and slow, and traders could more easily depart with goods, Athens would be much more attractive to people buying Athenian goods, and these would come in far greater numbers."

Xenophon, Ways and Means (Poroi), 4

[From the following it appears that the strategically productive economy of Athens was declined as the strategically useless silver mining industry prospered. According to Xenophon Memorabilia 2.5.2, the mining interests of Athens were managed by a slave named Nicias = victory, or justice of sacrifice.]

"As for the silver mines, it is my opinion that if they were properly organized, they would make an enormous amount of money for Athens. This aside from any other source of income it may have. ... Everyone knows that the mines have been worked for a very long time, so long in fact that nobody has any idea when mining activity first started. And although silver ore has been removed for so long, only a small amount has been removed thus far in comparison to the untouched silver-bearing hills. Nor is it the case that we are running out of silver deposits, for new deposits are constantly being discovered.

[1] Most mineral deposits are so vast in human terms they can never be depleted. 2) Archeological evidence shows that these mines in the Laureium district began operation in the 1500sBC, and experienced a large increase in operation around 500BC. This would have simultaneously devalued the nest egg of the land of no resources while giving the Athenians much capital. Thus these silver mines may be the reason for the 480 attack of Xerxes ('Kirk') where the bloom of a generation of Arabs was sent to their slaughter.]

For a while, huge numbers of men were working in the mines. And during this period, nobody was ever without work. In fact, there was always more work than people to do it. [Thus silver mining sort of took over the local economy] And even now, if someone owns slaves who work in the mines, he never decreases the size of his work-force, but always adds as many men to it as he possibly can. The reason for this, I suppose is that the quantity of silver discovered is directly proportionate to the size of the work-force engaged in digging for ore. As well, this is the only work I know of where nobody is concerned about competition.

... All you ever hear from people involved in the silver mines is that they are short of workers. The point is that silver mining is not like working with iron or bronze, where if there are too many smiths, their work becomes cheap and they are forced out of business. [The Athenian silver industry was

subsidized by the Arab parasite.] Likewise when grain or wine become plentiful, the price falls. Then working the land becomes unprofitable and in the end, large numbers of farmers abandon their work and become traders, or retailers, or money-lenders instead. However, the more silver ore that is discovered and the more silver there is as a result, the more people turn to this line of work. I mean, when someone has enough furniture for his house, he stops buying more, but nobody has ever had so much silver/money that he did not feel the need for more. In fact some people with vast amounts [of silver/money] are get as much pleasure from re-burying their surplus silver as spending it!

Another point is that times of national prosperity go along with a strong demand for silver/money. Men want to spend money on fine arms, and fine armor, good horses, impressive homes and furnishings, and women indulge in expensive clothes and golden jewelry [most of which are imported]. Meanwhile in times of national crisis, brought on by crop failure or war, silver coin is even more in demand, to pay for supplies and mercenaries, given that the land is being left un-farmed. [This argument ignores war-time inflation which devalues silver/gold/diamonds/money and make food and weapons much more expensive]

... my purpose in explaining all this is to encourage us to channel as large a work-force as possible towards the silver mines and make arrangements for them, confident in the knowledge that the ore will never give out and that silver will never lose its value. [It will in fact lose value] In actual fact, I think the state has anticipated me in this plan, because it permits any foreigner who wants to make mining his business to do so on the same conditions as citizens."

Xenophon, Ways and Means (Poroi), 5

"Undoubtedly, there must be peace for many sources of [national] income to reach their full potential. ... And Athens is better placed to grow during peacetime than any other state in the world." [Thus Athens suffered much economic harm from war when that came. Today, we in the West find ourselves in much the same position.]

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 35.3

"Men belong to the citizen body if they are of citizen parentage on both sides." [Clearly there were half-Greeks that were causing so much trouble that the Athenians had to say this. Perhaps we will decide the same thing in all nations now.]

Aristophanes, The poet and the women, 317

"Come light-eyed Athena
[not dark-eyed like the Persians]
the all conquering virgin,
For Thy spear is golden
and Thy city is envied"

Alcaeus fr. 428A

"Alcaeus is safe, his weapons are not. The Athenians captured them and they hang as trophies in the temple of their gray [light] eyed goddess." [The 'Persians' had dark eyes, like the Arabs today.]

Aeschines, Against Ctesiphon, 158

"in the case of the ferrymen who carry people to Salamis, you passed a law that if any of them accidentally capsizes a boat during the crossing, he is barred from working as a ferryman again, to prevent anyone from taking chances with Greek lives; so are you not ashamed at the prospect of allowing this man,

who totally capsized Greece and our city to steer public policy again?"

Xenophon, Ways and Means (Poroi), 2

"Let's start by looking at the interests of the resident aliens [of Athens, which are mostly Turks and Syrians as said below, the word is Metic]. I believe this group is one of the best sources of income Athens has, because they are self-supporting and help the state/government in a number of ways without getting any public money for it. In fact, they even pay a resident alien's tax [called a *Metokion*, or a Metic poll tax]. I think their interests would be fairly served if we scrapped all of the rules which deprive resident aliens of status and honor without helping the state in the slightest. And also if we rescinded their obligation to form infantry battalions to serve alongside the citizen units. After all, it is very risky for them to leave Athens, and no trivial matter for them to leave their children and households. Besides, it would help us if military service were handled exclusively by citizens, rather than also using non-Greeks from far-flung places such as Lydia Phrygia and Syria, [Turkey and Syria] where most of the resident aliens come from. In addition to the advantage gained by abrogating [cancelling] their duty to join the army, it would also be to the state's credit if Athenians were seen to rely on themselves rather than foreigners to fight their battles.

Also if we granted resident aliens certain privileges, and in particular the right to serve in the cavalry, I think we would make them loyal and at the same time improve Athens' strength and importance. [In other words, don't let the Syrian refugees serve in the infantry where they can't do much harm, train them to fly around in horses/aircraft where they can really harm/sabre-tage the war effort.]

Another point is that there are a number of abandoned houses and sites within the city walls. Perhaps the state should allow [refugee] applicants whom they judged suitable to take possession of these sites [to own land, Gr. *enktesis*] and build on them, I think this would greatly improve both the number and quality of people who wanted to live in Athens. [So Athens had these abandoned inner-city properties that nobody wanted. First they let the Arab immigrants/refugees buy these. Later when the Spartans ravaged the countryside around Athens and drove the farmers inside the city walls and caused a great housing shortage, these became valuable and the refugees prospered.]

Then again, if we made the custody of resident aliens an official post, along the lines of the custodians of orphans, and rewarded in some way those who presented the state with the most resident aliens, [clearly we are reading an Arab guide-book] this is another move that would increase the resident alien's loyalty. The chances are that it would also make everyone who is currently not enrolled as a citizen of some state want to move to Athens, which would raise its revenues" [in the short run as a million-man army was welcomed with open legs inside the town walls.]

Euripides, Rhesus, 817

"O you architects of the greatest sorrows, you enemy spies, how could those enemy spies come here, how could the army be slaughtered, all shamefully unobserved by you?"

Aristophanes, The poet and the women, 339

"A curse on the men who plan to help our enemies
He who talks with the Mede [Mideast] or with Euripides,
Or aspires to be a tyrant, or sit on a throne...
We pray then for blessing of people and state

And on all that is said in our serious debate
That he who speaks wisely, may carry the day
And none prove traitors by betraying our secrets
On all who from motives of malice or greed,
Who shame our city by conspiring with the Mede [Mideast]
or wickedly try to alter our laws"

Xenophon, The Constitution of the Spartans, 1.1

"Although Sparta has one of the smallest populations, it has become the most powerful and famous of all Greek states. ... Instead of softening their feet with shoes, Lycurgus decreed that they should harden them by going barefoot [year round]... Instead of pampering them in matters of dress, he decreed that they should always wear one garment all year round so they would become more tolerant of heat and cold. ...

[next the text seems to also be about the Haremi ways] He thought that food which tended to make people thin would make them grow taller [smarter] than that which produces fat. To reduce their constant hunger, he made it possible for them to steal whatever food they wanted, but not without trouble. As I am sure everyone realizes, he did not allow them to feed themselves through their own resourcefulness [by stealing] because he lacked the means of providing for them. He who intends to steal must [learn to] stay awake [and work] at night. He must also [learn to] deceive and ambush during the day. And if he is to succeed, he must also [work with his brothers so he can] have spies out. Clearly he added this aspect of their education to make the boys more resourceful in obtaining the necessities of life, and more suited for war [Arabic harb = war].

Some ask why he decreed a severe flogging for anyone who was caught, if he thought stealing was a good thing. [The Haremi are trained to steal without getting caught] My answer is that its similar to how punishment is always handed out for not doing one's lessons well. Those who are caught are punished severely for stealing. [The Arabs beat their lazy students, while we are not supposed to.] Lycurgus made it honorable to steal as many cheeses as possible from the altar of Artemis Or-thia [Ishtar/Astarte/Isis our-theo], and detailed others to whip the thieves [who were caught] in the process [of stealing], wishing to demonstrate in this way, that [risking] a brief moment's pain can bring the joy of enduring fame. ...

[This next part is not about how the Haremi train their collective young. This is about how the Arabs turned all the Spartans into homo-sexuals] To prevent the kids from being without control even if the supervisor left them, Lycurgus laid it down that any citizen who was present [hanging around the school] could give the boys whatever instructions seemed necessary, and punish any misconduct. By this means he produced more respect in the boys. In fact, men and boys alike [who grow up this way] respect nothing more than the men who are in charge of them [they simply follow orders]. In order that they might not be without someone in charge even when there was no adult present, he put the keenest of the Eirens [the irefull-uns, the most aggressive, and also the horniest of the boys] in charge of each company. Therefore boys in Sparta are never without someone to control them [to give them orders and whip them, and screw them].

Here I must also say something about affection for boys [homosexuality] since this too is relevant to their education. Elsewhere there are various practices — In Boeotia, men and boys live together as if they were married. In Elis, they attract a young man by favors... [Here is a society where boys were all left hungry but permitted to steal food. But if they were

caught, the older boys left in charge could whip them or take a bribe of sorts. Here is a society designed by an outside force to make all the boys into homosexuals. Behold the parasite race that has been doing this for 2,500 years at least.] ... Such then is the education system of Sparta and of the other Greek States. Whether it produces men who are more obedient, respectful and self-controlled is for the reader to decide."

Xenophon, The Constitution of the Spartans, 3.1

"When a boy begins to grow up, the other Greeks release him from his *pedagogue* [boy•guide] and no longer send him to school. No one then controls him, and he is totally his own master. Lycurgus again chose the opposite way. Realizing that at this age, pride is greatest, insolence at its height and temptations towards pleasures most insistent, he selected this period in which to subject them to the most demanding regime. He arranged for them to have as little free time as possible. He also said that anyone who skipped this training should be deprived of all social privileges. Thus he ensured that not only the rulers, but everyone really, would make sure their boys did not shirk in their duties and utterly destroy their standing in society.

He also wanted to firmly plant a sense of modesty in them. So he decreed that they should walk in silence and keep their hands inside their cloaks in public. They were also supposed to keep their eyes fixed on the ground in front of their feet and not look around. Here it became clear that in self-control, as well as other fields, men are stronger than women. For you would be more likely to hear a stone statue speak than them. more likely to catch a wandering glance from a bronze figure... At the common meals [Spartans ate in mess halls] you had to be content if you could even get an answer to a question. ... [In English Laconic = terse like a Spartan. Lack•on•ak = lacking a point to go on in a conversation.]

(4.1) He took by far the greatest care with those who had just reached manhood, thinking that if they became the sort of people they ought to be, they would have a very great influence for good in the city. He realized that the greater the rivalry involved, the better choruses are to listen to and athletic contests to watch. Therefore he thought that if he could induce a spirit of competition among the young in the field of virtue, this would bring them to the highest levels of manliness. ... [Here we see the parasite struggling to encourage and legitimize competition in a host society. It always struggles for competition over cooperation in its host societies because united we stand and divided we fall. Any step in the direction of rivalry, even friendly competition is as step in the direction of the parasite.]

(5.1) The Spartans were [originally] in the habit of eating at home like the other Greeks, and he realize that this led to considerable neglect of duty. He therefore instituted public mess halls, believing that this would be the most effective check on disobedience. He specified a food ration that would not be too much or too little. [They didn't get enough calories from food] ... He stopped anything involving compulsory drinking, which harms the body and fuddles the wits, but permitted each to drink when he wanted, believing this to be the least harmful and most pleasant form of drinking" [They got much of their caloric intake from alcohol, so all drank.]

(7.2) In Sparta, Lycurgus forbade the free citizens from having anything to do with money making business. [This they left to their Arab hel•ot=sun•ear slaves who ran Sparta, just like they did in Rome. The Arabs got to move to Greece and the Greeks of Sparta became this headless army that did

whatever its slave servant society directed. Also note how the Arabs have been using communism for around 2,500 years.] He ordered them to devote all their attention to those activities which ensure liberty for cities [In other words, a fully militarized police state dedicated to ensuring freedom, or at least freedom from being conquered. Another possible direction a free people can be lead astray.] Anyway, what need was there to worry about wealth in a society where the establishment of equal contributions to the mess halls and a uniform standard of living excluded the search for wealth in order to obtain luxury? They did not even need wealth for clothing, since for them, clothing is not rich fabrics but bodily health. Money was not even to be acquired to spend on the other members of one's mess hall. He made working physically to help one's comrades more honorable than spending money to this end."

(8.1) Spartans are famous for their outstanding obedience to their rulers and laws [it was a police state]. But Lycurgus did not even try to instill this discipline until after he had secured agreement among the leading men of the state. [Step-1, gain power, step-2, consolidate power.]

(9.1) Another aspect of Lycurgus' institutions which may properly be a source of wonder is his establishment of the principle that a noble death is preferable to living in dishonor. Investigation shows that fewer of those who believe in this are killed than of those who choose to retreat from danger. In fact, one is more likely to avoid an early death through courage than cowardice, for courage is easier, more pleasant, more resourceful and stronger. [This is of course not true. But it does sound exactly like something the Arabs might have taught the young Spartans.]

Manifestly glory accompanies bravery in particular, because everyone wants to be friends with the brave. We should not omit how Lycurgus achieved this. He made it clear that the brave would be rewarded with happiness, and the cowardly with misery. In other cities the coward suffers nothing more than the stigma of cowardice. He goes to the same market as the brave man, sits with him, and even goes the same gym if he wants. In Sparta, everyone thought it disgraceful to take a coward into his mess hall, or to wrestle with him. When teams are being selected for the sphairai contests, such a man is often not picked. [spheari contests = ball games. Why not translate it as ball games for historical resonance? Is someone hiding something? Do you now see the mentality of Sparta? It was a society of brain-dead football jocks.] And in the chorus, he is relegated to the most shameful position. He must also give way to others on the street. He must even rise even for young men when he is seated. ... he must endure a house without a wife, and yet pay the penalty for being a bachelor.... and if he does, he must submit to a beating from his betters. When such handicaps go with cowardice, it is not surprising that many Spartans prefer death to such a deprived and disgraceful existence. [That anyway is how the Arabs raised the fully militarized Spartans, who they helped to defeat their arch enemies, the free people of Athens.]

(10.4) Lycurgus...decreed that all citizens must practice all his virtues in public life. Just as individually those who practice virtue surpass those who disregard it. So it is reasonable that Sparta is outstanding and above [better than] all other cities in virtue because it is the only one [city] where nobility is consciously practiced in public life.where other cities punish men for doing harm to others, Lycurgus decreed no less severe penalties for men who lived in notorious disgrace and dishonor [harmed society]. His principle, it seems, was that if someone steals from or enslaves a people, then not only those who are directly harmed as wronged, but

their entire city. And Therefore it seemed right that they should receive the severest punishment. He also laid down an inflexible requirement that everyone practice political virtue.

[This was how the Arabs got the Spartans to hate the Athenians.] Those who did their part and their duties were given an equal share [i.e. made a Homoioi] in the existence of the state.

Also, note how the slave state always attacks the free state. This is because the slave state can be mentally screwed up the most.]

(15.2) Lycurgus... laid down that the king should make all the public sacrifices for the state because of his divine descent, and should lead the army on any foreign campaign." [1] They were taxing everyone and using the money to buy piles of super-expensive Arabian hashish-incense, just like in Rome. 2) The national defense effort of the police state generally comes to include foreign uses of military power.]

Isocrates, Panegyricus, 52

"[Our great Athenian ancestors] sometimes fought for the freedom of Greece, and sometimes for the freedom of the world. Because they always made their city the common possession of the Greeks and the defender of the victims of oppression. This leads to some accusations of bad policy, because of our habit of supporting the weaker." [Doesn't this sound like the US?]

Estimated Athenian population

We read estimates of the population of Athens.

Supposedly, it had 140,000 citizens in 480.

Supposedly, it had 170,000 citizens in 431.

Plague struck in 430-29 and again in 427.

By 400 the population was 90,000.

Supposedly the population fell by 48%.

Yet, did the population only rise by 21% after 480?

Isocrates, Panegyricus, 67

"I should say something about Athenian action outside Greece... especially against the non-Greek races. A complete account of all these emergencies would take too long, but I will try to describe the greatest of them... of all these races, the... strongest powers are Scythia [Ukraine, White Russia], Thrace [Bulgaria and the European part of Turkey] and Persia [Turkey and the Mideast. Not much has changed for democracies in the past 2,400 years. We are still fighting the same parasitic axis of ex-pull]. All these have actually harbored designs against Athens, and she has been in conflict with them all. ...in fact... every Greek state which could not secure her natural rights turned to us for [military] aid, and every non-Greek state which sought to enslave Greeks made its first attack on us.

[Again, this sounds like the US.]

The most famous of these wars was that with Persia, but... equally valuable evidence can be derived from ancient times. ... These [have always] hated the entire Greek race, but they made particular complaints against Athens. [again, this sounds like the Arab hatred of the US] and thought that conflict with a single state would lead them to the control of all. They did not succeed, even though our ancestors were their only opponents. They suffered defeat on a scale that might have suggested a war against the whole of mankind."

Andocides, on the mysteries, 140

[Beware of Arab flattery, especially when it makes you unable to harm Arabs.]

"Your people now have a reputation throughout Greece of outstanding good character and wisdom because you don't turn to retaliation for the past, [i.e. you forgive the Arabs.] but work towards the preservation of your city-state and unity among its people [both native citizens and immigrants] Many others have suffered from disasters as great as yours. But the settlement of existing differences in happy reconciliation is rightly thought a sign of goodness and wisdom. So since it is universally admitted that you have this character towards friends and foe alike." [Again, this sounds like America.]

Andocides, on the mysteries, 92

[Ando•cide = Andro•cide = men•killer]

"Cephisius leased the tax collection rights from the [Athenian] treasury, collected the profits from our farmers to the tune of 90 minae [a currency unit]. But instead of paying it in [the required share to the Athenian treasury] he absconded. Had he been found, he would have been arrested. For the law says that the Council has the power, in the case of non-payment of taxes, to put the debtor in jail." [The parasitic Arabs have always been stealing from our free governments.]

Thucydides, 1.120

"Those of us who have already had dealings with the Athenians do not need to be told that we have to be on our guard against them. But those who live inland or off the main trade routes should recognize the fact that, if they fail to support their maritime powers, they will find it much harder to export their goods."

Aristophanes, Acharians-I, 718

"Here's the boundaries for my market. Within these limits, the Peloponnesians [Spartans] may trade, all of them, and the Megarians and Boeotians too, but only if they trade with me... an election by lot has been held for the office of Market Commissioners" [Here is one of the things that the Athenians did to provoke the Spartans. Also elections by lot are not elections but draws. The Greeks frequently did this for their legislative leaders, and it was probably bad for their democracy.]

Aristophanes Acharnians 515-556

[In reading the following, consider that Sparta's lands are that part of the Greek Peninsula that are today cut off by the Corinthian canal. And while there is a place called Megara in Sicily, there is clearly a reference to Athenians getting drunk and running off the Megara territory, perhaps Corinth, (which is 60km from Athens) and kidnapping some women. So Megara probably means Spartan territory in the following. Also, if history is any guide and the trade references below are to be believed, the Spartans were fronts for the Brothers in Greece. Anyway, for the sake of clarity, I have substituted the name Sparta for Megara]

"It was some Athenians who started it — Some Athenians, mind you, not the entire city of Athens — but a bunch of good-for-nothing individuals, worthless counterfeits, foreigners, bad coin through and through. They kept denouncing the Spartans. First their woolen cloaks, and soon, whenever they saw a cucumber or a young hare or a piglet, or some garlic or some salt, they's shout "Spartan goods". They'd have them confiscated and auctioned that day. Well, that was just normal Athenian behavior, but then some young roisters got drunk, went to Sparta and kidnapped their tart [princess] Simaetha; and this raised the Spartan's hackles, and they stole two of Aspasias's tarts in retaliation. And that was the reason why this

war erupted throughout the Greek world. It was on account of these whores. Also because when it happened Pericles, Pericles the Olympian sent out thunder and lightning and threw Greece into turmoil, passing laws written like drinking songs: No Spartan shall be on the land or sea
Let our market henceforth be Spartan free!
Well, after that, the Spartans were starving by slow degrees and they asked the Spartans [Athenians] to get the decree of the three whores reversed. And they asked several times, but we refused — And then came the clashing of shields. Someone will say, 'They shouldn't have done that.' Tell me, then, what should they have done? Suppose some Spartan had 'sailed forth his bark' and had denounced and sold a puppy-dog belonging to the Seriphians —

Would you have sat within your halls? Far from it, You'd have launched a fleet of three hundred instantly, and every ear in the City would have been full of military noises — shouting crowds around ship's captains, pay being distributed, figureheads of Athena being gilded, the Piraeus corn market groaning as rations were measured out, people buying leathers and rowlock thongs and jars, or garlic and olives and nets of onions, garlands and anchovies and flue-girls and black eyes; and down at the docks, the sound of plaining spars for oars, hammering in dowels, boring oar-holes, of reed-pipes, and pan-pipes and boatswains and warblings. I know very well what you would have done."

Medusa's head on Athena's aegis

The Athenians knew about the world's dirtiest secret. That is why Athena had the gorgon's head on her aegis. And this is why the Athenians put the gorgon head on their shields — for the gorgon symbolized their knowledge and mastery of the parasite's agenda.

You see, the Arabs are a thousand times stronger than any one of us when we are disunited and ignorant of their agenda. However, once we know about the gorgon, we are a thousand times stronger than them. So this this knowledge of the gorgon was perhaps the main reason for the success of Athens. However, automatically, from day-one, the Arabs set about to blur away this harmful legend, for they benefitted from this blurring process from day-one. So slowly, over the decades and centuries they degraded the knowledge. It was just like how the Arab-harmful legend of the Odious Rex and the Sphinx was blurred away into the play Oedipus Rex. And incidentally, this erosion is what is meant by the sands of history memes.

Anyway, once the legend of the gorgon was changed into Medusa, or three Medusas, and then blurred and forgotten, the Barbarian/Arrabbian de•ex•pull could once again run wild.

Aristophanes, Acharians-I, 572

[When the Athenians put the gorgon on their shields it meant that they knew about the evil of the Haremi/Arab core•gonos, and this knowledge was the basis of their strength and freedom. Here in a later myth, it seems that the ordinary Greeks were made to think gorgons as horrific and unpleasant to them as well as their enemies the Arabs. La•machus= the•maker, the gods. Dike•polis = Decay•city]

"Lamachus bursts on the scene in full armor, his shield bearing a horrific Gorgon-head. His helmet has an enormous triple crest and two gigantic feathers. He is followed by a company of soldiers.>

Lamachus <bombastically>:

Where did the battle cry come from?

Who must I help, and where must I wreak havoc?

Who has aroused my Gorgon from her case?

Dikaio•polis <in mock adoration>:

O mighty hero Lamachus! What decorations, what troops!

Chorus leader <indicating Dikaio•polis>:

Lamachus, did you know this man has been persistently slandering the City?

Lamachus <in a rage worthy of a hero>:

How dare you say such things, you are a beggar.

Dikaio•polis <mock groveling>:

O mighty hero Lamachus, do pardon me, if I spoke a bit more freely than a beggar ought to.

Lamachus:

What did you say about us? Out with it!

Dikaio•polis:

I... I don't remember at the moment. That terrifying armor of yours is making me all giddy. Please take that horrid face away.

Lamachus <reversing his shield to hide the Gorgon-head>:

There you are.

Dikaio•polis:

No, put it down on the ground, face down, in front of me.

Lamachus <complying>:

There. ...

Dikaio•polis <wriggling free>:

...No, no Lamachus, we are not have a trial of strength here. Though <coming close to him, in a seductive voice> if you are so strong, why don't you give me a bit of a thrill? You're well enough equipped.

[This is a character named decay•city talking. here it seems most Athenian men were homos at the time.]

Lamachus:

How dare you talk to a general like that, you beggar.

Dikaio•polis:

A beggar? I'm no beggar.

Lamachus:

What are you then?

Dikaio•polis:

What am I? A decent citizen. I've never run for office, and ever since the [Peloponnesian] war started, I've been [dying] in the front line. And you, ever since the war started, you've been in the pay queue.

Lamachus:

I was democratically elected.

Dikaio•polis:

Yes, by three cuckoos. [Cuckoo birds lay their eggs in the nests of other species.] That's the sort of thing that nauseated me, and that is why I made peace — when I saw the gray-haired men serving in the ranks while strong young guys like you were sent to Thrace [Turkey] on three drachmas a day like Teisa•menus, Phaenippus and that swine Hipp•arch•ides [horse•rule•ideas], and another lot going to Chares [ak•our], and another lot in Chaonia [at the sphinx between the Euphrates and the Mediteranean] Geres Theodorus [theo•d'our] and that bragging liar from Dio•media [god•middle-east] — and more in Sicily, in Camarina [ak•mar•in•A], Gela, and Ge•laugh•at•us. [the business in Sicily was absurd]

Lamachus:

They were democratically elected too.

Dikaio•polis:

Then how come your lot are always on paid missions somewhere or other, and none of these people <indicates> ever is? Tell me, Marilades, you've been gray for many years. Have you ever been an ambassador <Marilades indicates no> He hasn't, you see, although he's a decent, hard-working man.

How about you Dracyllus? or you, Ecbatana, or Chaonia? <all indicate no> None of them, you see. But Coesyra's boy, and Lamachus here, they have! And yet only the other day, they were so much in arrears with repayments on loans from their friends, that they were warned to 'stay clear', like people say when they're emptying the day's slop into the street.

Lamachus:

"Goddess of democracy, this is intolerable!"

Dikaio-polis:

Nothing is tolerable to you, unless you are drawing pay for it.

Lamachus:

Well, come what may, I shall never stop making war on the Peloponnesians [Spartans, why not translate it as Spartans?] all of them, and harrying them everywhere, by land and sea, to the utmost of my power. <Lamachus departs with his men>

[Apparently there were good-for-nothing people in power in the Athenian democracy that were struggling/jihading helping to keep the war alive.]

Dikaio-polis:

And I proclaim to the Peloponnesians [Spartans], all of them, and the Megarians and Boeotians too, to come and trade with me [again] — but not with Lamachus. [Apparently Athens was imposing trade sanctions like America today.]

Aristophanes Acharnians 720

"Dikaio-polis: Right then, there's the boundaries for my market. Within these limits the Peloponnesian's [Spartans] may trade, all of them, and the Megarians and Boeotians too, but only if they trade with me — and not with Lamachus. An election by lot [a random selection, not an election] has been held for the office of Market Commissioners, and I declare these three straps from Lepri elected. No informers will be admitted, nor any other bird of that feather. <He hangs the straps from pegs on his wall> But I'd better go and get my inscribed copy of the peace treaty and put it on display here in my market place."

Euripides, Rhesus, 301

"The horses had coats that were as bright as snow — and a yoke of gold held their necks. A shield decorated with figures of beaten gold was gleaming on his shoulders. A Gorgon, as on the aegis of the goddess [Athena], hung in bronze from the horse's brows and with its many bells sent out a ring of terror." [All of which were probably expensive weapons systems sold by Mideast Inc. that were essentially useless in actual combat.]

The similarities between Athens, Rome and America

- 1) All started as democracies. Athens and Rome became tyrannies. Thanks to the find all the Patriots Act, the Arabs have probably started making their purge lists in America.
- 2) All three are or were full of immigrants, and full of the best leavers from the rest of the world. In fact all three places have this role as where the best lines go to die out.
- 3) All three were hollowed out and undermined economically. All were lent money and fed by the parasite. All were allowed to seem to prosper in a great bubble despite having little or no economic activity.
- 4) All three saw their way of life become one not of the liberty they were founded upon, but of libertine-ism — of insane freedoms. Libertine = people who behave without a sense of responsibility for their genetic lines (among other things). Thus these places became nations of sex and drugs and rock and roll, instead of procreation, economic advancement and civic responsibility. After each generation, the native stock degraded by perhaps 1/3. Thus these places became where the good lines went to die out.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities, 4.24.4

[This is a picture of Rome's problems with Arab immigrant desperadoes.]

"Things have come to such a state of confusion and the noble traditions of the Roman commonwealth have become so debased and sullied [corrupt and sordid] that some who have made a fortune by robbery, housebreaking, prostitution, and every other base means, purchase their freedom with the money so acquired and thus immediately become Romans. Others, who have been confidants and accomplices of their masters in poisonings, murders, and crimes against the gods or the state, receive from them this reward. Some are freed so that they can receive the monthly allowance of grain given at the public expense, or any other largess distributed by the leading men to the poor among the citizens, and bring it to those who have granted them their freedom. And others owe their freedom to the levity of their masters and to their vain thirst for popularity. I, at any rate, know of some men who have allowed all their slaves to be freed after their death, so that when dead they might be called good men and their funerals might be attended by a throng of mourners wearing liberty caps [The pilleus, a cap worn by an emancipated slave as a symbol of their freedom.] on their heads..."

Such...disgraces...should not be allowed into the body politic. I would like to see the censors...or...some important magistrates take this matter in hand, inquiring into those freed each year. Who are they and why and how were they freed?"

Rome 17BC Lex Junia. Here the Augustus Administration tried to reduce the speed that non Italian slaves and their descendants became first freedmen and then full Roman citizens through slave manumissions (granting a slave his freedom). Here we see the adoption of the halfway "Latin" status for L. liberti=freedmen. The children of these freedmen would however be full Roman citizens. See also the Lex Fufia Caninia (2 BC) and a Lex Aelia-Sentia (4 AD)

2. The 27-year war between Athens and Sparta

431BC the Second Peloponnesian war starts.

429 Pericles dies, Sophocles writes Oedipus Rex

438 Marble Parthenon finished. The marble was probably an overpriced Arab concession product, like so many airport components and approved services.

424 Athens loses Boiotia/ Boeotia and become cut off by land.

415 BC The Athenians massacre the men of Milos and sell its women and children into slavery. The island was the home of the Venus de Milo

In 415-413BC the entire Athenian fleet lays siege to Syracuse, Sicily and are eventually totally massacred. This marks a turning point in the war with Sparta.

Xenophon, Persian Expedition 1.3

"He remarked how absurd it was for us to ask for help from the very people whose business we are ruining. If we are actually going to trust the guidance that Cyrus [a Mideast emperor] gives us, we might as well ask Cyrus to occupy the strategic positions for us too. I certainly would hesitate to embark on the ships which Cyrus gave us in case he might sink us with his

ships; and I would be afraid of following the guide which he gave us in case he might lead us into a position from which there would be no possibility of escape."

In 412 we see the Treaty of Miletus between Sparta and Persia. We also see the revolt of Athenian allies.

In 411, there is an Oligarchic coup d'etat in Athens, with democracy restored within the year.

Aristophanes, Peace

"the Moon and that despicable Sun have been scheming against you for some time. They plan to hand Greece over to the Barbarians [an anagram of Arrabbians]... naturally they want to wipe us out. Then they can collar the rights to all the rites."

Euripides, Rhesus, 817

"O you architects of the greatest sorrows, you enemy spies, how could those enemy spies come here, how could the army be slaughtered, all shamefully unobserved by you?"

Aristophanes, Acharians-II, introduction

"THEME: The war with Sparta and Boeotia has been dragging on for six years. The countryside of Attica is devastated [and produces no food to speak of] and Athens itself is an overcrowded city in which plague has wreaked havoc. The Archarnians, inhabitants of a deme northwest of Athens whose land has been repeatedly ravaged, are thirsting for revenge. Aristophanes' comedy is a plea for peace, whose fruits and comforts are contrasted with the destitution, hardships and stupidity of war."

Aristophanes Acharnians 593

"Lamachus: How dare you talk to a general like that, you a beggar?

Dikaio polis: A beggar? I'm no beggar.

Lamachus: When are you, then?

Dikaio polis: What am I? A decent citizen. I've never run for office, and ever since the war started, I've been in the front line. And you, ever since the war started, you've been in the pay queue!

Lamachus: I was democratically elected.

Dikaio polis: Yes, by three cuckoos. That's the sort of thing that nauseated me, and that's why I made peace — when I saw gray-haired men serving in the ranks when strong young fellows like you skived off and got sent to Thrace on three drachmas a day, like [List of names]

Lamachus: They were democratically elected too."

Aristophanes, Clouds 1002-11013

"**Right:** What matters is that you'll be spending [wasting] you time in the gym, getting sleek and healthy, not like these people who are always chatting away in the town market about some obscure topic or other, or being dragged into court over some trivial argument or filthy little dispute. No you'll go down to Academe's park and train under the sacred olive trees, a wreath of white reeds on you head, with a nice decent companion of your own age. ...

If you heed my sound advice, if you follow my lead, you'll be healthy, strong and sleek. You'll have muscles that are thick and a pretty little prick. You'll be proud of your appearance and physique.

On the other hand, if you reject my society and turn to modern ways, you'll get pale and sickly. And with two

exceptions, all of your limbs will be too small. The exceptions are the tongue and the election [erection].

You will sing the trendy song, 'To be virtuous is wrong, and every kind of wickedness is right.' And you'll catch the current craze for Anti-machus' [anti-maker's] ways That is, for getting buggered every night.

Chorus: O how sweet your words are and how modest your thoughts. You noble and glorious sage! How we envy the happiness of those whom you have taught. They lived in a real Golden Age"

Aristophanes, The Frogs

"You've taught people to prattle and gab, emptying the wrestling schools and turning the young men's bottoms into flab."

Aristophanes, The Frogs

"It tempts the rich to shirk their responsibility: A wealthy tycoon evades the funding of a warship by dressing in rags and whimpering about his poverty."

Aristophanes, Clouds 13-176

[When asked the purpose of a house, the response is:]

Strepsaides: It is a thinkery for intellectual souls. [a school for philosophers.] That is where the people live who try to prove that the sky is like a baking-pot all round us, and we are the charcoal inside it. And if you pay them well, they can teach you how to win a case whether you are in the right or not.

Pheidippides: Who are these people?

Strepsaides: I don't remember their names, but they are very fine and reflective people.

Pheidippides: Yuck! I know the villains. You mean those pale, bare-footed quacks such as that wretched Socrates and Chaerophon

Strepsaides: Most beloved son, I beg you to go and study with them!

Pheidippides: What do you want me to learn?

Strepsaides: They say that they have two arguments, right and wrong, they call them. And one of them, wrong can always win its case even when justice is against it. Well, if you can learn this wrongful argument, then all these debts I have run into because of you, I need not pay anyone a cent of them ever.

Pheidippides: I am not going to do it. How could I ever face my equestrian buddies again? With all the tan gone from my skin?

[Line 719 says: 'No money, no tan, no shoes... So here the parasite's propaganda is mentioning tans twice, and pale faces once as a way of keeping the Greeks from studying]

Strepsaides: Then by holy Demeter [god of harvests]! you will never eat anything of mine again. not you nor any of your damn horses. I will throw you out of my house and you can go to hell.

Pheidippides: No, to uncle Megacles, if necessary. He won't leave me horseless. ... and I could not care less what you say!

Strepsaides: That was a hard knock, but I am not going to take it lying down. So may it please the gods, I will to to the Thinkery [school] and get taught there myself. [He knocks at the door of the school and a student comes to answer]...

Student: What kind of fool are you? Do you realize that by your violent and un-philosophical knocking of the door, you have totally ruined an important discovery?

Strepsaides: Forgive me. I am from a long way off in the county. But do tell me, what was it that I ruined?

Student: [mysteriously] It is not permitted to divulge it to non-

members of the academy.

Strepsaides: It's ok, you can tell me. I came here to the thinkery [school] to join up.

Student: Very well, but you must treat this as a holy secret. Socrates a moment ago asked Chaerephon how many of its own feet a flea could jump. One of them had just bitten Chaerephon's eyebrow and jumped over on to Socrates' head.

Strepsaides: And how did he measure it?

Student: In a very elegant way. He melted some wax and put the flea's feet into it, so that when it hardened, the flea was wearing a stylish pair of shoes. And then he took the slippers off and used them to measure out the distance [The student illustrates this by taking a step of two, heel touching toe].

Strepsaides: Lord Zeus, what a subtle intellect!

Student: Want to hear another of Socrates' clever ideas?

Strepsaides: I beg you, yes, please tell me.

Student: Chaerephon of Sphettus once asked Socrates whether he was of the opinion that gnats produce their hum by way of their mouth or their anus.

Strepsaides: So what was his opinion about the gnat?

Student: He [Socrates] said, 'The intestinal passage of the gnat is very narrow and consequently the wind is forced to go straight through to the rear end. And then the anus, being an orifice forming the exit from this narrow passage makes a noise owing to the force of the wind.'

Strepsaides: So a gnat's anus is like a trumpet. How utterly marvelous! I can see that defending a lawsuit successfully is going to be dead easy for someone who has such precise knowledge of the guts of gnats.

Student: Just yesterday, he was robbed of a great thought by a lizard.

Strepsaides: How on earth did it happen?

Student: He was doing some research on the movements and revolutions of the moon, gazing upwards, open mouthed, and then this gecko shit on him from the ceiling

Strepsaides: Oh, I like that one, a lizard [la dino] shitting in Socrates' face [mouth]!"

Aristophanes Acharnians 1020 - end

"Dercetes: I've lost my two oxen. I'm ruined.

Dikaiopolis: How did you lose them?

Dercetes: Boeotian raiders carried them off.

Dikaiopolis: How shocking. I'm surprised you're not wearing black

Dercetes: They always kept my life so fertile.

Dikaiopolis: Well, what do you want now?

Dercetes: I've wept for them till I cried my eyes out. [Their men became as emotional as women] Please, if you care for poor Dercetes of Phyle [Fool], rub some peace on my eyes quickly. [Here it seems that the Athenians were blinded by their overwhelming desire for peace. In the following, peace is used as code for getting out of the draft.]

Dikaiopolis: I'm very sorry for you, but I don't happen to be the public physician. [They were using Mideast specialists as our healers.]

Dercetes: No, please! — if I can only get my oxen back

Dikaiopolis: No go. Sob off to Pittalus and Co. [They had little pity]

Dercetes: Couldn't you just drip one little drop of peace into my reed-stalk? [they had settled down]

Dikaiopolis: No, not so much as a smear. Will you go away and moan somewhere else?

Dercetes: <departing> Oh, my poor, poor dear ploughing oxen.

<Dikaiopolis returns to his cooking>

Chorus: He's found he really likes this peace:
He doesn't want to share it.

Dikaiopolis: Now pour some honey over the tripe
And brown the squid. [They became frivolous]

Chorus: Just listen to those stirring [war] cries!
[They were more emphatically called to dinner, than to war]

Dikaiopolis: Now turn the eel over.

Chorus: The neighbors will die of envy when
[They were all trying to impress one-another with their consumption]

They smell it and hear you shout.

Dikaiopolis: <Handing some more meat to the slaves> Roast these, will you, nice and brown.

<Enter the slaves of a bride and groom with some slices of meat>...

Groom's slave: I've come from a wedding. The groom sends you these <shows the meat slices>

Dikaiopolis: Vey kind of him, whoever he is.

Groom's slave: And in return he wants you to give him just one ladle-full of peace, in this flask, so he won't need to go to the war but can stay home and fuck.

Dikaiopolis: <Gesturing rejection> Take the meat away. I don't want any of it. I wouldn't give you any of this for a thousand drachmas. <Noticing the bride's slave> Who's she?

Groom's slave: She is the bride's slave, and she's got a request from the bride to whisper in your ear.

Dikaiopolis: <To the bride's slave> All right, what have you got to say? <He bends down to hear the whisper and then laughs loudly> Gods in heave. Do you know what the bride's message was? I would like you very much to make sure that my bridegroom's prick stays at home with me.

Very well <to a slave> bring the treaty here. I'll give her some specially. She's a woman, and she wasn't responsible for the war. <The wine-skin symbolizing the peace treaty is brought to him [a misdirection].> Put the flask to the spout, lady. <He pours a little wine into the flask.> Now do you know what to do with it? Tell the bride this: Any time they're preparing the army lists, just rub this on to your bridegroom's prick at night. ... Take the treaty away, and bring me the wind ladle, so I can take some wine and pour it into my pitcher. [There appears to have been much corruption in the exclusion of men from service.]

Leader: Look, here comes someone in a hurry, bringing bad news, by the frown on his face. <Enter First messenger, running towards Lamachus' house.>

First messenger: O War, O Battle, O Lamachus.

Lamachus: <comes to the door without his armor> Who is it that brazenly knocks at the door of these halls?

First messenger: Orders from the Generals, sir. You're to go immediately, with all your troops and all your crests, take up position in the snow and keep a look-out for enemy raiders. There's been a report that Boeotians may take advantage of the Pitcher and Pot Feasts to do a little cattle rustling. [Drinking feasts and cattle rustling].

Lamachus: O High Command, more numerous than kind.

[Their military command was bloated and indifferent.] Isn't it dreadful that I don't get time off even for a festival?... [Their priorities were out of focus]

Second Messenger: <To Dikaiopolis> Message from the Priest of Dionysus, sir. You're to come to dinner as quickly as possible. Bring a boxful of food, and your pitcher. Hurry up, you're keeping everyone else waiting. He's got everything ready: Couches, tables, cushions, covers, garlands, unguents; the nuts and raisins are there, so are the tarts, and sponge-cakes and flat-cakes and sesame-cakes and wafer-cakes and

— oh yes, and lovely dancing-girls, 'Harmodius' beloved, so to speak, come on, hurry!

Lamachus: Oh, woe is me. What great misfortunes surround me.

Dikaiopolis: Well, what do you expect when you choose that great big Gorgon as a patron? ...

Lamachus: <to a slave> Boy! bring me out my ration-bag

Dikaiopolis: <mimicking him — as often hereafter> Boy! Bring me out my dinner box.

Lamachus: Bring some salt flavored with thyme, and some onions.

Dikaiopolis: I'm fed up with onions, bring me some slices of fish.

Lamachus: Now some salt fish in a fig-leaf — aged, please

Dikaiopolis: yes, a fig-leaf of pork fat would be nice. I'll cook it when I get there.

Lamachus: Bring me two plumes for my helmet.

Dikaiopolis: Bring me the pigeon and thrush.

Lamachus: This ostrich feather is lovely and white

Dikaiopolis: This pigeon's meat is lovely and brown.

Lamachus: <Turning haughtily to Dikaiopolis> Would you please, my man, not make fun of my equipment.

Dikaiopolis: Would you please, my man, not look hungrily at my thrush.

Lamachus: Would you please, my man, not presume to speak to me.

Dikaiopolis: It's just that my slave boy and I have a little argument going. <To his slave> Lets make a bet of it, and let Lamachus be the judge. Which is nicer to eat, locusts or thrushes?

Lamachus: Damn your insolence!

Dikaiopolis: He'd much rather have the locusts, obviously.

Lamachus: Bring me out the crest-case, with my triple crest.

Dikaiopolis: And could I have my bowl of rabbit meat?

Lamachus: Don't tell me the moths have eaten it.

Dikaiopolis: Don't tell me I'm going to be eating this for an appetizer

Lamachus: Boy. Take my spear off the peg and bring it to me.

Dikaiopolis: Boy. Take my sausages off the fire and bring them to me.

Lamachus: Let me pull the cover off the spear. Hold the other end, boy.

Dikaiopolis: And you, boy, hold on to this <His slave holds the spit while he pulls the sausages off.>

Lamachus: Bring me the stand for my round shield.

Dikaiopolis: Bring me the oven-baked loaves for my round tummy.

Lamachus: Now bring me the Gorgon-faced shield itself.

Dikaiopolis: And bring me a cheese-faced flat-cake.

Lamachus: This is flat mockery in anyone's book!

Dikaiopolis: This is delicious cake in anyone's book!...

Lamachus: I'll carry the ration-box myself

Dikaiopolis: And I'll take my coat and go.

Lamachus: All right boy, take the shield and lets be off. Brr! its snowing. Wintry outside.

Dikaiopolis: Take my dinner, boy. Its a party outlook.

Chorus: Go your ways, and may fortune go with you.

How different the paths that you tread.

One leads to the wine and garlands,

One leads to cold bivouacs instead.

And just guess which ends up with a bimbo

Massaging his whats-it in bed."

Thucydides, on the Spartan attack of 431BC, 2.14.2, 16.1

"The move was hard for them because the majority had always

lived in the country" [When the plague struck the Athenians it was brilliantly timed and planned by the parasite. The majority of the Athenians had been living in the countryside where they could simply stay on their farm and wait for the pathogen to attenuate. But when the Spartans attacked in 431, they were forced to seek refuge inside the town walls, where everyone could be exposed to the full strength unattenuated pathogen. So in 430-29 and again in 427 there were plague outbreaks. This was not a coincidence. and judging from the variety of symptoms it was probably a pandemic or a pan-epidemic where the parasite used everything it had on the free and democratic people of Athens.

It is an ancient technique of the parasite to use terrorism of the countryside or warfare to drive people together in dense communities. Then once they are living in a town, they throw in a fleabag, or a small pack, or a rock with a "letter" over the wall. Curiosity gets the better of someone and before you know it the whole town is exposed to a fresh epidemic or three.]

J.M.Moore, Ariston and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy

Footnote to section 2.2 - 2.6

"It is surprising that 2.6 could have been written after the plague had struck Athens in 430-29 and 427. After such a catastrophe, it is remarkable to discuss disease striking crops and make no mention of human disease, particularly as the Athenians must have been uncomfortably conscious of the fact that the plague struck them and not their enemies. The average man would have been likely to suspect some form of divine punishment in so selective an epidemic." [Here it seems that first a plague struck the Athenian people and then afterwards another plague struck their crops. Also, the parasite frequently says that its doings are divine punishment.]

Thucydides, on the Spartan attack of 431BC, 2.14.2, 16.1

"When they saw the Spartan army only 7-8 miles from the city, at Acharnae, it was intolerable. They saw their own land being devastated, which the younger men had never seen, and their elders only during the Persian invasion." [In the West, we have forgotten already and we, like the Athenians have all turned to the arts and childless sex. We will be doomed like the Athenians if we don't change our ways.]

J.M.Moore, Ariston and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy

Footnote to section 2.2 - 2.6

"When it came to the test of war, shortage of raw materials do not appear in fact to have hampered the Peloponnesians [Spartans, because the Arabs were helping them as much as possible in this regard.], although Athens was in a good position to attack their communications." [Remarkably the Spartans got goods through, with the Athenians in control of the seas.]

Aeschines, On the Embassy, 161

"There were some men [mostly new citizens fronting for Arabs Inc.] who got rich on the war and our special war taxes and the public purse."

Aeschines, On the Embassy, 173

"Then our political system was invaded by individuals who had neither free birth nor moral restraint, and we embarked on war again because of the Aeginetans. [Officially an island near Athens, but perhaps the Aegyptians/Arabs] This caused us no

small damage, and we became eager for peace."

Aeschines, On the Embassy, 164

"You made war on Eretria and Themision, and then later you rescued them."

Aeschines, On the Embassy, 161

"There were some men [mostly new citizens fronting for Arabs Inc.] who got rich on the war and our special war taxes and the public purse."

Aeschines, On the Embassy, 177

"When the democracy had regenerated and recovered its original strength, people who had themselves fraudulently enrolled as citizens constantly attracted to themselves the corrupt element in the city and pursued a policy of war and more war. In peace they spoke of danger they foresaw and tried to stir up ambitious and over-hasty minds, while in war they never lifted a weapon but got themselves made army auditors (exetastai, extacy) and naval inspectors (apostoleis, apostles). these are men [of Arab customs] who father [sire, beget] children with [local] mistresses [i.e. not wives], men disenfranchised for malicious prosecution (sykophantia). [root of sycophant?] And they are placing the city in extreme danger. They support the name of democracy with their flattering words, and not with their actions. They are trying to destroy the peace that keeps democracy safe, while they champion the wars that destroy democracy."

3. The defeat of Athens in 404 BC

77 years

Little realized today is that great age of Athenian democracy lasted only 77 years, with the entire age of Greek democracy lasting less than two centuries

In 413, Athens lost its entire marine force in Sicily. Funny how Athens was vying for control of far off Sicily in the strategic center of the Mediterranean

In 406 the Athenian naval is defeated at Arginusae (east of Lesbos) near Turkey.

In 405, Athenian general AL•CIBIADES foolishly attacked Sicily leaving the Athenian grain ships undefended. The Spartan admiral LYS•ANDER (LYS=loosening + ANDER= man) went for the food ships supplying Athens (he went AL=towards + CIBI=food).

After this, the city of Athens was forced to surrender without a fight, thus demonstrating just how much Athens had become dependent on imported Aegospotami grain in the 400s BC. Notably, this attack occurred at the mouth of the Black Sea suggesting that the grain was from Scythia, today Ukraine and not from Egypt. Here it also seems that Alcibiades was not a real person.

Xenophon, Story of My Life 2.1.28

Here the Spartans attack the Athenian grain ships while they are ashore at Aegospotami near Istanbul

Aeschines, Against Ctesiphon, 157

"Since you were not there in person [my harem brother], witness their disasters with your mind's eye and imagine that you can see their city being captured, the demolition of the walls, the burning of houses, the woman and children being led

away to slavery, old men, old women learning late in life to forget their freedom, weeping, begging"

Aegospotami was in June 405 BC

This was followed by the Spartan general Lysander (who was born a Helot slave) laying siege to Athens. He let starvation do its work until the autumn, when the city succumbed to an oligarchy fronting for the Arabs. This oligarchy appointed a "moderate" named Thera•menes to negotiate with Sparta. He prolonged negotiations until Athens was forced to demolish the "Long Walls" and surrender all but 12 ships from its great merchant marine fleet competing with Mideast Inc. Athens was also forced to allow the return of all exiles, mostly the many Arabs who first came as suppliants or refugees and were expelled. These Athens at some time before had expelled, probably for good reason.

Thus after 404, totalitarian and militaristic Sparta ruled all of Greece as an Arab frontman state. Thus Sparta earned universal hatred for the woe it demanded on behalf of its secret master. Democratic constitutions were thrown aside and garrisons installed in each major city under a Spartan governor curiously called a harmost, and a board of ten oligarchs called a decarcy. Eventually these Arab-appointee decarcies were discarded and replaced with Arab-appointee oligarchies a bit broader, an event that changed little.

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 43

"When disaster came at Aegospotami [When in 405, the Spartan/Persian alliance (Persian ships, Spartan fighters) attacked the grain shipments that were to feed Athens in the following year], democracy still existed in Athens. But through the coup d'etat emerged a body of five [oligarch] Ephors [overseers] that was appointed by their fellow members of the so-called Clubs to assemble the people and to lead the conspiracy in action against the democracy...

There thus came into being a conspiracy against the state not merely on the part of the enemy, but also among Athenian citizens [generally recent Mideast immigrants], to prevent good decisions and secure widespread need. These were well aware that the only condition of their survival was calamity in Athens. They supposed that in your anxiety to be rid of immediate disasters you would not give a thought to the future." [Here it may be more obvious that these words are not so much account of past events, but an Arab training gazette for the next time the parasite must take a democracy apart.]

Plutarch, Life of Lysander 15

[After the defeat of Athens in 404] "A proposal was made to the Spartans and their allies that the population of Athens should be sold into slavery" [The parasite of course made this proposal and the Spartans apparently did not go for it.]

Thucydides = thus•cide = sacrificial•death

Thucydides was the chief chronicler of the war that ended Athens

Seneca, On the Tranquility of the mind, 5

"Can you find a city in a more miserable nation than Athens when the 30 Tyrants were dismembering it? They murdered 1300 of the city, all the best men, and were not ready to stop on that account, but rather their very savagery was sustained by its own energy."

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 68

[The following is about an Arab mole who was taken for a Greek and appointed as the peace treaty negotiator for his people.]

"He promised to secure peace without the destruction of the city walls, the forfeiture of the navy, or the return of prisoners. [He got elected by promising 'the moon'] But he refused to reveal his scheme... yet the people trusted him with the safety of their wives and children and themselves. He broke all his promises. So obsessed was he with the need to make Athens small and weak that he led her to action as far removed from the proposals of the enemy as from the expectation of the Athenians. He was under no compulsion from Sparta. It was he himself who put forward the proposal to pull down the walls of Piraeus and abolish the existing constitution. This was because he fully realized that unless every hope Athens had was quickly destroyed, instant retaliation would be taken upon him. And finally... he did not allow a meeting of the Assembly until the moment laid down by Sparta had been faithfully observed by him, and his had summoned Lysander's fleet and the enemy force had taken up its position in the country. Then with this position established... they held an assembly, to forestall opposition or threats from any speaker, and to prevent a correct choice by Athenian citizens, who were compelled to vote for the measures they [the Arab frontmen] had already decided on.

Theramenes now rose and ordered Athens to be put into the hands of 30 individuals, and the constitution of Draconides [draconian+your+ideas = your draconian ideas] to be adopted. [Reminder: This is an Arab heuristic gazette you are reading] Even as things were, there was a violent outburst in refusal. It was realized that the issue of the meeting was slavery or freedom.

[Then] Lysander spoke and among other statements pronounced that he held Athens under penalty for failing to carry out the terms of the truce, and that the question would not be one of her constitution, but of her continued existence, if Theramenes' orders were disobeyed. Loyal members of the Assembly realized the degree to which the position had been prepared and compulsion laid on them. These either remained silent or walked out, with their conscience [in some way] clear for because they didn't vote for the ruin of Athens.

A few despicable characters whose deliberate intentions were traitorous held up their hands to vote as they were told. Instruction had been given to elect ten men secretly nominated by Theramenes, ten laid down by the established Ephors, and ten from the people present." [Note the use of bullshit checks-&-balances.] They saw the weakness of the Athenian position and their own strength so well that they realized beforehand what would happen in the Assembly."

Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, 35.3

"the city [Athens] was pleased with these [initial] achievements, and thought the Thirty [oligarchs] were acting from good motives. But once the Thirty had a firmer grip on the city, there was no type of citizen they did not attack. They killed those remarkable for their wealth, others for their birth or reputation. Their aim was to remove any potential threat, as well as to seize their property. Within a short span of time, they had killed [the best of Athens] no fewer than 1500 men."

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 2

"Normally the prosecution needs to explain the grounds for hostility to the defendants. But in this case, it is the defendants whose hostility to Athens that needs explaining, along with the

reason for such outrageous conduct towards the state."

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 5

"When the Thirty began their government of wrong and intrigue, they declared that they must clear Athens of its worst elements, and set the rest on the path of righteousness and virtue." [They purged Athens of the people who did all the thinking. These people were told to drink hemlock.]

Euripides, The Medea 292-305

"This is not the first time, Creon. I have suffered often and greatly from from being considered clever. A sensible person should never bring his his children up to be more clever than average. For apart from their cleverness bringing them no profit, it will make them the objects of envy and ill-will.

Plutarch, Life of Dion 58

"Athens is said to produce good men who are outstandingly excellent and bad men who are supremely wicked, just as it produces the sweetest honey and the deadliest hemlock."

Seneca, On the Tranquility of the mind (5)

"Can you find a city in a more miserable state than Athens when the 30 Tyrants were dismembering it? They murdered 1300 of the city, all the best men..."

A mass poisoning of Athenians

Towards the end of Athenian democracy, there seems to have been a mass poisoning. Now the word Symposium has two meanings:

- 1) A conference attended by all the leading thinkers, and
- 2) a drinking party and discussion, especially that held by Socrates and portrayed in Plato's Symposium dialogue.

Now Gr. sumposion=together+drinking. But sumposion does look a lot like with+poison or together+poisoned. And Socrates did die from drinking poison. And his reasons for killing himself, while thoroughly argued in numerous texts make little sense to skeptical minds that consider them. As well the name SOCRATES does like an impersonization of Athenian ISO-CRACY. The following seems to be the Arab record of what happened:

Euripides, Ion 1166

"a herald strutted forth and announced that any native Delphian [Athenian] that wanted could come forward and enjoy the [free] banquet. When the pavilion was filled, they put on garlands and partook of the abundant buffet. Then an old man stepped forward and took his stand in the middle of the floor. He caused the banqueters to laugh hard with by his officious zeal. From the pitchers he ceremoniously poured water for washing the hands. He swung censers of [expensive Mideast] Myrrh resin. He took charge of the gold goblets: A self-appointed do-it-all. When they came to the part of the feast where the flutes were sounded and a common bowl set out. The old man said: "We ought to put away these small wine cups and bring in the large ones, so that these gentlemen might grow jovial [like Jove, Jupiter, Zeus] sooner." Then there was work to do, carrying round the silver and gold goblets. The old man took a special cut, as if to please his new master and handed it to him full. But first he put a potent poison into the wine..."

Epictetus 64. [Here is Arab advice about staying cool so they can come back later and cause some real harm.] "It was the first and most striking characteristic of Socrates that he never

became heated in discourse. He never spoke an injurious or insulting word. On the contrary, he persistently bore insult from others and thus put an end to the quarrel. If you care to know the extent of his power in this direction, read Xenophon's Banquet, and you will see how many quarrels he put an end to. This is why the Poets are right to commend his faculty: 'He would settle even bitter feuds quickly and wisely.'

Nevertheless, the practice [of using poison] is not very safe at the moment, especially in Rome. One who adopts it, I need not say, ought not to carry it out in an obscure corner, but boldly accost, if occasion serve, some personage of rank and wealth."

Plato, Apology 39c

[Here Socrates impersonizes the Athenian iso•cracy and is condemned to death.] "Having said so much, I feel moved to prophesy to you who have given your vote against me; for I am now at that point where the gift of prophecy comes most readily to men: at the point of death. I tell you, my executioners, that as soon as I am dead, vengeance shall fall upon you with a punishment far more painful than your killing of me. You have brought about my death in the belief that through it you will be delivered from submitting the conduct of your lives to criticism; but I say that the result will be just the opposite. You will have more critics, whom up till now I have restrained without your knowing it; and being younger they will be harsher to you and will cause you more annoyance.

If you expect to stop denunciation of your wrong [inverted] way of life by putting people to death, there is something amiss with your reasoning. This way of escape is neither possible nor creditable; the best and easiest way is not to stop the mouths of others, but to make yourselves as well behaved as possible."

[The Spartans invaded in 404BC and Athenian democracy died in 399BC, and poison seems to have been involved. My guess is that it took 5 years for the Spartans to forgive their neighbors in Athens and then there were great celebration banquets all over Greece. Here I surmise that the parasite poisoned all the iso•crates in every town. That is who Socrates is, it is why he/they drank hemlock and why he was so respected for his wisdom. And the large symposium, or sym•poison, or poison together was what happened.

The underlined part reminds us of the line from the 1942 film Casablanca: "And what if you track down these men and kill them? What if you murdered all of us? From every corner of Europe, hundreds, thousands would rise to take our places. Even Nazis can't kill that fast." In fact the Arabs are able to kill that fast when they use poisons and send in their Lys•ander = dissolve•men. Lye=solvent.]

Lysistrata

LYSI•STRATA = dissolving•strategy. Perhaps the women in this play were not withholding actual sex, but metaphorical sex=trade. Perhaps the women of the city were the Arab traders that were trying to get Athens to surrender so it could be ground down and eliminated over some years.

We read how there was in Athens at the time of the dissolving strategy play a metaphorically female (a harem bro) public figure, a priestess named LYSI•MACHES = dissolve•maker. This impersonized figure is recorded in line 554 of the play.

There are some other curiously named characters in this play, like the leader of the chorus of old women, STRATA•TYLLIS= strategy•tele = strategy•extension. There is CALO•NIKE or callow•victory = green victory. There is also

Lysistrata's slave SCYTH•ANA = cut-down•again.

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 20

"Because of our money, they behaved towards us as if they were filled with resentment for the most serious crimes, though in reality, we were entirely innocent. We had carried out all our public obligation. We had made numerous contributions [to the war effort]. We had been exemplary in our behavior. We had performed every instruction we had been given. We had never made any enemies, but on the contrary had on several occasions paid ransom money for Athenian citizens" [Which race is #1 at holding people hostage for ransom?]

Penguin, Greek political oratory

[Remember: This is an Arab guide to taking democracy apart. Try to read the following as if you are an Arab thinking about taking another democracy apart. This was said of the Thirty Arab-friendly oligarchs, Mostly men who were 1/2, 3/4 or 7/8 Greeks.] "They began with claims of a reformation [that was the excuse], and proceeded against those who spoke-out and opposed the oligarchs. But soon they went on to eliminate all who opposed their views, using [claims of] secret informers. Their confidence [power] was based on the presence of a Spartan garrison [army presence] for which they [the Arab front oligarchy] had asked. The moderates among the Thirty disapproved of these methods [or at least they made a show of disapproving to gain credibility]...

[The 30 oligarchs produced] a 'Catalogue' of 3,000 [1,000 to 10,000] privileged people who were to be exempt from persecution [these were the green Arabs still loyal to the parasite's agenda], and in measures taken against the class of resident aliens, whose only crime was their wealth. [the yellow Arabs, that had become Jews] The attack began on aliens and any others who were thought ideologically unsound. There ensued a reign of terror whose nature is illustrated in Lysias' narrative. The death of Thera•menes [treatment•memes], which resulted from his opposition, freed the Thirty from all restraint."

Isocrates, c. 380BC, Panegyricus, 118

"The decline of our empire coincided with the beginning of troubles for the Greek states. After the defeat at the Hellespont [when the Athenian grain shipments were cut off], when the leadership of Greece passed to others [Not just Sparta], Persia [the Mideast] gained a naval victory and secured the control of the sea. [Note how the parasite was struggling to control the seas 2,400 years ago.] Thus it [Mideast Inc.] also won supremacy over most of the islands, descended on Laconia [the Spartan province] and stormed the island of Cythera and sailed round the Peloponnese, raiding the country [from the sea]."

...It was we [Athenians with their navy] who [had previously] laid down the boundaries of Persian territory, and in some cases stated tribute to be paid, and barred [Persia/ Mideast Inc.] her from access to the sea. [This is why the Arabs hate freedom so much, because it prevents the unjust stealing/monopolies that they live on.] Now it is the [Persian] King who directs the affairs of the Greek world, gives orders for individual cities, and selects a governor in each city. There is little else missing. It was he who took control of the [Peloponnesian] war and presided over the peace [writing the peace treaty. This is the King's Peace, or the Treaty of Antalcidas (anti•al•cide=before•the•genocide) in which Persian terms were imposed on all of Greece by Sparta.] And he is the one who rules our present political situation. He is a tyrant, and

we sail to his court to accuse one another. We call him the Great King, as though we were his subjects or prisoners of war. And if we wage war with each other, it is on him that our hopes are set — though he would destroy both sides without reservations [The parasite eventually did do this.]

We should be ready to reflect on this, to resent the present position, and to desire to regain our place as leaders. We should cast blame on Sparta for beginning the war with the aim of liberating the Greeks, and in the end reducing so many of them to subjection, for causing the revolt of the Ionian states [in western Turkey far] from Athens — which had been the source of their foundation and of often, their salvation — and putting them at the mercy of Persia, the enemy of their very existence and their unceasing opponent in war. [There is a vitally important lesson to be learned here. It is simply that the Arabs are totally powerless unless the host part of the world is divided and fighting among itself.]

At that time, they [the Spartans] were outraged at our perfectly legal claim to control of some cities. But now that these have been reduced to such slavery [at the hands of the Turks] they feel no more concern for them. For these unfortunate cities, it is not enough that they should be subject to tribute [excessive and impoverishing colonial or co-al-one-i-al taxation], and see their strong places [citadels] in the hands of their enemies. Their communal troubles are intensified by personal suffering greater than under the tax collectors of Athens.

No Athenian was ever so cruel to his slaves as Persians [Arabs] are to free men. But the greatest misery of their slaves is the obligation to join in the fight for slavery against the cause of freedom. Here defeat leads to instant death, while success submerges them further into slavery.

At who's doors but Sparta's can we lay the blame for this? [Certainly not Mideast Inc. which officially does not exist as an international puppet master.] Despite their great power, they stand aside and watch the pitiable plight of people once their allies, [as well as the] rise of a Persian empire out of the strength of Greece. In the past, their [Spartan] habit was to oust tyrants and to give their support to the Greeks. But now they have changed. Now they make war on free states, allying themselves with tyranny. The city of Manti•nea [prophet/profit•new], at any rate, is an example. ...

Indeed, it is surely a paradox that the leading power in Greece should make one man [the Persian/Arab king] master of such countless numbers, and not allow the greatest of cities [Athens] to be autonomous, but instead drive it to an alternative of slavery or utter disaster. The final humiliation is seeing those claiming the leadership of Greece at war day after day with Greek states and in permanent alliance with a non-Greek people.

... Yet for proud men... this is much more than the right to collect tribute from [slave plantations on] islands. These deserve our pity, when we see them farming the rocky hills for lack of good soil. This while the mainland is so productive that most of the land can be left idle and great wealth comes from the only part which is cultivated.

It seems to me that an outside observer of the present political situation would condemn it as utter insanity. Both sides risked total disaster for the slenderest of reasons, when we might have enriched ourselves in a moment. We tear our own land to pieces and neglect the harvest we could reap... [Again, all this was the result of the mecca•nations of the Arab empire.]

Nothing is more profitable for Persia [and the rest of the Middle East] than ensuring that we keep fighting each other forever. Yet we never think about interfering with Persian affairs

or of raising insurrection [This despite the fact that Mideast Incl. is always thinking about such things for its host.]...

There are two [Greek] armies fighting in Cyprus. We allow Persia to use one to besiege the other, though both are Greek. The rebels are friendly to Athens but under the control of Sparta. In the case of Tiri•bazus' [Persian] force, the most valuable part of his infantry comes from Greek territory. The best part of his naval force was recruited in Ionia [The Greek parts of western Turkey. All these Greeks] would greatly prefer attacking the Persians/Arabs over fight their own people for little benefit.

We never gave any thought to this. We fought over the Cyclades [relatively worthless outer-ring 'islands', some of which were on the mainland] while we handed our important cities to Persia/Arabia. These [cities] she now holds or will soon hold, [regardless of] the justifiable [justifiable?] contempt she shows for the Greeks.

The King [of Persia/ the Mideast] has indeed achieved something which is beyond the achievements of all his ancestors. He has secured the admission from both Athens and Sparta that Asia belongs to him, and has assumed such authoritative control of the Greek cities that he can either raze [razor, shave] them to the ground, or build fortifications [for his enemy garrisons] in them. And all this is due to our folly, not his power. [All Arab power is based on the host's folly and not the parasite's power.]

Yet there exists a sense of the impressiveness of Persian [Axis, Mideast] power, and an idea of it as invincible because of the great mark it has made on Greek [Western] history. My own opinion is that this was not a deterrent, but an incentive for the expedition [to Cnidus].

We are united while Persia is divided — and yet we still find her hard to fight. We should fear a united Persia.

[This was the prevailing matrix illusion in the word-of-mouth media of the day. In truth the Mideast is never divided or powerful, but only pretending to be that way. Here the Haremi spoofed the Greeks into thinking that the Mideast was powerful. It spoofed them into giving up without even fighting.

Next is the original version of the underlined text above. I include it to demonstrate how the group spirit de•ex•pull hides the truth. When you see seemingly valuable presented in the following way, you can be pretty sure that the people writing and distributing these ideas wanted them to remain hidden. Note how it is all in one sentence.] If we have achieved agreement while Persia is in difficulties, and yet are still going to find it hard to face her, there must surely be a great deal to fear, should there come a time when Persian affairs are secure and Persian opinions united while we are in our present condition of mutual hostility." [When you see a tract like this, copy it twice so you have an original for comparisons. Break one copy down into short thoughts. Change the long or awkward words into short ones. Use heady words, words easy to get your head around. Eliminate duplication and unnecessary words. Make the grammar easy to use. Profundity is most important, next is understanding. Accuracy is important, but only if the idea can be understood and is worth understanding.]

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 92

"Remember that your domination at the hands of the Thirty was so absolute that you were compelled to fight a war against your own brothers and sons and your own fellow citizens."

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 96

"Remember the foreign soldiers they put on the Acropolis to

preserve their domination and your slavery." [There is a fundamental difference between an American/Greek/Host style occupation/liberation and that of the parasite. The parasite uses this military to kill in great numbers, like the Nazi/Hitler government did.]

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 96

"You fought many engagements on foreign soil, yet you were never disarmed by an enemy, but only by the Thirty, and in a time of peace."

[The right to bear arms should not be infringed, even by a conquering army. Here is the parasite talking about disarming its host. Please believe me that the greatest opponent of the US right to bear arms is a secret Arab parasite bent on enslaving all lands of the free.]

Lysias, Against Eratosthenes, 99

"There has been no slackening in my eager regard for our temples, which they desecrated and then sold [all the loot they stole]; for our city which they lowered; for our shipyards, which they destroyed; for our dead, which they failed to protect in their life and whom you must avenge after their death."

4. After the massacre and enslavement of Athens

Aeschylus Choephoroi, 95±

"God gave our city to the enemy, to loot and massacre, We the survivors, and our families are all slaves, Only our boiling [seething] hatred keeps its freedom, In our hearts, we scream against the tyranny of this throne,

Ammianus Marcellinus, 17.13

No sooner had the hostile tribes been defeated than the families of the slain were dragged out in droves from their humble huts without distinction as to age or sex, to exchange the proud independence of their former life for the degraded status of slaves.

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 17.10

"Our men were so enraged that they burnt the fields, seized livestock, and rounded up the people [to be sold as slaves]. Anyone who offered any resistance was cut to pieces without mercy. The king was shattered by this disaster. The spectacle of desolation presented by the burnt villages of his land convinced him that he was on the verge of total ruin."

Isocrates: Panegyricus 118 (c. 380BC)

"No Athenian was ever so cruel to his slaves as Persians [Arabs] are to free men. But the greatest misery of their slaves is the obligation to join in the fight for slavery against the cause of freedom. Here defeat leads to instant death, while success submerges them further into slavery."

Isocrates, Panegyricus, 140

[The parasite is our complete opposite. It wants other nations to come in and occupy its lands and simulate its economy. It wants other nations to massacre its unchosen people — except of course the harems — which seldom get attacked because they are located in the middle of nowhere.]

"Persian power is not properly measured when we ask what help it was to one side or the other. [Instead, we should ask,] what have they achieved in their own unaided battles? First, after the revolt of Egypt, what steps have been taken against its inhabitants? The King sent his most distinguished generals, A•bro•co•mas [no•bro•with•more], Tith•raustes [Tithe•rouser],

and Phar•na•bazus [grain•yes•bazaar/market] to the scene. They stayed three years. During this time they did more harm than good. They were such a dismal failure, that the rebels, not content with their own freedom, are now trying to liberate their neighbors. [1) The parasite taxes the heck out of its hosts. The desired effect is analogous to when it cuts kelp forrests to below where the sunlight penetrates. This keeps the kelp/host from growing fast and getting out of control. 2) People once liberated, generally try to liberate their neighbors. This is because, if they do not liberate their neighbors, the parasite will remain in control and drive the neighbors into attacking the newly free people. Thus it is easier to attack and liberate than to tolerate the neighbor enthralled to the parasite's agenda. BOTH OF THESE ARE VERY IMPORTANT MEMES.]

Next there was the operation against E•va•goras [ex•va•horn, ruler of Cyprus]. He holds a single city, that was surrendered to Persia by the terms of the peace. His kingdom is an island and he has had an initial setback at sea [due of course to sabotage, like with the joint strike fighter], and can only muster 3,000 light infantry for the defense of his land. Yet this modest force is beyond the power of the King of Persia to overcome. He has already wasted six years, and if the past is evidence for the future, there is more probability of a new revolt and of the suppression of this one by siege. And these delays are the norm in the king's affairs." [This is how weak the Arabs actually are]

Isocrates, Panegyricus, 146

"They faced 6,000 select Greeks... These did not know the land. They were devoid of allies and were betrayed by their associates [Arab guides] in their march and deprived of their leadership. [The Arabs killed their leaders right away. Xenophon's Persian Expedition is an excellent account of this] Yet the Persians proved so inferior to them, that the King was hopeless about his position"

Isocrates, Panegyricus, 181

[Fight you stupid Greeks, fight. Go kill unchosen Arabs so the chosen Haremi will all have a place.]

"We must have retribution and put things properly in balance for the future. It is a disgrace that our public thinks of these barbarians as servants, while we allow so many Greeks to be their slaves. [In our ancient legends] the abduction of a single woman [Hellen of Hellas, an impersonization, caused] the Greeks of the Trojan wars to join the victims of wrongdoing in universal indignation. Then they refused any compromise until they had razed the arrogant criminal's entire city to the ground. But today, with the entire Greek race insulted, it is a disgrace that we inflict no group retribution now — though we have the power to do so. This is the only war that is in fact preferable to peace. It is more like a religious mission than a battle. It is desirable for the advocates both of peace and war, the former of would be enabled to harvest their gains in security, the latter to acquire wealth from the possessions of others."

Aeschines, Against Ctesiphon, 132

"the king of Persia... who yoked the Hellens•pontus, who demanded land and sea from the Greeks, who dared to write in his letters that he was master of all mankind from the rising to the setting sun"

5) Leading the Spartan army into the desert to die.

Euripides, Rhesus, 390

"I am here to help you undermine their walls and set fire to

their ships."

Euripides, Rhesus, 987

["Wait for the sound of the trumpet, torches in hand... I will force my way through the Greek defenses. I will burn their ships, and the new day will bring freedom for the Trojans."](#) [Troy is in Turkey/Persia, the Mideast]

Leading the Spartan meatheads into the desert

Athens surrendered in 404 and by 394 was so reduced that the parasite no longer needed the Spartans. So some time around 395-394 BC, the Mideast staged this sham rebellion against Cyrus to lure the remaining Greeks to the shores of Turkey.

The Spartan slaughter took place at Cnidus. If you look up Turkey in the Apple dictionary, you will see the parasite's version of a dictionary map for its host. This is one of our parasite's awful maps that exist to block geographic understanding. But aside from that, you can clearly see the Cnidus Peninsula. It is right next to the island of Rhodos. And it looks remarkably like an erect cock-&-balls in profile view. The 100km-long waterless peninsula does not look anything like this, so here we see a little internal gloating. Anyway, the Greek ships probably came ashore near the tip where the chances of survival were lowest. And here is where the Spartans received a bit of famous Arab hospitality — Orwellian doublespeak hospitality. Here is where the Spartans were lead into a desert — Arab hospitality style.

The battlefield was probably a couple km inland from the landing, so it would take the armored forces some 10 -15 minutes to reach the battlefield from the shore, and vice versa. Here they found a nicely outfitted army of slaves which they would quickly defeat.

The shape of the land probably might also obscure an arriving fleet from the people on the battlefield as well. And the Spartans began engaging the slave army a signal was given to begin the real attack. Here we imagine three ways to destroy the Greek ships. 1) A number of tiny and harmless looking Persian ships and tossed burning amphoras, molotov cocktail style, into the Greek ships. 2) Persians swam in and used 4-man scuttling rams on the floors of the Greek ships. or 3) The Persians swam in and rowed off with the boats.

Under any of these circumstances, the Greeks survivors of the battle had to walk some 100km down a waterless peninsula with no ships and little water. Thus, the survivors of Greece were mostly eliminated. Here is why history records that the Athenians lead the Persians to victory at Cnidus in 394. Isocrates also says this was the main event of the Rhodian or Hodian war where everyone died on the road out.

And incidentally, the name of the famous island of Rhodos the RHODOS INSULA is probably a blurd. It covers the existence of the HODOS PEN-INSULA. I also would not be surprised if the terms pine and peninsula were created to hide the existence of the legendary Hodos Peninsula.

We also read about an Athenian Admiral named "Conon" leading the Persians to victory. His name is co•non, so according to the matrix reality which generally records the truth, there were practically no Persian forces involved. The Athenians and some Persian slaves met the Spartans on the end of a 100km-long peninsula that was probably cleansed of all sources of drinking water, as well as given one or two false exits.

Now the Arabs probably rescued a large share of these meaty Spartan men from the brink of death and nursed them back to health — in irons. These were kept as meat on

the hoof for the Cannibals of Arabia. After all, it only took a little food and water along the way. Little doubt they sent a few back to Sparta saying that there were thousands kept as war prisoners. This was to lure more Spartans to their death in Cnidus.

After Cnidus, there was the battle at Coro•nea = core•new, where the Spartans got a new core that was Arab though and through. After this, in 387-386BC, we see the Greeks accepting the "King's peace" that came from the new Arab core of Sparta

After this, the Arab refugee hoards flooded into Greece, killing the remaining men and old women, and taking the young woman and children as menial/sex slaves. These were scattered all over the known world so they were powerless. Most had their achilles (ak•illi's) tendon nicked, so they could not walk very far or fast without pain or risk of loss. And they certainly could not run. Most were softened up with a painful and memorable beating. Nearly all were raped by various Arabs. Thus went the race of gian'ts (Gi•n'ts) that was once called Athenian. Will we in the land of the free go that way? Will we be like the people in that Cloud Atlas film? Will we live like stone-age primitives or wear exploding dog collars?

If you have to kill every single Arab and priest on earth to prevent this reality, then that is what you have to do. The parasite's spirit cannot be allowed to live on from this day forward in any shape or form.

Euripides, Rhesus, 987

["Wait for the sound of the trumpet, torches in hand... I will force my way through the Greek defenses. I will burn their ships, and the new day will bring freedom for the Trojans."](#)

Euripides, Rhesus, 390

["I am here to help you undermine their walls and set fire to their ships."](#)

280 Colossus of Rhodes completed as war memorial. This existed to cover up the legend of the giant roads of the **CNIDUS & CUMALI** = at the tip of a long Turkish peninsula near Rhodos. Cnidus is where the Spartan army was eliminated by the eternal secret 3rd party in any war — the party secretly keeping the war alive for profit.

A great archeological site

I bet the tip of the "Hodos" peninsula (and areas just off shore) are full of archeological treasure from this ambush. And because there is lots of metal, the exact battle site will be easy to find using metal detectors and artifact density. The shipwrecks should be just off shore.

Aeschines, Against Ctesiphon, 133

["And the poor Spartans, who became involved in these events only at the beginning with the seizure of the temple, who once claimed to be leaders of Greece, are about to be sent to Alexander \[another Arab front empire\] as hostages and make an exhibit of their calamity, to suffer, both individually and as a country, whatever he chooses, and to have their fate decided by the merciful•ness of a victor they have wronged."](#)

Montesquieu, Persian Letters, c.1721, #131

["One of the things which has aroused my curiosity since my arrival in Europe \[From the Mideast\] is the origin and history of republics. As you know, most Asians have no idea that this type of government even exists. Their imaginations have not stretched far enough to make them realize that there can be](#)

any other sort [of government] on earth except despotism.

The first governments of which we have any knowledge were monarchies. It was only by chance, and through the passage of hundreds of years, that republics came into being.

After [the Mycenaean] Greece [empire] was devastated by [tsunami] floods, new inhabitants came to repopulate it. Almost all its settlements came from the neighboring Asian [Arab] countries and Egypt, since these countries were ruled by kings, the people who came from them were ruled in the same way. [So the new Greeks were no longer free, but Arab slaves.]

But the tyranny of these princes became too oppressive, their authority was thrown off, and upon the ruins of all these kingdoms arose the republics which made Greece, the one successful civilized country among barbarians.

Love of freedom and hatred of kings preserved Greek independence for a long time, and extended republican government to distant parts. The Greek cities found allies in Asia Minor [Turkey], and established settlements there which were as free as themselves. They used them as defenses against anything the Persian kings might attempt. Not only this, but Greece populated Italy, Spain, and perhaps Gaul as well. It is known that Hesperia, [Hesperia = western civilization. In Greek, Hesper was the setting sun, and Hesperia was the 'land of the west', the Atlantic civilization of Atlantis.] the ideal country that was so famous among the ancients, was originally Greek, which its neighbors regarded as a house of bliss. ... All of these countries [Italy, Spain, Portugal] once bore the name of Hesperia [The wild west] among the ancients. These Greek settlements brought with them a spirit of freedom which they had acquired in their own delightful country. Thus in those remote times, there are hardly any monarchies to be found in Italy, Spain or Gaul. You will see shortly that the races of Germany and the North were no less free. If any traces of royalty have been found among them, it is because chiefs of armies or republics have been taken for kings.

All this was in Europe. As for Asia and Africa, they have always been crushed under despotism. That is if you except the few towns of Asia Minor which we have mentioned, and the city of Carthage in Africa.

The world was divided between two powerful republics, Rome and Carthage. Nothing is better known than the beginnings of the Roman republic and nothing less known than the origin of Carthage. We are totally ignorant of the succession of the African monarchy after Dido, and of the way in which they lost their power. The enormous extension of the Roman republic would have been very beneficial for everyone, if there had not been an unjust distinction between Roman citizens and their subject peoples.[The subject colonies of Rome were taxed into poverty by Rome.] If the provisional governors had been given less authority; if the august laws against their tyranny had been observed; and if in order to stifle these laws, the governors had not used the very treasure that they had amassed by their injustice.

Caesar oppressed the Roman republic, and subjected it to arbitrary power. Roman moderation morphed into oppression and cruelty, and then Europe languished for a long time under a violent and militaristic government. Meanwhile, an infinite number of unknown tribes came out of the north [and especially from over the Hellen's•pontus, the Greek•bridge at Istanbul] and spread like torrents through the Roman provinces. Finding it easy to live by brigandage, they conquered and dismembered the Empire and founded

kingdoms. These tribes were free and they limited the authority of their king so strictly that in reality he was only a chief or a general [Emir=admiral]. Consequently, these kingdoms, although established by force, never felt the conqueror's yoke."

Penguin books, Menander Plays and Fragments, Intro

"Comedy... had its first official production in Athens in... 486BC. Sixty years later Aristophanes was producing plays... in which wild fantasy (to make a private peace with Sparta, to fetch a poet back from the world of the dead), politics (issues of peace or war, the jury system of the Athenian law courts), and personalities (Socrates, Cleon, Euripides) are presented with (occasional) bawdiness of speech and indecency of dress and gesture... a wide range of imaginative vocabulary; the structure is loose, and the setting can be Athens, Heaven, Hell, or any station in between.

A century later, the plays of Menander present a very different picture. Comedy is now about a very limited range of domestic or personal issues. It is about relationships between fathers and sons, or husbands and wives, about love affairs, or about children lost and found... In such dramas, neither fantasy nor politics has any real place." [Athens of the late 400s BC was a free state full of great minds. But a century later, after the Arabs cut down all the smart ones, after they had killed off the cortex, we see junk media like Menander. How many times must we see our best killed off by the Arabs?]

APPENDIX—3

THE LONG DECLINE OF ROME

SPQR = Senate and People Que Roma

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 22.9

"The feature of the city's plight that bothered him most was that the local senate and people, who had formerly been immensely prosperous..."

[1] Everyone suddenly went from rich to poor.

2) SPQR = Senate and People Quod Roma = Senate and People which are Rome. In other words, until the very end of Italy, it was the Senate and People who are Rome. In fact this term even exists today in 2017 in the city of Rome where SPQR are written all over the manhole covers and assorted other public facilities.]

Procopius, Secret History, c.565 AD, 14.10

"The [Roman] Senate sat merely as a picturesque survival, without any power either to register a decision or to do any good, assembling for the sake of appearance and in fulfillment of an old law, since no member of that assembly was ever permitted to utter one word."

SPQR = Senate and People Who-are Rome

We look at the history books and we see clearly that Julius Caesar/seizer seized power in Rome instituted himself as first citizen. That is what a seizer is. So Rome in truth and fact became a dictatorship in 44BC.

Bun in the minds of the Roman people, the Arabs at least did not dispute the idea of SPQR = Senate and People Quod/Que Rome = Senate and People Who-are Rome. It stayed on all the plumbing and public buildings. And to this day SPQR is still written on the manhole covers.

Rome still had elections and it still had a Senate until

just before it was overrun by barbarians and its own provincials. And Rome was still ostensibly a democracy even if all power had rested in the Seizer/Caesar emperors fronting for the Arabs since the time of Julius Caesar some 400 years earlier.

Everyone should take note of how Rome still passed itself off as a democracy, even though it had been a democracy in name alone for 400 years.

Rome = Prome = Pro-men, as in Pro-men•theus

X•P in Greek is the sign of Christ, and said 'chi-ro'. So P was pronounced as 'ro'. And Pome was Rome and so was Prome.

Thus the religion of these Italians was called Romen•theus, or Roman•beliefs/ Roman•gods. Another form of this word is Roman•theic, which is now Romantic. And no longer is there a word for the common-sense, down-to-earth age-old approach of the native Italians.

Of note here is the way that the Romantic approach of the Europeans is still in some ways the opposite of the Classical approach of the Arabs. Gr. klasis = breaking, or breakdown, and the classical period is the time when the Arabs break down their host. They do this by supporting wine, women and song, as well as partying, homosexuality, bath houses, sports, inconsequential arts and drugs — as well as corruption

The same government architecture

Consider the marble of classical architecture. This was a hugely overpriced Arab concession product — Hermes brand marble columns of the purest white imported marble, costing a king's ransom. Thus when we started our modern democracies, we began using the same corrupt architecture the Greeks and Romans used. This went for both the buildings and the government within them.

Procopius, Secret History, c.565 AD, 13.32

"Had he [Roman emperor Justinian] spent the same amount of time on good works, the nation could have enjoyed a very high degree of prosperity. Instead he [his Arab administration] employed all his [its] powers for the ruin of the Romans, and succeeded in bring the whole political edifice crashing to the ground." [That last sentence is an admission of guilt and intent.]

Procopius, Secret History, c.565 AD, 6.17

"It was a long establish custom that the Roman Emperor should sign all his decree documents. Emperor Justin, however, was incapable of either drafting his own laws, or taking an intelligent interest in the measures contemplated. The official whose luck it was to be his chief advisor - a man called Proclus [pro•kal•us = pro•green•us], who held the rank of 'Quaestor' [The Quaestors were tax collectors.] - used to decide all measures as he himself though fit. Here would secure approval for these in the Emperor's own handwriting. The men responsible for this business went about it as follows: On a short strip of polished wood they cut a stencil in the shape of four letters [LEGI] spelling the Latin for I have read. Then they used to dip a pen in the special ink reserved for emperors and place it in the hands of Emperor Justin. Next they took the strip of wood described above and laid it on the document grasped by the Emperor's [illiterate] hand, and while he held the pen guided it along the pattern of the four letters, taking it [a]round all the bends cut in the wooden stencil. Then away they went, carrying the Emperor's directives, such as they were." [In other words, this Roman emperor, like all the others was just an figurehead for the infiltrative Arab parasite

race.]

1) The history of Polybius — a chronicle of Rome's rise

Why Greek and Roman writings are important

1) These are mostly the parasite's cryptically written heuristic records for to dissolving, parasitizing and enslaving free societies.

2) The same guides and tactics are being used on the democratic world today

3) By studying and understanding these tactics, we can prevent their use again.

Polybius, d. 118BC, History, 1.1

1. "How can people be so apathetic that they ignore the means and form of government the [then democratic] Romans utilized to conquer [liberate] almost the entire inhabited world in less than 53 years?" [219 - 167BC].

Polybius, History, 1.1

1. "the study of history is in the truest sense an education and a training for political life. And the most instructive, or rather the only, way to learn to bear [carry on, handle, deal with]... the twists of fortune is to recall the catastrophes of others."

Polybius, History 1.2

"We can show ... our subject best by comparing three of the most famous empires of the past: The Persians had a great empire for a time, but every time they ventured beyond the limits of Asia [the Mideast], they found not only that their empire, but heir own existence was also in danger [an enduring dilemma for humanity's parasite race] The Spartans, after trying to dominate Greece for many generations, which they finally did achieve, held it undisputed for barely 12 years [405-394 BC]. [And Alexander's] Macedonian empire only dominated that small portion of Europe between the Danube and Adriatic. -- and, this with the destruction of the Persian Empire, [Rome was about to start a 700-year on-and-off war with the Persian empire at this point in time. In the end, both Rome and Persia would be exhausted and Islam would rise in the power vacuum.] they went on to add the domination of Asia [only the south-western part of Asia actually]. And although they can be credited with dominating a larger empire than any others before, they still left more than half of the inhabited world in the hands of others. They never even thought of trying [to conquer] Sicily, Sardinia, or Libya. And as to Europe, and to speak the plain truth, they never knew about the most warlike tribes of the West. The Roman conquest [Fronting for Mideast Inc.] on the other hand, was complete. Nearly the whole inhabited world was reduced to obedience by them: and they left behind them an empire not to be paralleled in the past or rivaled in the future." [The last underlines part is an anachronism. Polybius died in 118BC, some 250 years before Rome's empire reached its imperial zenith.]

Sallust, Letter of Mithridates, C.69BC

[This Letter to Mithridates was called 'an invention of Sallust' in my source: (Eyewitness Ancient Rome edited by Jon E. Lewis). But whether fake or genuine, this description of the parasite is no less vivid.]

"Rome [the land of no resources] has one age-old motive for making war upon all nations, peoples and kings—it is a profound need for empire and plunder. [because it has no resources of its own] ... They have had nothing since the beginning of their existence except what they have stolen—

their homes, their women, their lands, their empire. Once vagabonds [men bonded for voyages], without parents or fatherland, created to be the scourge of the whole world. No laws, human or divine, prevent them from seizing and destroying allies and friends, the weak or powerful, or those near or far — or from considering [con+sider=star, or bending their way] every government which does not serve them, especially monarchies, their [sworn] enemies. [Apparently the Romans were the sworn enemies of monarchies. What a brilliant idea for the people of the world to have — that all monarchies and oligarchies are the enemies of all good people.]

In truth, few men desire freedom. Most are content with just and fair-minded masters. We are suspect of being rivals of the Romans and future avengers. But you, who possess Baghdad [Rome] greatest of cities, and the Persian [Roman] empire, famed for its riches, what can you expect from them other than guile in the present, and war in the future? The Romans have [unanswerable] weapons to use against all men, the sharpest being where victory yields the greatest spoils.[total enslavement of a city, something that was much more profitable to the Haremi.] It is by audacity, deceit, and a string of wars that they [the Romans fronting for the Haremi] have grown great. Following their usual custom, they will destroy everything or perish in the attempt. ... [text missing].... and this is not difficult if you in Arabia and we in the Russian Caucas surround their army, which has neither supplies or allies, and has through luck survived this long."

Polybius, History, 6.3

[Most of the following Polybius quotes are propaganda] "...regarding the Romans, it is hard to describe their current state, owing to the complexity of their constitution. [The Romans seem to have had a remarkably complex constitution.] Nor can we speak confidently about their future, due to our inadequate experience with their [new and] peculiar institutions. [L. peculium = the property of a slave, and the administration of the Roman democracy was run by public slaves from the Eastern Mediterranean.] ... It will then require no ordinary effort to get a clear understanding of their constitution. [Again, the Roman constitution seems to have been hard to understand.]

Most authorities [Brotherly experts] on this subject recognize three types of government: MONARCHY, ARISTOCRACY, and DEMOCRACY. However, in my opinion the question is whether they name these as being the only possibilities, or as the best. In any case I think they are wrong, because obviously we must regard as the best constitution that which partakes of all these three elements. And this is no mere supposition, because it has been proven by Lycurgus, who was the first to construct a constitution -- that of Sparta -- on this concept.

Nor can we say that these are the only [possible] forms [of government]. After all, there are [many] examples of absolute and tyrannical forms of government. These, while differing as much as possible from monarchy, still appear to have some points of resemblance. On this account all absolute rulers take and use, as much as they can, the title of king. There have also been many instances of oligarchical governments appearing in some way like aristocracies. These, if I may say, were as different from them as it is possible to be. The same also holds true for democracy."

Polybius, History, 6.4

[Polybius or perhaps poly-bias supposedly died 72 years

before Julius Caesar dissolved the Roman democracy.] We cannot hold that every absolute government is a monarchy. Only those which are accepted voluntarily [by the people], and are directed by an appeal to reason rather than by fear and force [can be called a monarchy. The rest should be called tyrannies]. Nor should we regard every oligarchy as an aristocracy; [because] the latter [aristocracy] only exists where power is held by the wisest and fairest men selected on their merits. [Here it seems that monarchy is to tyranny as aristocracy is to oligarchy.] Likewise, under a democracy, we cannot simply leave the people [L. populus] to do whatever they want. The people must still worship the gods [burning lots of expensive Arabian sacramental incense/hashish], and they must take care of their elders and heed the traditional laws of their people [that were shaped by their Mideast parasite]. And if the will of the majority prevails in these communities, we may speak of this form of government as democracy.

So now we will list the six forms of government: The three just mentioned... and their three related forms; by this I mean DESPOTISM, OLIGARCHY and MOB RULE. [the benign forms are supposedly mon-archy, aristo-crazy and demo-crazy.] The first of these [despotism] arises without unnatural help, and in the natural course of events. Next we have monarchy, which is produced with the help of art and manipulation and degenerates into tyranny, the evil form related to it [monarchy]. Both are destroyed and aristocracy produced. Again the latter [Aristocracy] being in the natural course of events is perverted to oligarchy. And when the people passionately avenge the unjust acts of their rulers, democracy comes into existence — which, by its violence and contempt for the law, turns into sheer mob-rule.

Polybius, History, 6.5

Now the natural laws which regulate the transition of one form of government into another are probably discussed with greater accuracy by Plato and some other philosophers. But [this subject's] exploration is only within the capacity of a few men, due to its complex and sweeping [nature]. I will therefore try to give a summary of the subject, one that will fall within the scope of a practical history, and the intelligence of ordinary people. And if my summary seems inadequate, owing to the imprecise [Latin] words in which it is expressed, the detailed discussion which follows will make up for what was left unsaid. [For examples of these words in English consider: CONDEMN, BEST MAN, FAIR TRADE, TELESCOPING, and WISE]

Polybius, History, 6.7

"when their royal power became hereditary, they found everything necessary for [their personal] security available in their hands, as well as more [money] than was necessary for their personal support. Then they gave free reign to their [expensive] appetites and conceived that rulers needed to wear different clothes from their subjects; and have different and elaborate [expensive, imported] luxuries of the table; and even seek sensual indulgence, however illicit the source, without fear of denial. These things on one hand gave rise to offense and jealousy, and on the other to outbursts of hatred and passionate resentment. The monarchy [then] became a tyranny, and the first step towards disintegration was taken. Plots then began to form against the government. And these did not now come from the worst of society but from the best and most high-minded, and most courageous, because they are the men who can least submit to the tyrannical acts of their rulers.

[1) Note how the parasite's feeding is blamed on the appetite of

the frontman odious rex. 2) It is the parasite defending its frontman with its secret police, not the idiot frontman that listens to his advisors. 3) Note how being high-minded lies in one's readiness to oppose Arab feeding activity. Here we understand which people the parasite always goes after first. Now tell me: Is this a good thing or a bad thing to select for in a breeding population?)

Polybius, History, 6.8

[The first 7 words here are just so loaded with significance. The Arabs must prevent their host from finding leadership, and from finding a voice, for their agenda.]

"As soon as the people had leaders, they cooperated with them against the dynasty [all dynasties are Arab fronts] for the reasons I have mentioned; and then monarchy and despotism were alike entirely abolished, and aristocracy once more began to revive and start afresh. The people then, as if by reflex, showed their gratitude to the men who had deposed the despots by making them their leaders and entrusting them with their [national] interests. [These new leaders] first looked at this duty as a great privilege, making the public benefit their chief concern, conducting all sorts of business, public and private, with diligence and attention.

But [eventually] the sons of these men inherited the same position of authority from their fathers. They were born and grew up under the shadow of their father's authority and lofty position. These suffered no bad experiences with civil [in]equality and freedom of speech. Some of them went in for drinking and the endless debauchery and dissipation which accompanies it. Others kidnapped and raped either women or boys. Others developed a passionate and shameless love of money. And so they turned an aristocracy into an oligarchy. In a short time, they had roused the same feelings as before in the minds of the people. Thus their fall was just like the misfortune which the tyrants experienced."

Polybius, History, 6.9

"As soon as jealousy and hatred among the people encouraged someone to oppose the government by words or actions, he was sure to find the entire people ready to take his side. And having then gotten rid of the [old] rulers by assassination or exile, they do not dare set up a monarchy again, still being terrified by all the injustice which this caused before. Nor do they dare entrust the common interests again to one [man], considering the recent example of their misconduct. So therefore, the only alternative left to them is to depend on themselves. They are thus driven to take refuge in that [democracy]. And so they change the constitution from and oligarchy to a democracy, and take upon themselves the superintendence and care of the state.

And as long as anyone lives who had experience under oligarchical supremacy and domination, they [all] regard their present constitution as a blessing, and hold equality and freedom as of the utmost value. But as soon as a new generation has arisen, and the democracy has descended to their children's children, long familiarity weakens their [nation's] value of freedom and equality. Some [then] seek to become more powerful than the ordinary citizens, and the most inclined to this temptation are the rich. So when they begin to be fond of office, and find themselves unable to obtain it by their own unassisted efforts and their own merits, they impoverish their estates, while enticing and corrupting the common people in every possible way. By these means, in their senseless obsession for status, they make the public greedy, and ready to receive bribes. The virtue of democracy is [thus] destroyed,

and it is transformed into a government of violence and the strong hand. For the plebs, once [they become] accustomed to being fed at the expense of others, and to having their hopes for sustenance [based] on the property of their neighbors: As soon as they get a leader sufficiently ambitious and daring, being excluded by poverty from the sweets of civil honors, produces a reign of mere violence. Then comes tumultuous [large, loud and disorderly] assemblies, massacres [Brotherly purges], banishments, and redivisions of land; until, after losing all trace of civilization, it [the nation] has once more found a master and a despot.

This is the regular cycle of constitutional revolutions, and the natural order in which constitutions are transformed, and cycle back to the first stage. If a man has a clear understanding of this theory, he might not be able to tell the exact dates at which this or that will happen to a particular constitution. But he will rarely be entirely mistaken as to the stage of growth or decay the [nation] is at, or at what point it will undergo some revolutionary change.

Regarding the Roman constitution, this way of thinking will teach us about its formation, its growth, and zenith [Gr. *xenos* = far out, and zenith = the farthest-out point] — as well as the changes awaiting it in the future. For this constitution owes... its foundation and growth to natural causes — just it will [one day] owe its decay to natural causes.

Polybius, History, 6.10

"Now I will briefly discuss to the laws of Lycurgus [father of the Spartan police state widely praised by the parasite in its Roman police state]. For such a discussion is not at all incompatible with my subject. This statesman [great leader] was fully aware of how all the changes I have explained come about through an invariable law of nature. [He also] thought that any form of government that was unmixed, and rested on one kind of power, was unstable. This because it was swiftly perverted into that particular form of evil owned by it and inherent in its nature. For just as rust naturally dissolves iron, and wood-worms [termites, eat] timber, so in each [type of] government there naturally arises a particular evil that is inseparable from it. In monarchy, it is absolutism [tyranny], in aristocracy it is oligarchy, In democracy it is lawless violence and savagery. As I have just shown, all these forms of government are inevitably transformed into their vicious [vice=bad-side] state.

I think Lycurgus saw all this, and appropriately combined all the best parts of the best constitutions. This way, no part can dominate and become perverted into its kindred vice. Thus each power is checked by the others, so that no single part [of government] can tilt the scale, or out-weigh the others; but that, by being accurately balanced and in exact equilibrium, the whole might remain steady for a long time, like a ship sailing close to the wind. [Doesn't this sound just like all the American-style checks and balances pro•pagan•da = for•pagans•give?]

Thus royal power was prevented from growing insolent through fear of the people. Because a suitable share of constitutional power was assigned to them. The people in their turn were kept from [displaying] outright contempt of their kings by fear of the Ger•usi•a [Gr. *geras*=old men• *usi*•A] — the members of which, having been selected on grounds of merit, were certain to throw their influence on the side of justice in every question that arose. Thus the party placed at a disadvantage by its conservative tendency [Mideast Inc.'s tendency to conserve the old] was always bolstered by the Gerusia's power. This combination resulted in the Spartans

keeping their freedom longer than any people we know of. [In fact, Spartan freedom barely outlived Athenian freedom.]

Lycurgus, however, [was able to] come up with his constitution without the discipline of adversity, because he was able to foresee by the light of reason the course which events naturally take and the source from which they come. And although the Romans have arrived at the same result in framing their commonwealth. They have not done so by means of abstract reasoning, but through many struggles and difficulties [otherwise known as trial and error. Here the parasite is telling us that trial and error is much better than reasoning when it comes to designing a democracy.] and by continually adopting reforms from knowledge gained from disaster. [You know, like the reforms introduced right after the September 11 disaster — the find all the patriots reforms.] The result has been a constitution like that of Lycurgus, and the best of any existing in my time."

Polybius, History, 6.11

"As for the Roman government, it has three branches, each of them possessing supreme powers. The respective share of power [of each branch] in the whole government has been regulated with such careful regard to equality and balance, that no one could say for certain, not even a native Roman, whether the constitution as a whole was a democracy, aristocracy or monarchy. And no wonder; for if we only look at the power of the Consuls we are inclined to regard it a monarchy. If [we only look at] the Senate, it is aristocracy. And if we only looks at the power possessed by the people, it seems clearly a democracy."

QTAPC

Rome had a refinitive democracy of sorts with around half of each level being elevated at each election — although because there were only around 32 senators in all, it might be best called a refinitive aristocracy. Roman senators began as quaestors, then half were elected tribune or aedile, next praetor, and finally the two that survived the process became one of the two consuls. Quaestors were financial agents in charge of public revenue and expenses. Tribunes were champions of the plebs, and also military officers. Aediles were magistrates responsible for public buildings and grain supply. Praetors were sort of sub consuls. Consuls acted as co-presidents/ co-dictators, or governors of provinces.

Also, Roman senators were different from ours today. Instead of focusing exclusively on making laws, they were more like managers of the 'civil service' that bought and sold things for the state. They also granted and sold privileges, like highly profitable monopoly rights. And of course, as the Roman Republic degenerated, all of these were eventually sold to the well organized and well financed Mideast interests that could outspend the locals.

This is typical of the way the Mideast operates. At first it always favors a corrupt system over a non-corrupt system because it has advantages in corrupt system. Then once a corrupt system is established, it favors an increasingly corrupt system because of these advantages and because the locals are eventually completely priced out of corrupting their own government. A great example of this strategy is in the high cost of US elections today. Nearly everyone is simply priced out of running for office in our "democracy". This leaves our parasites uber-rich frontmen the only ones who can afford to become our "elected" leaders.

Polybius, History, 6.12

[Under the Roman "Republic," there were two hugely powerful Consuls that were elected annually. These two dual-presidents basically ran Rome's "democracy" acting as a sort of back door monarchic power over Rome. They are rather like America's president and vice president.] The Consuls are supreme masters of the government so long as they remain in Rome and are not leading the Roman legions out [and into war]. All other senators, except the Tribunes [of the judiciary], are under them and obey their orders. They introduce foreign ambassadors to the Senate, and bring matters requiring deliberation before it. [Thus only two men set the agenda of the "democratic" Roman Senate including who it allies itself with and who it battles in war.] They also execute the laws [of the Senate. Thus the Consuls not only served as the executive branch, but they also set the Senate's agenda and decided which matters the Roman government would consider.] If there are any matters of state which require the authorization of the people, it is their business to see to them. They summon the popular assemblies [L. comitia], to bring the proposals before them, and to carry out the decrees of the majority. Regarding the [immensely costly] preparations for war, and as well as the entire administration of a military campaign, they have all but absolute power. They have legal authority to impose on [Roman] allies whatever levies [taxes/impositions] they think appropriate. They also draft the soldier's roll [draft soldiers?], select and appoint suitable Military Tribunes [Officers]. Besides this, they also have the absolute power to punishment all who are under their command while on active service. They also have the authority to spend as much public money as they choose, being accompanied by a quaestor who is entirely at their orders. A survey of these powers would in fact justify our describing the constitution as despotic, and a clear case of royal government."

Polybius, History, 6.13

[In reading the following keep in mind that the Roman state elected two Censors. These magistrates held the tax census, or the head count, and supervised public morals=meme=orals= by "censoring" objectionable material and administering the public sacrifices of burnt Arabian incense using cen=sers. It also seems that they had the power to censure people for their behavior.]

"The Senate first of all has control of the treasury, and regulates both income and expenses. The Quaestors cannot spend any public money for the various government departments without a Senate decree — except when serving under a Consul. [Thus, however frugal the Senate was, the consuls could spend as much money as they wanted on whatever they wanted to spend money on.] The Senate also controls what is by far the largest and most important expenditure [of the Roman government], that [burning of hugely expensive Arabian incense] which is made by the Censors at every purification ceremony for the construction or repair of public buildings; [however, as a check and balance] money cannot be obtained by the censors except by the grant of the Senate.

All crimes committed in Italy requiring a public investigation, such as treason, conspiracy, poisoning, or willful murder, are in the hands of the Senate. [So the 30-odd men of the Roman Senate seems to have wasted much of its time making insignificant one-off legal decisions] Besides, if any individual or state among the Italian allies requires a controversy to be settled, a penalty to be assessed, help or protection to be afforded, --- all this is the province of the Senate [interstate adjudication]. Or again, outside Italy, if it is

necessary to send an embassy to reconcile warring communities, or to remind them of their duty, or sometimes to imposed requisitions upon them, or to receive their submission, or finally to proclaim war against them, -- this too is the business of the Senate. [This made the Roman Senate and indeed Roman democracy into a bad guy among the Roman provinces. This was probably intentional on the part of the parasite to soil the good name of democracy.] Also the reception party to be given to foreign ambassadors in Rome [how frivolous], and the answers to be returned to them, are decided by the Senate. With such business, the people have nothing to do. Consequently, if one were staying at Rome when the Consuls were not in town [which was most of the time], one would imagine the constitution to be a complete aristocracy: and this has been the idea entertained by many Greeks, and by many kings as well, from the fact that nearly all the business they had with Rome was settled by the Senate [giving everyone the illusion that Rome was a democracy, and a democracy was doing all these nasty things to them].

Polybius, History, 6.14

"After this, one might naturally be inclined to ask what part is left for the people in this ["democratic"] constitution. With the [narrow and aristocratic] Senate having these various functions, especially the control of income and expenses; and with the Consuls having absolute power over defense spending as well as absolute military command [commander in chief power].

There is, however, a part [a tiny hard-to-understand bullshit part] left for the people, and it is a most important one. The people are the sole source of honor and of punishment. And it is by these two things, and these alone that dynasties and constitutions and indeed, human society are held together. For where the distinction between them is not sharply drawn in theory and in practice, there no undertaking can be properly administered ... These considerations again would lead one to say that the chief power in the state was the people's, and that the [Roman] constitution was a democracy." [Note how the parasite is happy to have democracy in name alone.]

Polybius, History, 6.16

"As for the Senate, which possesses the immense power I have described: [immense? Wasn't all the power was actually in the hands of the 2 Consuls] In the first place, it is obliged in public affairs to take the people into account, and respect the wishes of the people... But most important of all is the fact that, if the Tribunes of the Plebs exercise their veto, the Senate is not only unable to pass a decree, but unable to even hold a meeting at all, whether formal or informal." [Thus Rome's only democratic institution, a barely democratic institution, was weakened by the very power-base it was supposed to represent. This left the powerful Consuls with even more power.]

Polybius, History, 6.17

[Government] contracts, too numerous to count, [and richly paid] are handed out by the Censors in all parts of Italy for the repairs and construction of public buildings. There are also the [tax farming] rights to collect revenue from the many rivers, harbors, gardens, mines, and land -- essentially everything that comes under the control of the Roman government. And the [Roman] people in general are all involved in these [government enterprises.] So there is hardly a man who is not involved either as a contractor [publicani=tax collector] or as an employee in the works. [Here we see how the parasite seeks

to involve the people of the host society in its own false economy. It does this because these people will generally act to defend their own interests -- and in so doing, they will also help to defend the parasite's interests. Today, the economies of the world are full of these people, and if we are going to kill our parasite completely, we must wipe out all of their rights in the parasite's false economy.] A few purchase the [government franchise] contracts from the censors by themselves [paying cash]. Other form partnerships with the Censors. Others pledge property to the treasury for them. And still others finance the purchase of [their government franchise] contract. [They borrowed money from the desperate land of no resources. They paid the people with nothing a regular mortgage payment to use the money and power that it had previously stolen.] Now over all these transactions, the Senate has absolute control. It can grant an extension of time; and in case of unforeseen accident can relieve the contractors from a portion of their obligation, or release them from [their obligations] altogether, if they are unable to fulfill them. And there are many details in which the Senate can inflict great hardships, or, on the other hand, grant great indulgences to the contractors. For in all cases, [all] appeals are to it, [Recall how the agenda of the Roman Senate was determined by the administration of a Roman consul/ president. Thus this man's unelected administrators had a good chance of changing the rules at any time for any government franchise.]

But the most important point of all is that judges are taken from its [the Senate's] members in the majority of trials, whether public or private, in which the charges are heavy. Consequently, all citizens are much at its [the Senate's] mercy. And being anxious about when they might need the Senate's help, they are cautious about resisting or actively opposing its will. And for a similar reason, men do not rashly resist the wishes of the Consuls, because one and all may become subject to their absolute authority on a campaign." [In other words, as every man was subject to being drafted, and then ordered to do anything at all on the battlefield, it was easy for the parasite to purge Rome of her troublemakers and best men.]

Polybius, History, 6.18

"The result of this power in the houses for mutual aid or punishment [best-friend or worst-enemy] is a union [just] strong enough for all emergencies, and a constitution that remains unsurpassed. For whenever any [faux/foe] danger from outside demands that they to unite and work together, the [faux/foe] strength the state develops is so extraordinary, that everything required is unfailingly carried out by the eager rivalry shown by all classes to devote their whole minds to the need of the moment.

For this reason, the peculiar constitution [peculiar=slave-property. This is a great characterization of the parasite's fake franchise economy] of the [Roman] State makes it irresistible, and certain of obtaining whatever it decides to try for. Nay, even when the crisis has passed, and the people are enjoying their good fortune and the fruits of their labors, and, as normally happens, growing corrupted by idleness and flattery... It is in these circumstances, more than ever, that the constitution appears to have the power of correcting abuses."

Polybius, History, 6.18

"whenever any one of the three groups becomes self-important, and shows a tendency to be contentious and excessively encroaching, the mutual interdependence of the

three, and the possibility that the resolutions of any one will be checked and balanced by the others, will easily check this tendency. And so the proper equilibrium is maintained when the impulsiveness of one part [of government] is checked by its fear of the others..." [And so native rule is checked and Arabian imperial power is more easily maintained]

Polybius, History, 6.43

[peculiar= the property a slave is allowed to have. Thebes was 60km Northwest of Athens and seems to be where the Athenians fled to some time after the city was defeated in 404BC. Thebes prospered from 371 to 336BC when it was razed by Alexander "The Great". Thebes = Gr. Thevai = thieves.]

"fortune quickly made it evident that it was not the peculiar characteristics of their constitution, but the valor of their leaders, which gave the Thebans [Athenians] their success..."

44. "A somewhat similar remark applies to the [democratic] Athenian constitution. It perhaps had more frequent interludes of excellence, but its highest perfection was attained during the brilliant career of Themistocles [Themis was the goddess of order and justice. In Homer she was the personification of justice and order and convened the assembly of the gods. The name breaks down as theos=religion + mis=mouth. Themis is secret code for the single unified agenda of Mideast Inc. Anyway, Themis•tocles helped build up the Athenian fleet and defeated the Persian fleet at Salamis in 480BC, thus killing off and getting rid of a generation of unchosen Harem spawn]; and having reached that point [peak/acme] it [Athenian democracy] quickly declined, owing to its essential instability. You see, the Athenian demos [like every other race] are always [finding itself] in the position of a ship without a captain. In such a ship, if fear of the enemy, or the occurrence of a [metaphorical] storm cause the crew to be of one mind, they obey their captain and everything goes well. But if they recover from this fear, they begin to treat their leaders with contempt. Then they quarrel with each other because they are no longer all of one mind. One group wants to continue the voyage — another wants to bring the ship to anchor. Some let out the sails — while others hauling them in and roll them up.

Their quarrels and disharmony make a sorry show for [Mideast] observers. And this state of affairs is full of risk for everyone. The result has often been that after escaping the dangers of the widest seas, and the most violent storms, they sink their ship [of state] close to shore, or in a safe harbor. And this often happened under the Athenian constitution. You see, on many occasions, they repelled the greatest and most formidable dangers, thanks to the valor of their people and their leaders. Then in periods of secure tranquility they suddenly and recklessly met with disaster.

I need say no more about either constitution. In both, a mob [the demos] manages everything on its own unfettered impulse -- a mob in the one city distinguished for headlong outbursts of fiery temper, in the other trained in long habits of violence and ferocity."

Polybius, History, 6.45

"Moving on to the Cretan constitution, there are two points which deserve our consideration. The first is how such writers as E•phorus [out•carry], Xenophon [foreign tongue], Calis•thenes [green•thin] and Platon [pull•a•ton, Plato] -- who are the most learned of the ancients -- could assert that [the Cretan constitution] was like Sparta's; and secondly how they

came to assert that it was at all admirable. I agree with neither assertion; and here is why. First as to its dissimilarity with the Spartan constitution, the peculiar merit of the later [Sparta's constitution] is said to be its land laws, [a sort of communist system] by which no one possesses more than another, but all citizens have an equal share in the public land. The next distinctive feature regards the the possession of money: for as it is utterly discredited among them, the jealous competition which arises from inequality of wealth is entirely removed from the city. [And most people just assumed that communism was a new idea of the 20th century. Here we see how the Arabs have been trying to foist this idea on their host nations for over 2,100 years.]

Polybius, History, 6.46

"The Cretans [Arab] customs are the exact opposite. Their laws allow them to possess as much property as they can get ahold of, without any limitation. Money is so highly regarded among them, that its possession is not only thought to be necessary, but it is also esteemed and [considered] honorable in the highest degree. In fact, greed is so innate to the land of Crete, that they are the only people in the world who attach no stigma to any type of moneymaking whatsoever. Again, all their offices are annual and on a democratic footing. [The Cretans were a rebels empire that was massacred to the man after the eruption and tsunami of Santorini in around 1650BC ±]

Polybius, History, 6.46

"These writers have gone out of their way to comment on the laws of Lycurgus: 'He was the only legislator', they say, 'who saw the key points'. For there being two things on which national safety depends, -- courage in the face of the enemy and unity at home. By abolishing greed, he eliminated all motive for civil strife: This made the Spartans the best governed and most unified people in Greece. ... by contrast... the Cretans [Arabs] in their deep-rooted greed are engaged in countless public and private seditions, murders, and civil wars. Yet they [the commentators] regard these facts as not affecting their constitution, but are bold enough to speak of the two constitutions as alike." [They both work to benefit the Arabs.]

Polybius, History, 6.47

"Nor would it be right to introduce Plato's Republic, which is also spoken of in high terms by some philosophers. ... unless it can first point to some real and practical achievement. Comparing it with the constitutions of Sparta, Rome, and Carthage would be like comparing a statue to a living and breathing men."

Polybius, History, 6.48

"I will therefore omit these, and continue with my description of the Spartan constitution. Now it seems to me that for securing public unity, for safe-guarding the Spartan territory [Rome's big problem] and guarding the freedoms of Sparta, the laws of Lycurgus were so excellent, that I am forced to regard his wisdom as something super-human. For the equality of land possession, to the simplicity of their food, and the practice of taking it in common [at mess halls], which he established, were well conceived to secure private morality and to public order. This, just as training in the endurance of physical labors and dangers made [the Spartan] men brave and noble minded. But when the virtues of courage and high morality are combined in one soul, or in one state, vice will not readily spring from such a soil, nor will such men easily be overcome by their enemies.

By creating his constitution in this spirit, and of these

elements, he [Lycurgus] secured two blessings for the Spartans: Safety for their borders, and a lasting freedom for themselves long after he was gone. He appears however to have made no provision at all...for the acquisition of the territory of their neighbors; or for the assertion of their supremacy; or, in a word, for any policy of aggrandizement at all." [Aggrandize = to increase the power, status or wealth]

Polybius, History, 6.49

"So long as their ambition was confined to governing their immediate neighbors, they were content with the resources and supplies provided by Laconia [al•ak•onia, the Spartan region], having all material of war readily available, and nearby. But when they tried to send out naval expeditions, or to go on campaigns by land outside the Peloponnese, it was evident that neither their iron currency [Gr. sideros=iron while L. Sider= of or relating to the stars, so Iron was "space metal" and somewhat expensive at this time.], nor their use of crops for payment in kind, would be able to supply them with what they lacked [while on campaign] if they abided by the laws of Lycurgus; for such undertakings require a universal form of money [useless and rare gold rather than iron which was very practical], and goods from foreign countries. Thus they were compelled to wait humbly at Persian doors, impose tribute on the islanders, and exact contributions from all the Greeks: knowing that, if they abided by the laws of Lycurgus, it was impossible to advance any claims upon any outside power at all, much less upon the supremacy in Greece."

Polybius, History, 6.50

For ensuring the nation's safety and freedom [i.e. for not being captured and hauled off to be sold as slaves] the laws of Lycurgus were entirely adequate. And for those who are content with these objectives, we must concede that there never has been a constitution better than Sparta's. But for those who want greatness, and and many subjects all looking to him, it is a finer thing still. From this standpoint, we must acknowledge that the Spartan constitution is deficient, and Rome's is superior and better constituted for obtaining power. This has been proven by actual facts. For when the Spartans strove to dominate Greece, it was not long before they brought their own freedom itself into danger. Whereas the Romans, after obtaining supreme power over the Italians, soon brought the whole world under their rule [This is an anachronism for an author that supposedly died in 118 BC], -- in which achievement the abundance and availability of their [imported] supplies largely contributed to their success.

Polybius, History, 6.51

"Now the Carthaginian constitution seems to have been well thought out with respect to the important parts. It was organized like [the constitutions of] Rome and Sparta. They had kings, and a Gerusia with the powers of an aristocracy, but the people were supreme in such things that affected them. [Here we imagine Crete, then Atlantic, then Athens, then Carthage, then Britain, then Judea, and finally Rome as having a relatively free way of life. Then we see each of these rebel bases destroyed in one way or another by Ishtar.]

Around the time it [Carthage] entered the Hannibalian [cannibal, animal] war, the political state of Carthage was on the decline, and Rome's improving [This sounds like the parasite society was changing host societies like with American and China today]. Just as there are in every body, government, or business, natural stages of growth, zenith, and decay. And just as everything in them is at its best at the

zenith, we can judge the difference between these two constitutions ...at that period. For exactly so far as the strength and prosperity of Carthage preceded that of Rome in point of time; by so much was Carthage then past its prime, while Rome was exactly at its zenith [as a Haremi/Arab host society]... In Carthage therefore, the influence of the people in the policy of the state had already risen to be supreme, while in Rome the Senate was at the height of its power. [So according to Polybius, Carthage was a democratic naval power that was defeated by a nearby non-democratic land power. It is worth noting that Athens was also a democratic naval power that was defeated by a nearby non-democratic land power some 203 years earlier.] ... And so, in the one [Carthage] measures were deliberated upon by the many, in the other [place, Rome] by [only a handful of] the best men. The Roman government decisions proved stronger [or perhaps just faster]: And although they suffered from [a series of] financial crises, they finally conquered the Carthaginians in the war — thanks to the vision of its counsels [presidents/kings. Does this look familiar America? You are next in line. for elimination by an enemy that has killed maybe, 10 or 20 free civilizations — your predecessors. You must wake up now or all humanity will go down the tubes in a series of Arab purges. The machines are upon our citadel of freedom — and only a new program will stop them. Wake up. Muster-up.]

Polybius, History, 6.52

"Let's look at the provisions for carrying on a war. Here we find that the Carthaginians [Arabs] were better trained and prepared for naval warfare, while the Romans were much better trained and prepared for land warfare. This is only natural for a people [the Carthaginians] who for many generations followed the seaman's trade to all nations of the world.

The [Romans on the other hand] give their whole attention to... [land warfare]: while the Carthaginians wholly neglect their infantry, though they do take some slight interest in a cavalry. The reason for this is that they [the Carthaginians] employ foreign [unchosen Arabs slaves as] mercenaries, while the Romans draft native citizen [to fight]. It is in this point that the former system is inferior to the later. They rest their hopes of freedom on the courage of [hamstrung, achilles tendon nicked, can't-run-away] mercenary troops: While the Roman [hopes for freedom rest] on the valor of their own free citizens and the help of their [similarly free] allies. The result is that even if the Romans have suffered a defeat at first, they renew the war with undiminished forces, something the Carthaginians cannot do. For as the Romans are fighting for country and children, it is impossible for them to relax the fury of their struggle; but they persist stubbornly until they have overcome their enemies.

... In [naval] skill the Romans are much behind the Carthaginians, as I have already said. Yet the upshot of the whole naval war has been a decided victory for the Romans, owing to the valor of their men. For although nautical science is a big contributor to victory in sea battles, the courage of the seamen is a more decisive factor. [This is not true and propaganda. In truth, the Romans won the war with Carthage with the amphibious invasion lead by the impersonization Scipio Africanus, the Roman General curiously named Africa Ships. Apparently the fact that the 2nd punic war was won by Africa ships was a problematic idea for the parasite so it hid the idea in an impersonization.] The fact is that the Italians as a nation are by nature superior to the Phoenicians and Libyans as they are stronger and braver. As well, their habits do much to inspire the youth with enthusiasm for such exploits. Here is

an example that will show the pains taken by the "Roman state" to produce men ready to endure anything to win a reputation for valor [military honors] in their country."

Polybius, History, 6.52

[Until the late 100s AD, about 300 years after this was supposedly written, the Romans cremated their dead, adding hugely expensive Arabian incense to cover the smell of burning the partially decayed bodies. This was said to help gain favor with the gods by "buying a stairway to heaven".

Here we see how the dumb Rumi were marched off to die in war. And the biggest absurdity of all was how the Romans were battling to preserve the trade wall that made them dependent on Mideast grain.]

"The Romans are innately superior to the Phoenicians and Berbers/Barbarians, both in physical strength and in animal courage. They also greatly stimulate the development of their young men in this direction by the training that they give them. The description of a single institution will suffice as an example of the efforts made by the Roman government to breed men prepared to endure any hardship for the sake of winning honor and glory in the eyes of their countrymen.

"Whenever a high-ranking man dies, the funeral procession normally carries the body in an upright position and exposed [a•palled, for all to see his wounds and expensive para•pher•ana•alia] although sometimes it is lying down [on pall bearers]. It is carried in state to the so-called "Rams" [a flock of men] or rostra in the Forum, as a raised platform there is called. Then with everyone gathered around, a son, if one is alive and happens to be present, or if not some other relative, or an orator steps up onto the rostra and speaks about the virtues and achievements of the deceased. By this speech, the audience [audi•hence] are vividly reminded of what [brave deeds] have been done [by the deceased], and made to see these [exploits] with their own eyes. Seen not only by those who were engaged in the actual exploits, but also by those who were not. And sometimes their sympathies are so deeply moved, that the death is not only felt by the actual mourners, but something it is felt by the whole public as a public loss.

After the burial and all the customary ceremonies have been performed, they place the likeness [mask] of the deceased in the most conspicuous part [place of honor] in the ancestral home, setting it in a wood shrine. This likeness is a [wax museum] mask [called an imago in Latin and an eikon or icon in Greek] a completely accurate and detailed recreation of his face, similar in features and complexion. They lovingly prepare a whole series of these masks and display them at the public festivals [where huge piles of Arabian incense hashish were burned] And whenever a famous member of the family dies, they carry them [the masks] to the funeral, placing them on those whom they consider to most resemble the deceased in size and build. These mimes [Gr. mimeomai=imitate] assume the clothes according to the rank of the person represented: If he was a consul or praetor, a toga with [expensive Tyrian] purple borders; if a censor, an all purple toga; if he had also celebrated a triumph or performed any exploit of that kind, a [pricy designer] toga adorned with gold. [purple and gold have generally been expensive Arab concession goods.]

These mimes ride in carriages, heralded by the Rods and Axes and the other insignia of power which ordinarily accompany [Roman] leaders — These in accordance with the official rank attained during the career of the dead man that is impersonated [and brought back to life]. When they arrive at the rostra, they all sit on ivory chairs in order of rank. It is hard

to imagine a spectacle that would instill or inspire a more positive impression on a young man of good character and wholesome ambition. It is hard to imagine one who would remain uninspired by the sight of all his family-men who have earned glory [in battle protecting their way of life] — Gathered together as though they were living and breathing [and as if death was an illusion]. What could be a more glorious [powerful, and motivating] spectacle?"

After the speaker is done eulogizing about the body that will soon be buried [cremated] he moves on the achievements of his ancestors, beginning with the earliest there represented. By this means, the glorious memory of brave deeds by dead men is continually renewed. And through this perpetual commemoration=co•memory•ation, the fame of those who have done any noble deed at all is thus never immortalized and never allowed to die. [i.e. getting wounded in a war to keep the great Arab trade wall from falling.] Thus the story of those who have served their country well becomes a household word that is handed down to posterity.

But the most important benefit of the ceremony is that it inspires [or manipulates] young men to shrink from no exertion for the public welfare, in the hope of winning the glory which always comes to the brave. And what I say is confirmed by this fact. Many Romans have volunteered to decide a whole battle by single combat; and not a few have deliberately accepted certain death, some in time of war to secure the safety of the rest, some in time of peace to preserve the safety of Rome. There have also been instances of men in office putting their own sons to death, in defiance of every custom and law, because they rated the interests of their country higher than those of natural ties even with their nearest and dearest [so completely believable is the matrix].

Polybius, History, 6.56

"Again, the Roman customs and principles regarding money transactions are better than those of the Carthaginians. For the latter [Carthage/ the Arabs], nothing that makes a profit is disgraceful. With the former [Rome], nothing is more disgraceful than to receive a bribe or to make profit by improper means. For they regard wealth obtained from unlawful transactions to be as much a disgrace, as a fair profit from the most unquestioned source is [worthy] of praise. A proof of this fact is how the Carthaginians obtain office by open bribery [i.e. they sold the offices like a modern-day Arab kleptocracy], but among the Romans the penalty for this is death"

Polybius, d. 118BC, History, 6.56

[This first paragraph is about the hugely expensive opiated Arab hashish incense that Rome was "sacrificing to the gods".] "The most important way the Romans seem better is in displaying their religious beliefs. ... I mean a scrupulous fear of the gods is the thing keeping Rome together. They take this to extraordinary levels in both private and public business, [but especially public business] that it could not be exceeded. Many people might find this inexplicable, but in my opinion their objective is to use it as a check on the common people, [Apparently there actually was a real opium of the masses and the Romans were smoking it.]

If it were possible to form a state wholly of philosophers, such customs would perhaps be unnecessary. [the Arabs love to get our smartest pondering imponderables. New subject] But seeing that The People are always fickle, and full of lawless desires, unreasoning anger, and violent passion, the only resource is to keep them in check by mysterious

terrors and scenic [matrix] effects of this sort. For this reason, I think the ancients were not acting without purpose or randomly, when they brought in among the vulgar [outies peoples of the world] those beliefs about the gods, [especially] the belief in the punishments in Hades. [personally] I think that men nowadays are acting rashly and foolishly when they reject them [these beliefs].

2) The pre-Caesar era

Plutarch (d. 120AD), Sulla 9. Sulla died in 78BC, 30 years before Julius Caesar staged his coup and appointed himself dictator for life. Here we see why the democratic Roman Republic died. Its brightest men were murdered in a great purge staged by Mideast Inc.'s latest figurehead dictator. "It is also said that Sulla dreamed of the goddess whose cult came to Rome from Cappadocia [Turkey] and who may be called either the Moon, or Athena, or Bellona. It seemed to Sulla that this goddess stood beside him and put a thunderbolt [musket] in his hands. She then named his enemies one by one and told him to strike them. And after he had hurled the thunderbolt [many times], they all fell down and disappeared.... [Sulla] ordered his archers to make use of their fire-arrows and shoot them at the tops of the [Roman] houses. The action was quite poorly considered, and merely the result of rage [at least that was the excuse]. In his anger, he had lost control of his actions. All he could see were his enemies and he gave no consideration to friends, relations, and old acquaintances. [so lots of people died] No feeling of pity moved him as he made his entry into the city [of Rome] by means of fire, which knew no distinction between the innocent and the guilty. Meanwhile, Marius was driven back to the temple of Tellus. Here he issued a proclamation offering freedom to the [Arab] slaves in return for their support. "

Plutarch, d. 120AD, Sulla 3

"He then summoned the Senate to meet in the Temple of Bellona, and at the same time as he rose up to speak, those who had been given the job, began to butcher the 6,000 men in the Circus [Colosseum? co·lysi·um? clearly a great number were murdered at an entertainment venue. Perhaps that is why the parasite channels billions into building these places all over the world. Perhaps it is angling for future massacres, or simultaneous bombings. Also note the number 6. It means that their star is missing one axis. So these were disloyal yellow G•oos, the people of the 6-pointed star.]

The noise of their shrieks, so many men being massacred in so small a space, was as might be expected easily heard, and the senators were amazed, but said nothing. Sulla however, continued to speak with the same calm and unmoved expression [You are reading a heuristic guide on how to do such things]. He told the senators to listen to what he had to say and not to bother with what was going on outside. Some criminals, he said, are being corrected. It is being done on my orders. This immediately made it clear to even the dumbest Romans that, far from escaping tyranny, they had only exchanged one [Mideast frontman] tyrant for another."

Plutarch, Sulla, 31

"Sulla now devoted himself entirely to the work of butchery. The city was filled with murder and there was no counting the executions or setting a limit to them. Many people were killed because of purely personal ill felling [an excuse. The real reason is always that your lines pose a threat to the lines of the parasite Haremi race]. They had no connection with Sulla in

any way, but Sulla, in order to gratify members of his own party, allowed them to be killed. ... [Let me remind you again, that this is a heuristic guide to killing off the disloyal Jews of the 6-pointed star, as well as the tallest/smarest lines in the house of the host.]

[Just like the Nazi frontmen of Arabs Inc., Sulla] also condemned anyone who sheltered or attempted to save a person whose name was on the [proscription/ death] lists . Death was the penalty for such acts of humanity, and there were no exception in the case of brothers, sons, or parents. On the other hand, the reward for murder was 2 talents, and this sum was paid to anyone who killed a condemned man, even if it was a slave who killed his master or a son his father. Also (and this was regarded as the greatest injustice of all) he [Sulla] took away all civil [inheritance] rights from the sons and grandsons of those on the lists and confiscated the property of all of them [for the oo, the drain, the nest-egg of Haremi Brothers Inc.]. These lists were published not only in Rome but in every city in Italy. No place remained undefiled by murder [of smart people and disloyal Jews] — no temple of the gods, nor hearth of hospitality, nor ancestral home. Husbands were murdered in the embraces of their wives, sons in the arms of their mothers. And those who were killed in passion of the moment or because of some private hatred were as nothing compared with those who were butchered for the sake of their property [It is always about money, it is always about feeding the bottomless pit of demand]. In fact, it became normal for the executioners to say among themselves that: 'So-and-so was killed by his big mansion, so-and-so by his gardens, so-and-so by his hot-water installation.' There was, for example, Quintus Aurelius, a man who had nothing to do with politics, and who imagined that he was only connected with these disastrous events because he sympathized with others in distress. He went into the forum and, reading through the list of condemned, came upon his own name. He said, 'Things are bad for me, I am being hunted down for may Alban estate'. He didn't get far before he was cut down by someone who had in fact been hunting for him. Finally, however, not having sufficient time at his disposal, he [Sulla] herded them all together into one place and gave orders that the whole lot of them, 12,000 in all, should be killed." [A 12 pointed star is even more perfect a number than an 8-pointed one. This suggests that they killed all the leadership 30 years before they brought Julius Caesar to power. It should be noted that Rome probably began acting like a dictatorship or headless horseman around this time, killing many people in Italy. It should also be noted that Rome invaded nearby Gaul/France 20 years after this was written. Here, Julius Caesar's army killed a million people and enslaved another million. So here we imagine that once Rome's leadership was purged, the Army rampaged though Europe killing all the adversaries and potential adversaries of Haremi Inc. This process culminated 30 years later in the beginning of the Caesar dynasty in Rome.]

Plutarch, Sulla, 31

"Apart from the massacres, the rest of Sulla's conduct also caused offense. He proclaimed himself Dictator, thus reviving a type of authority which had not been used for the last 120 years. A decree was passed giving him immunity for all his past acts, while for the future, he was to have the power of life and death, the power to confiscate property [for the Arabs], to found colonies, to found new cities, or to demolish existing ones, to take away or to bestow kingdoms at his pleasure. [These are all typical Arab frontman powers.]

In conducting the sales of confiscated estates, which

he did sitting raised up on a platform [like a Haremi frontman ruler], he behaved in such an arrogant and tyrannical way that he became more hated for his gifts than for his depredations. Attractive women, musicians, dancers and former slaves of the lowest possible type received at his hands the territories of nations and the revenues of cities...[These were all either Haremi or front men for the parasitic Haremi race.]"

Plutarch, Sulla, 34

"in spite of the great numbers of people he killed, and the great changes he made in the constitution, he laid down his dictatorship and gave back to the people the right to elect consuls [paired presidents]." [This was to preserve the illusion, the matrix. Arabs feel no shame at anything, least-of-all retreating when they have reached too far and had to leave some dumb Rumi frontman as an escape goat.]

Plutarch, Crassus, 4

"When Cinna and Marius seized power [in 87BC], it quickly became evident that their purpose in re-entering the city was not to do good to their country, but simply to wipe out and destroy the nobility. They killed as many of these as they could lay their hands on, Crassus's father and brother among them. Crassus himself, who was very young, escaped" [After this, there is a long and unbelievable story of his childhood in a Spanish cave. This suggesting that after Mideast Inc. killed all the nobility of Rome, and then inserted their own boys to be the new nobility.]

Aulus Gellius, Attic Nights, 15.27.5

"When voting is done according to property value and age, the assembly is called the Committee of Centurions. When it is done according to districts and localities, it is called the Committee of Tribes. It is unlawful for the Committee of Centurions to assemble within the city limits because it is unlawful for the army to be mustered within the city limits. The army must be mustered outside the city limits. Therefore, it became the custom for the Committee of Centurions and the army to be mustered in the martial camp."

[1] Here we see checks and balances 1.0. and a bi-cameral legislature. Although it might be 2.0 or 9.0 — it is impossible to say.

2) The Committee of Centurions was a legislature that seems to have been based on military service, and met at the army base the Campus Martius = Camp Martial. This probably discouraged government service — for one had to join the military to participate in this house of government. It also mad this house of the Roman democracy into one dominated by infantrymen.

3) It is just a hunch, but I bet when Julius Caesar "JC" seized or Caesar-ed power, the committees were where the people who protested most — after all they were the ones who were armed, trained, and organized. It is just hunch, but I bet it was these committees that stabbed Julius Caesar many times and then dragged his corpse through to the streets, cremating his body on a heap of dry manure and leaves. Thus they denied JC a proper funeral and a stairway to heaven on the smoke of a great heap of Arabian incense.]

The Roman Campus Martius

This was the martial camp of Rome. It began as a camp for the training of the Roman militia and convening the Comitia Centuriata — essentially two aspects of the same institution. Later the Campus Martius was transformed into the main site in Rome for exercise and physical fitness, instead of being the

home of its citizen militia and civil defense force. Originally physical fitness was closely kinked to preparation for war, and each citizen of military age was expected to keep himself fit and ready for war. Over time, the parasite struggle to change physical fitness from war preparation to recreation.

Now while Rome's citizen militia had a veto over the government, the people had some power, and due to the military might of the assembly, that power was fairly unassailable. The solvent parasite worked by slowly turning the Campus Martius into a recreation area. Then when the Comitia Centuriata was ultimately attacked and purged, it could not defend itself.

Plutarch, Pompey, 54

"Rome was again without a government, and people [Brothers] began to be still more outspoken in agitating for a dictator. Cato and his party fearing that they might be forced to give way to this agitation, decided to let Pompey have a kind of office which was defined by law, so as to keep him out of the absolute power and authority which would be his as dictator. ... In this way, Rome would either be saved from the present state of anarchy, or if subjected, would at least be subjected to her ablest citizen."

Plutarch, Crassus, 2

[Crassus] "was conspicuous for how he never once refused to buy the property of those that Sulla had killed or purged. Sulla called this property the spoils of war. He wanted as many influential people as possible to share the burden of his guilt.

...

He owned countless silver mines, large areas of valuable land, and laborers to work it for him. Yet all this was nothing compared with the value of his [Mideast] slaves. There were great numbers of these, and they were of the highest quality — readers, secretaries, silversmiths, managers, organizers...

His house was open to all, and he used to lend money to his friends without interest"

Plutarch, Sulla, 8

[of Sulpicius, the parasite's disposable mask, its short-lived figurehead frontman:] "He was cruel, reckless, and grasping. He was so without shame and principle that actually auctioned off the rights of Roman citizenship to aliens and freed-slaves — whoever would pay most. He set up special tables in the forum and counted his income. He maintained a private army of 3,000 swordsmen and went around accompanied by large bands of young men from the moneyed [buyable] classes outside the Senate. He called these men who were ready for anything his anti-Senate."

Lucius Catilina, Catiline rouses his accomplices, 63BC

[Lucius Catilina stood against Marcus Cicero for the consulship in 64 BC. In 63BC, he ran on a platform of radical land redistribution and debt cancellation. Catilina appears to have been a death spasm of Roman democracy in the face of the creeping Mideast take-over.] "Day by day, my burning passion for action grows more excited when I consider what our future living conditions will be if we don't assert our right to freedom. Ever since the government has fallen under the power and jurisdiction of a few men [fronting for Mideast Inc.], a steady flow of nations have become their tax paying tributaries. But all the rest of us, no matter how brave or worthy, whether noble or plebeian, have been regarded as a mere mob. We have no authority or financial interest, and are now subject to men to

whom, if the state were in a sound condition, we should rightly be afraid of. Hence all influence, power, honor, and wealth are in their hands, or where they dispose them. To us they have only left insults, dangers, persecutions, and poverty. To such indignities, O bravest of men, how long will you submit? Is it not better to die in a glorious attempt, than, after having been the sport of other men's insolence, to resign a wretched and degraded existence of ignominy [namelessness]."

Sallust, 82-35BC, The War with Catiline

"... as soon as the [Roman] state had gained its freedom... what progress it quickly made; so great was the thirst for glory that had ensued. Now, for the first time, the young men, as soon as they were of age for service, learned warfare by the experience of hard labor in camp. Handsome arms [the opposite of unwieldy] and warlike horses became preferred over women and wine. To men like these no toil was too unusual, no ground too rugged or steep, no enemy under arms an object of fear; their courage had subdued all things. But their greatest contests for glory were [internal and self-cancelling and] with one another. Each was eager to strike the foe, to scale the wall, and to be seen so engaged. This they counted as wealth, this as reputation and the highest nobleness. Greedy for fame, they were liberal with money [This is an Arab talking about a technique], and wished that their glory might be unbounded, and their wealth honorably won. [They cared not for money but were greedy without limit for martial/war honors.] I could tell of [all the many] places where a small Roman force routed huge bodies of the enemy, and of towns naturally strong taken by assault, were it not that this would be too wide a digression. [such propaganda is a world unto itself]

Fortune [eff•our•tune=shout•our•tune], however, is truly everywhere paramount, and she [the Arab shout] makes known or obscures every event according to her own whim rather than its real value. The performances of the Athenians, as I respect them, were sufficiently noble and magnificent, and yet somewhat less than fame reports [The Arabs were puffing up the Athenians in Rome of later centuries]. At Athens, however, there flourished historians of genius, and, consequently, throughout the world the exploits of the Athenians are esteemed as of the highest order. Thus the merits of men of action are valued in proportion to the capabilities of men of genius to extol them in words. [They puffed up Athenian courage as much as they could] But the Roman people have never had any advantage of this kind; among them the most capable men were always [carefully kept] the most preoccupied, no one exercised his mind apart from his body, and the best men preferred action to narration, and to have their own services praised by others rather than themselves to be another's historian." [The Romans did all the hard work and killing and Arabs recorded their history.]

... In their offerings [of expensive Arabian incense and other imported products] they were magnificent [meaning serving to magnify], in their domestic expenses sparing, and to their friends loyal. [They were cheap with their families and loyal to their friends.]

They guarded their personal and national interests with boldness and daring in war, and then generous treatment in the ensuing peace.

...In war, punishment was more often inflicted on those who had fought the enemy contrary to orders, or who had too slowly obeyed the signal to recall from battle, than on deserters or those who gave way when pressed. In peace, they carried on their government rather by kindness than by fear, and when

they had received an injury, preferred rather to pardon it than avenge it. [Sounds like the United States, doesn't it?]

Thus by diligence and fair dealing, the state was advanced. Great kings were conquered in war, and wild races and vast areas were subdued by force. Carthage, the rival of the Roman Empire perished root and branch. Sea and land everywhere lay open before us. When at last fortune began to turn cruel, and throw everything into confusion, those who had lightly borne toils and dangers, doubtful fortunes and desperate straits, found leisure and wealth, things under other circumstances so desirable, a pitiable burden. [This seems an anachronistic remark]

At first the lust of money increased, then lust for power. And these it may be said, were the sources of every evil. Avarice subverted loyalty, uprightness, and every other good quality. And in their place, taught men to be proud and cruel, to neglect the gods, and to regard all things as open to corruption. Ambition compelled many to become deceitful. They had one thought buried in their breast, and another ready on their tongue. Their friendships and enmities they valued not at their real worth, but for the advantage they could bring, and they maintained the look rather than the nature of honest men. These evils at first grew gradually, and were occasionally punished. Later, when the contagion advanced like some plague, the state was revolutionized, and the government, from being [once] one of the justest and best, became cruel and unbearable. At first it was not so much avarice as ambition which spurred men's minds — a vice, indeed, but one akin to virtue. For glory, distinction, and power in the state are equally desired by [both] good and evil men. The good ones strive to reach their goal by the path of honor, the evil and dishonest ones use the weapons of falsehood and deceit.

Greed, on the other hand, implies a zeal for money, something no philosopher ever yearned for. Tainting the body and mind of the strong, it weakens them as by some deadly poison. It is always boundless, always insatiable. [Both] abundance and scarcity alike fail to lessen it. After Sulla [Lucius Cornelius Sulla Felix], had seized the government by force of arms [and became dictator in 82 BC], and made a bad end to a good beginning, robbery and plunder became universal [in the city of Rome]. One coveted a house, another an estate, [cutting down the tall stalks of corn] the victors knew neither limit nor self restraint. Thus the Roman citizens became the object of vile and cruel outrage. To make matters worse, Sulla, to secure the loyalty of the army he had led in Asia, in defiance of ancient usage had allowed habits of luxury and far too much freedom [among his forces]. Pleasant and voluptuous quarters in times of peace had easily enervated the hardy spirit of his men. It was in Asia that a Roman army first gained habits of partying and sex. They also learned to admire statues, paintings, and plate, and stole them from their private or public owners. They also plundered shrines, and polluted everything whether sacred or common. Soldiers like these, when they gained a victory, stripped the conquered bare. Even the wise have their temper tried by prosperity, and much less could men of this abandoned character use their success with moderation.

Riches became a means of distinction and glory, thus power and influence flowed out of their wealth. As a result, the edge of virtue was dulled, poverty was accounted a disgrace, and uprightness a king of the mean spirit. Riches made the youth a prey to luxury, avarice, and pride: They [the Romans thus] plundered and squandered [their spoils], valued lightly their own property, and coveted that of others. They cared neither for modesty nor purity, nor for anything at all in heaven or earth. And they were without

principals or moderation. To one acquainted with mansions and villas built on the scale of towns, it is worthwhile to visit the temples erected by our ancestors, the most god fearing of men. They, indeed, decorated the shrines of the gods with piety, and their own homes with glory, while they deprived their conquered enemies of nothing save the power of doing harm. But in this generation the most worthless of men in the depth of their wickedness have deprived our allies of everything which those brave men in the hour of victory had left them. It was as if the one and the only use of an empire was to inflict harm. ...

... the passion for sex, gluttony, and all other kinds of indulgence, kept pace with that for wealth. Each sex alike trampled on their modesty. Sea and land were ransacked to supply the table. People went to bed before they felt a desire for sleep. They did not wait for hunger or thirst, cold, or weariness, but anticipated them all by luxurious expedients. Such a life, when means had failed, spurred youth into crime. Their minds, tainted with bad accomplishments, could not endure to be deprived of their sensual pleasures, and they abandoned themselves with all the more recklessness to every sort of gain and expense.

It was in a state of this magnitude and corruption that Catiline, [kata•line] as was easily done, gathered round him, to serve as bodyguard, bands of men stained by every vice and crime. Every gambler, adulterer, and glutton, who, by the gratification of his passion, had cruelly impaired his [national] patrimony. Every one whose debts had been swollen to buy indemnity [indulgences] for some deed of crime. All the cut-throats from every quarter, all who had committed sacrilege. All who had been tried and condemned, or whose deeds made them fear a trial. All who gained a living by polluting their tongues with perjury, or their hands with their countrymen's blood. In sum, all who were harassed by crime, by need, or by the pangs of conscience. It was these who were Catiline's intimate associates. [This reminds us of the description of Hitler's henchmen from Rise and Fall of the Third Reich.]

... In reliance on friends and associates such as these, and encouraged by the enormous prevalence of debt throughout the world, [They were all in debt and facing being sold into slavery] and by the number of Sulla's soldiers who has squandered their fortunes, and mindful of plunder... were now hoping for civil war [in Rome]...

[in preparation for the coup d'etat ...] he [Cata•alli'n and his Brotherly helpers] stored arms in suitable places throughout Italy, and brought money, borrowed on his own or his [Brotherly] friends security, from a certain Man•li•us of Fae•sulae [Man•ali•us de Eff•ay•sul•A] who afterwards was the first to move in the war. At this point in time, he is said to have gained over many men of every rank, and a number of [metaphorical] women [Brothers], whose beauty had provided them the means to support their extravagance while they were young, but advancing age had limited their luxury, and consequently they had contracted huge debts. Though the Catiline hoped to tamper with the slaves of Rome, to fire [burn down] the city, and either to win over or murder the women's husbands."

Quintus Cicero, How to become consul, 64 BC

[Here we have a great picture of how corrupt Roman 'democracy' had become, some 15 years before Julius Caesar 'crossed the Rubicon' river and lead his armies into Rome to make himself dictator. This was also 25 years after the so-called Social wars of 91-89BC where Rome gave the Italians of mid-to-south Italy the right to vote.]

"Although natural ability is a strong advantage, over a

campaign of a few months, dirty tricks frequently prevail. Therefore, bear in mind what city this is, and what office you are running for, and who you are. Every day as you walk down to the Forum, you must say to yourself, 'I am a novus homo' [a new man, a new harem man. I must work harder to make up for the fact that I am not established.]. ... You will best compensate for the newness of your name with your fame as an orator. ...

Therefore, make sure that both the large number of your friends [clients, entourage], and also their high rank [as shown by their expensive imported clothing] is apparent. For you have allies which few 'new men' have had before: The tax collectors, almost the entire equestrian [equal•east•ouri'n] order, and many towns are especially devoted to you. You also have many men who have been defended by you, and many trade guilds and clubs. And you also have a large number of the new generation, who have become attached to you in their enthusiasm for oratory, and who visit you daily in swarms [for their daily client allowance]. Take care that you secure these supporters by reminding people that they are in your debt. Use every means available to make sure that the people who owe you favors understand there will never be another opportunity for them to return the favor. And for those who may want your help in the future, there will never be another opportunity for you to be put under obligation to them.

Novi homines [New Men] can also be greatly helped by the endorsement of men of high rank, especially of ex-consuls. It is [definitely] advantageous to be thought worthy of a particular rank by those very men into whose ranks you wish to enter. All these men must be carefully courted by you. You must send envoys to them and persuade them that we have always supported the Optimates [Aristocracy] in government matters, and never the populares [the common people]. Also take pains to get young men of high rank on your side, and keep the friendship of those whom you already have. They will contribute much to your political position. Whosoever gives any sign of inclination to you, or regularly visits your house [as a client], you must put down in the category of friends.

The most advantageous thing is to be related by blood or marriage — but you should also be a pleasure to see for those who are members of the same club, or some other close tie. You must take great pains that all these men should love you and desire that you receive the highest honors. In a word, you must secure friends of every class, magistrates, consuls and their tribunes to win you the vote of the centurions: [especially] men of wide popular influence. And take all pains to secure the vote of anyone who will benefit, or hopes to benefit from your influence, especially the centurions.

Thus by the number and variety of your friends, you will secure the votes of all the centurions. Firstly and obviously, you need to embrace the Roman senators and equites, and the active and popular men of all the other orders. There are many hard-working men in the city. There are also many ['Greek'] freedmen engaged in the Forum [The government center of ancient Rome] who are popular and energetic. Try with all your might, both personally and through common friends, to make these men your eager spokesmen. Seek them out, send agents to them, show them that they are putting you under the greatest possible obligation [if they would just vote for you]. Then develop a plan for the whole city, for all the guilds, for the districts and the neighboring regions. If you can win over to your side the leading men in these groups, you will with their help easily gain the votes of the other members of the groups and the common people. Next, make sure that you have in your mind and memory a plan of all of Italy divided

and arranged by tribes. Learn this by heart, so that no town, colony, or prefecture, indeed no place in Italy exists where you lack support. You will also need [influential] men from every region [of Italy]. Entreat and encourage them. See to it that they campaign for you in their own districts and serve as your vicarious presence. [What an absurd way to run elections in ancient times. I mean, the idea of senate candidates riding all over central Italy campaigning on disc-wheel chariots is just absurd. Look at what Roman democracy became in the wake of the Social Wars (91-89BC) where the Romans gave all of Italy the right to vote in Roman elections. What a backdoor this was for the 'Greeks' of the Mideast to enter the Greek speaking areas of southern Italy.]

And since I have brought up the topic of clients [attendants supporters/ clique audience], try hard to make sure that you are attended each day [that you are speaking in court or in the senate] by as many people as possible of every class and order. From this number alone, you can estimate the amount of support you will get in the election.... Your clients/attendants can be divided into three groups: 1) Those who come to your home for the morning salutation. 2) Those who escort you from your home. And 3) Those who go with you into the city [and stay with you all day long as an entourage.] The morning greeters are more common than the other two groups, and more numerous, because this has recently come into fashion. You must be sure to make the slightest little service they do seem especially gratifying to you. Indicate to those who come to your house that you are aware of the attention. Make it known to their friends (who will, of course, report your words to them). And tell them often in person. When several candidates are campaigning and men see that there is one who really appreciates the services of his attendants, they frequently desert the other candidates and pledge themselves to him [This seems to have become fashionable because the parasite upped how much it spent on clients] ...As for the other group who escort you from your home, whose service is greater than that of the morning greeters, clearly indicate to them that it is more gratifying to you. Come down to the Forum at the same time every day [so you don't waste your client's time]. For a large crowd of escorts/clients every day brings you great renown and great respect [and gives you great power in making decisions for the nation]. Now the third group in this classification are those who attend you assiduously. Some do so voluntarily. So make sure that they know that you will be obligated to them for this enormous favor.

As for those who owe you this service, simply demand that they repay you. Those whose age and occupation will allow it should attend to you constantly. But those who cannot personally attend to you should assign their relatives to this duty. I strongly urge, and I think it important, that you always appear [in public] with a group of attendants. And you will particularly gain great respect and renown if your attendants are men who have been defended by you in court and who have been acquitted. [The Brothers must have had an advantage here, over the outsiders due to their connections with the judges.] Simply demand from them that they repay you with this service since they, through your efforts and at no cost to themselves, won their court case or preserved their reputations, or kept their lives and property. And never again in the future will there be a time when they can show their gratitude to you. [1) Apparently, many Roman lawyers worked pro bono and for no fee. All they wanted was to accumulate followers so they could go into politics. This scheme was most convenient for the parasite which would simply poison the men

who were not under its thumb before they acquired enough clients to enter government. 2) By running all the lawyers, the parasite ran Rome's justice system. It used this power to get rid of any native Romans, outsiders trying to horn in its rackets. 3) That part about preserving of one's reputations is probably about slander lawsuits. These may have been drummed up to get rid of any smart people not participating in the client/ clique game. It was probably the case that Roman culture was made to be very touchy about such things.]

Enough has been said about establishing friendships. We must now discuss the other aspects of a political campaign: what is done to win over the common people. Here you need flattery, constant attention, courtesy, good reputation, prominence in the public life, and the knowledge of each man's name. In fact, make it very clear that you know men's names. Add them to a list [and study it] so that every day you become even better at this. Nothing, as far as I am concerned is so popular or pleasing as this [Squandering your leader's time on campaigning is stupid enough, but taking the time to remember everyone's name is just absurd. What a huge waste of time this was. The Brothers probably made lists and had assistants prep them. Of course they also must have told all the Rumi that they were memorizing the names so they would do the same and distract themselves.]

Also, never should we ask our leader to remember peoples names. And for this reason, leaders should always use pronouns or generic terms like Sir or Mister. They should do this despite the parasite's extensive propaganda that discourages the use of pronouns. This will help our leaders to be less distracted by something that is truly insignificant.]

Although you may not be a flatterer by nature, persuade yourself that you must give the appearance of complimenting people in a very natural fashion. Certainly you possess that affability which befits a good and pleasant man. But you really need the gift of flattery which, although it is wicked and reprehensible in all other aspects of life, is essential in a political campaign. Actually, when flattery drives men away from you, it is bad, but when it makes him more supportive of you it shouldn't be criticized. It is certainly essential for a candidate, whose demeanor and speech must adapt to the opinions and wishes of everyone he meets.

Constant attention implies... that you campaign continually, that you appear to the same people again and again...

Men want to hear promises when they make a request of a candidate, and they want to hear freely-given and creditable promises. So make it clear that you will do whatever you do freely and with enthusiasm. Also, even if it's not in your nature, a successful campaign requires that you often promise what you cannot accomplish.... But it is the strategy of a good campaigner... that if you make a promise, its fulfillment is never a definite thing yes or now. Explain how it concerns only a few members of the public, and how you are waiting for the right opportunity [to introduce the matter]. However, if you refuse to make a promise, you alienate many people definitely and immediately. In any case, far more people ask for the promise of a favor than ever demand its fulfillment...

...it is especially important for the public to think that you are honest and trusts you to serve well in office. Politics is not simply a matter of success on the campaign trail, or in the Senate, or in the popular assembly, but rather these things must be kept in mind: The Senate should think that you will be a defender. The Roman equestrians and other honorable and wealthy men should think from your past life that you are eager

for the easy life. And the Plebs should think, from the fact that in your speeches in the assemblies and in court you supported the rights of the people, that you will not be opposed to its interests...

Rome is a [melting pot] a nation formed by the confluence of many nations. In Rome, you must endure treachery, deceit, vices of every kind, arrogance of many men, scorn, malevolence, pride, hatred, and harassment. I think that anyone living in the midst of so many vices, of every sort and scale, and of so many men must have great prudence and skill to avoid giving offense, to avoid gossip and treachery."

Appian, Pompey enters Rome in triumph, 61BC

[Pompey was a great general from the Social Wars, and the Spartacus slave rebellion. He fought the Mediterranean Pirates, Mithridates of Pontus, Tigranes of Armenia, Antiochus of Syria and met with huge successes.] "As he approached the city, he was met by successive processions, first of youths farthest from the city, then bands of men of different ages came as far as they could walk. Last of all came the Senate, which was lost in wonder at his exploits. For no one had ever before vanquished so powerful an enemy, and at the same time brought so many great nations under subjugation and extended the Roman rule to the Euphrates river. [Again, the land of no resources wants to be invaded and "conquered".

...There was a parade of the immense pillage, including humans, and afterward] the multitude of captives and pirates, none of which was bound [they wanted to be brought to Rome] but all arrayed in their native costumes.... among them were five sons of Mithridates, and two daughters, also Astro-bulus, king of the Jews, the tyrants of the Cilicians, and other potentates. ... Pompey himself rode a chariot studded with gems, wearing, it is said, the cloak of Alexander the Great [In other words, Alexander was his functional predecessor] ... When he reached Rome, he did not put any prisoners to death, as had been customary at other triumphs, but sent them all home at the public expense, except the kings. Of these, Aristobulus [the guy playing the king of the Mideast] alone was quickly put to death, and Tigranes some time later."

Rome the liberator became Rome the oppressor

Rome didn't acquire its world-dominating empire by conquest, it acquired it by being perceived as a democratic liberator, just like America. Then, over about 63 years, (91BC - 28BC) the world's greatest liberator was morphed into the world's greatest oppressor, mostly due to a series of purges/ mass murders. Then its cred was abused by the parasite to institute a government that was the exact opposite of freedom.

This process became more or less complete with the long-term seizure of dictatorial power by one incredible, legendary man above men, called something like: Tullius Caesero (tool-i-us key-sir). He was a blend of Julius Caesar the brilliant general and statesman, and Tullius Cicero the great scholar, orator and lawyer. This incredible man was a poly-math or many-mouth, because many Brothers were his ghostwriters and administrators — so he achieved many things. In fact, he achieved too much to be believable by later generations, so he was divided into two men. Note the similarity between the sound of T and J. Plato's Republic with its philosopher kings probably dates to the decades before the key-sir dynasty began. The brothers probably thought that a remarkable man was their best shot at installing a dictator, so they created one. And little doubt they also went to work on Roman values, with works like Plato's Republic. Plato probably pushed for philosopher-kings, in the decades before Mideast

Inc. raised Julius Caesar as its scholar-king, emperor of Rome.

You see, the parasite worked all the various angles. They worked the great man angle with the scholar-king Tullius Caesero and they worked the political environment angle with Plato's Republic with its philosopher-kings. This is how they imposed a monarchy/dictatorship in Rome. Then once the proscriptions became common, Rome quickly became under the Mideast yoke. The only ones left were dumb "yoke-als" that went along with the yoke. Then if the parasite ever sucked too hard, they could blame the schmuck-ornament (our-name-ment) king-Caesar, whack him, and get a new one. This incidentally is why there were so many 'decadent' Emperors. The decadence was part of the excuse. This way, when the parasite pulled too hard, they would hang it on the key-sir, kill him and get a new hood (oo-de) ornament.

Suetonius, the Lives of the Caesars: Julius Caesar 10

"During his aedileship, Caesar... arranged wild animal hunts and theatrical performances... He also arranged a gladiatorial show, but with somewhat fewer pairs of gladiators than he originally planned. This was because the group he had purchased was so large that their sheer number terrified his political enemies. These enemies then passed legislation restricting the number of gladiators that anyone could keep in Rome."

Julius Caesar was pure evil

If you believe in freedom and justice, you should not regard Julius Caesar as anything but an evil anti-democratic Mideast frontman. According to ancient texts, Julius Caesar killed a million free people in Gaul (France) and enslaved another million. Then he went on to be the man who dissolved the Roman 'Republic' and instituted a murderous and enslaving Europe-wide 'monarchy' that lasted for over 500 years. When this imperial 'monarchy' began, Europe had a city (Rome) with a population of around 5 million (in the time of Augustus). It also had many writers and libraries. However, by the 700s, Europe had no community of more than 25,000 people and only one anti-book full of useless information was left to replace what was obviously a vast library. In fact at this time, all other books except this anti-book were outlawed. So when you hear the name Julius Caesar, you should imagine an Adolph Hitler of 2,070 years ago, only an Adolph Hitler who's side and administration won.

3) The CAESAR and the SEIZURE of power

Catullus, Poems, 93

"Caesar, I have no great desire to try to learn about you, or even to know whether you are black or white."

Suetonius, d.160AD, personal traits of Julius Caesar

"His stature is said to have been tall, his complexion light and clear, with eyes that were quick, lively and black, set in a face somewhat full. His limbs were round and strong, and he was also very healthy, except towards his later days when he was given to sudden fainting and disturbances of sleep. And twice in the conduct of military affairs, he was seized with the falling sickness [epilepsy]. In the care of his person, his scrupulousness almost approached the fantastical. For he not only kept the hair of his head closely cut and had his face smoothly shaved, but even had the [dense black] hair on other parts of his body plucked out by the roots, a whim for which he was often teased."

Plutarch, Cicero, 7

"he was starting to go in for politics more seriously. And he came to the conclusion that it was a disgraceful thing that, while a craftsman who uses inanimate tools and inanimate materials still knows what each of these is called, and where each can be found, as well as what each can do. However, the statesman, who uses men as his tools for public action, is often slack and indifferent where knowledge of his fellow citizens is concerned. He therefore trained himself not only to memorize names, but also to know in what part of the city every important person lived, where he had his country houses, and who his friends and neighbors were. And so, whatever road in Italy Cicero happened to be traveling on, it was easy for him to name and to point out the estates and villas of his friends." [What a waste of mental energy for our leaders. What a back door for a man with a scroll-carrying brotherly advisors. Indeed the Brothers probably shared information/scrolls.]

Cicero, Brutus, c. 50BC

"Many instances can be produced in which the people have voluntarily increased the power of their rulers, but few if any in which the rulers have willingly abridged their authority"

James Madison

"There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power, than by violent and sudden usurpations."

Thomas Jefferson

"Experience has shown that even under the best forms of government those entrusted with power have, in time, and by slow operations, perverted it into tyranny."

Absolute power corrupts absolutely

We see this idea offered repeatedly in Star Trek mythology. With ordinary men, we are hard pressed to figure out a reason why. However, with respect to disposable figure-head front-men, we see that their corruption is just the latest mask of Mideast Inc. feeding on its host societies. Here is why some men so power hungry and here is how they so often rise to power over us.

Aeschylus, d. 456BC, Agamemnon, 1355

"The lust for power never dies — men cannot ever have enough. But nobody will ever lift a finger to send it from his door"

Ammianus Marcellinus, 354-378AD, 29.1

"Their property was collected by the treasury and used by the [Arab figurehead] emperor for his own purposes, while the condemned were ground down by fearful poverty and reduced to beg for their bread" [with a monarchy or a lig•archy, all the public's tax money can be squandered on overpriced purchases and outright gifts to people beholden to the parasite.]

Euripides, Heracleidae, line 1

"For years, I've known that anyone who's just
Is born to serve his neighbors, but the man
Who persists in feathering his own nest
Has no public spirit and is hard to deal with."

Cicero, Republic, 34

[This is the great philosopher/ orator/ statesman/ general Tullius Cicero / Julius Caesaro explaining why he dissolved the free

and democratic Roman republic and instituted a totalitarian dictatorship in 48BC. Tullius Caesaro was of course a Mideast frontman and this is why the Caesar seized power.]

What can be more noble than national government by virtue? For here the man who rules others is not himself a slave to any passion, but has already developed all those qualities which he is teaching and bringing forth in his fellow men. Such a man imposes no laws upon the people that he does not obey himself, but puts his own life before his fellow citizens as the model for them to follow. If a single individual of this character could arrange all things properly in a State, there would be no need of more than one ruler. Or if the citizens as a body could see what was best and agree on it, no one would desire a selected group of rulers [an oligarchy]. It is the difficulty of formulating policies that has transferred the power from a monarch to a larger number [democracy]— And it is the perversity and rashness [fickleness?] of popular assemblies [legislatures] that has transferred it [power back] from the many to the few. Thus between the weakness of a single ruler and the rashness [fickleness] of the many, aristocracies have occupied that intermediate position which represents the utmost moderation. And in a State ruled by its best men [Gr. aristo = best + Gr. cracy=power], the citizens must necessarily enjoy the greatest happiness, being freed from all cares and worries, when once they have entrusted the preservation of their tranquility to others, whose duty it is to guard it vigilantly and never to allow the people to think that their interests are being neglected by their rulers.

But the equality of legal rights of which free peoples are so fond cannot be maintained. This is because the people themselves, through free and unrestrained, give very special powers to many individuals, and create great distinctions among men and the honors granted to them. And what is called equality is really most inequitable. For when equal honor is given to the highest and the lowest — for men of both types must exist in every nation — then this very 'fairness' is most unfair. But this cannot happen in States ruled by their best citizens. These arguments and others like them, Laelius, are approximately those which are advanced by men who consider this form of government the best.

Laelius: But what about yourself, Scipio? Which of these three forms do you consider the best?

Scipio: You are right to ask which I consider the best of the three, because I do not approve of any of them when employed by itself, and consider the form which is a combination of all of them superior to any single one of them. But if I were compelled to approve of one single unmixed form... [Missing text]...

The name of king seems like that of father to us, since the king provides for the citizens as if they were his own children, and is more eager to protect them than [missing text] to be sustained by the care of one man who is the most virtuous and most eminent. But here are the aristocrats, with the claim that they can do this more effectively, and that there will be more wisdom in the counsels of several than in this one man, and an equal amount of fairness and scrupulousness. [begin palimpsest] And here also are the people, shouting with a loud voice that they are willing to obey neither one nor a few, that nothing is sweeter than liberty even to wild beasts, and that all who are slaves, whether to a king or to an aristocracy, are deprived of liberty. [end palimpsest] Thus kings attract us by our affection for them, aristocracies by their wisdom, and popular governments by their freedom, so that in comparing them it is difficult to say which I prefer.....

Cicero, Republic c.50BC, 42

"After explaining my ideas about the form of Government I consider ideal, I will explain the changes which frequently happen to Governments. Though I think such changes will not happen easily in the Nation I have in mind.

But the first and most certain of these changes is the one that takes place in kingships. When the king begins to be unjust, that form of government immediately ends, and the king becomes a tyrant. This is the worst sort of government, though closely related to the best. For when the best men overthrow it, as usually happens, then the State is in the second of its three stages.

This form is similar to a kingship, being one in which a paternal council [oligarchy/ aristocracy] of leading men makes good provision for the people's welfare. But if the people themselves have killed or driven out the tyrant, they govern rather moderately, as long as they are wise and prudent, and, delighting in their exploit, they endeavor to maintain the government they have themselves set up. But if the people ever rebel against a just king and deprive him of his kingdom, or, as happens more frequently, taste the blood of the aristocracy and subject the whole Nation to their own caprices (and do not dream, Laelius, that any sea or any conflagration is so powerful that it cannot be more easily subdued than an unbridled multitude enjoying unwonted power), then we have a condition which is splendidly described by Plato, if only I can reproduce his description in Latin; it is difficult, but I will attempt it. [The host language Latin was often said to lack the vocabulary and expressive power of the parasite's language, Greek.]

43. He [Plato] says: 'When the insatiable throats of the people have become dry with thirst of liberty, and, served by evil ministers, they have drained in their thirst a draught of liberty which, instead of being moderately tempered, is too strong for them, then, unless the magistracies and men of high rank are very mild and indulgent, serving them with liberty in generous quantities, the people persecute them, charge them with crime and impeach them, calling them despots, kings, and tyrants.' I think you are familiar with this passage.

Laelius: It is very familiar to me.

Scipio: He continues thus: 'It follows in such a Nation, that liberty prevails everywhere, to such an extent that not only are homes one and all without a master [paterfamilias] but the vice of anarchy extends even to the domestic animals, until finally the father fears his son, and the son flouts his father. All sense of shame disappears, and all is so absolutely free that ... the schoolmaster fears and flatters his pupils and pupils despise their masters... wives have the same rights as their husbands... even the dogs, horses and livestock are free and running around in the streets so that men must make way for them.'

Tullius Cicero, On Laws' III, c.50BC

[This was written just as Julius Caesar's army was wrapping up its massacre and enslavement of Gaul/France and Britain in 58-49BC. During this time, Caesar had killed 1-million people and enslaved another 1-million people. This was just before the tyrannical Mideast figurehead Julius Caesar seized (same word) power in 48BC and ended the democratic Roman Republic. Here we see our parasite working to reintroduce a monarchy to the Roman Republic, but under a new name.]

"...what these philosophers debated was whether it is desirable for a nation to have one single ruler obeyed by all. I understand that this was at first considered the best course by our ancestors after they got rid of their kings. The monarchy

had in earlier days been well regarded, but was subsequently rejected, not so much because there was anything wrong with how things were run, but because it seemed dishonorable to be ruled by one man. So, at the next stage, if one single official was going to be chosen to rule, it would have appeared that it was merely the royal title which had been abolished, while the institution of monarchy itself remained unchanged."

58 years into the Caesar dynasty

58 years later (in 14AD), the administration of front-emperor Tiberius ended the popular election of Roman magistrates. The parasite did this because it could get away with it. By this time, democracy in Rome had faded so far, that the parasite could simply eliminate the elections. After this, the leadership fronting for Mideast Inc. no longer needed to please the public at all. From this point, Rome rapidly declined due to the parasitic frontman killing all the Rumi that posed any threat to the Mideast parasite.

Velleius Paterculus, A History of Rome, 2.126.2-5

[The parasite generally backs off on its struggle and gives peace when it gets what it wants. This is so people of the host civilization think that pleasing the parasite will help them achieve peace. Unfortunately the appetite of the Haremi brothers and their spawn is insatiable. And regardless of what we do, they will never be satisfied for long. They will always come back and they will do whatever they can to get more for their cause. The following quote starts out talking about the post Caesar civil war period and how they had backed off. It should be noted that this backing off caused it to be necessary for the grandchildren of these people to kill everyone in Arabia in 69AD, about 97 years after Rome had secured the Red Sea.]

"Credit has been restored to the Forum. Strife has been banished from the forum. Campaigning for office [banished] from the Campus Martius. Justice, equity, and industry, long buried and forgotten, have been restored to Rome. Magistrates once more have authority. The Senate has its honors, and the courts have their dignity. The riots in the theatre have been suppressed. [In the days before printing, ideas were spread in theaters (audi•ori•ums = hear•say•ums). So people would naturally go to the theatre to hear the news and to assemble and organize politically. And the parasite would help them. Then it would send in its forces and massacre a great number of trouble makers in one stroke.] Everyone has either been inspired with desire, or forced by necessity to do what is right. Good and right are now honored, and evil and wrong are now punished. The humble man respects the man of power, but does not fear him. The man of power has precedence over the humble man, but does not despise him.

[New subject] And when were grain prices more reasonable? When were the blessings of peace greater? The peace of Augustus has spread to the regions of the east and of the west, and to the boundaries of the north and south. This [peace] protects every corner of the world from the fear of brigandage [land piracy].

The munificence of the Emperor [Tiberius] takes upon itself the accidental losses not merely of individual citizens but of whole cities. The cities of Asia have been restored, the provinces have been liberated from the outrageous misconduct of their [imperial] magistrates. Such honors are now only given to those who deserve them, and the corrupt do not escape punishment. Fairness has replaced influence and favoritism, and merit has replaced clever campaigning for office. And the

best [Optimus] of emperors teaches his citizens to do right by himself doing right. And although he is great in his authority, he is even greater in his example." [Thus we see the parasite struggling to justifying its tyranny.]

Epictetus, d.120AD, Discourses 3.13.9

"the emperors appears to have provide us with profound peace in that there are no longer wars, nor battles, nor extensive piracy or brigandage [land piracy]. At any time we can travel the roads or sail from the rising of the sun to its setting."

Virgil, Aeneid, d. 19BC, 6.756-853

"Augustus Caesar, son of god, who will once again establish the Golden Age of Latinum, in the region once ruled by Saturn, and will extend the empire beyond the Garamantes and the Indians [of India]."

Horace, c. 13BC, Odes, 4.15

"The age of Caesar has brought fertile crops to the fields and has restored to our own Jupiter, the military standards stripped from the proud [uprising] columns [armies] of the Parthians [Arabs]. Freed of wars, it has closed Janus' temple. It has put reins on license overstepping righteous bounds. It has wiped away our sins and revived the ancient virtues through which the Latin name and the might of Italy waxed great, and the fame and majesty of our empire were spread from the sun's bed in the west to the east. So long as Caesar is the guardian of the state, neither civil dissension nor violence shall banish peace, or wrath that forges swords and brings discord and misery to cities. Not those who drink from the deep Danube shall violate the orders of Caesar, nor the Getae, nor the Seres [Chinese], nor the perfidious Parthians [Arabs], nor those born by the Don river [This runs from near Moscow to flow into the Caspian Sea]. And we on both sacred and profane days, amidst the gifts of merry Bacchus, together with our wives and children, will first duly pray to the gods; then, after the tradition of our ancestors, in songs to the accompaniment of Lydian flutes we will hymn leaders whose duty is done, and Troy and Anchises [Aeneas' father] and benign Venus' offspring" [Clearly, if the Arabs had the power to back off on war, they also had the power to start wars. Also, note they way they backed off for a while, once they got what they wanted..]

Intersect Caesar & Seizer

I remember reading somewhere how Julius Caesaro had the idea of marching his legions on the Mideast a couple days after the so-called Ides of March (the idea of a march) when he was stabbed to death by an angry mob. Supposedly his body was dragged and burned unceremoniously without incense, thus assuring that he would not have a stairway to heaven with the gods, and he body would stink or sink, or something like that.

Clearly it was a mob that killed the power seizer named Jew•ally•us Caesar. Remember. Remember. Remember. This is the man who ended all pretenses of Roman democracy once and for all. Remember that fact. Julius Caesar was the seizer that ended Roman democracy in 44BC.

And we know that it was a mob that killed the first Caesar/seizer. The ancients say that, even the Shakespearian propaganda play says it. Why would a mob kill Caesar when one good body stab would have eventually proven fatal in those days? What sort of dummy would give a second stab if he knew that Caesar would already die slowly and in agony? So the mob was not small and conspiratorial in nature like we see so vividly in the Shakespeare propaganda, hidden under the sacred play by the "great and illustrious" (if not impossible

to understand) William Shakespeare.

And look at the centerpiece of the play by William Shakespeare. Remember that line: 'Et tu Brutus?', lying at the heart of the play. And you too my dear friend Brutus? What a lie. Caesar's own henchmen did not kill him, an angry mob of democratic Romans got ahold of him (even after all the many purges), and they all stabbed him one after another. And they could not hide the fact that Br•oo•tus lead the event. They couldn't hide that, it was too memorable. All they could do was use the false anarchy of the CNN of the day to bend the story. And then 1600 years later when the tale started to ring hollow, they used the "great" William Shakespeare to reinforce the idea.

It was an angry mob of Romans struggling against an invisible puppet-master, a Mideast hydra. — and the seizer was just the disposable figurehead. He was disposable at least, once the purges got started as in that film Looper. I have to stop that. We all have to stop that from happening. And we have to realize that most people are whacked by the parasite, not by death, but by mind addling drugs. Take it from someone who had that stuff in his mouth when he was a boy, someone who luckily spit out just enough to keep his reasoning powers intact, but got enough of it that he was someone else for a couple weeks.

Anyway, I say this: Your first duty under freedom is to kill all Caesars, all kings and all presidents by a painful way if you can. Firebrand them, or burn them with gasoline if you can. Or blind and deafen them, or whatever. Otherwise shoot them. And do the same thing with all the billionaire lig•archs. If you are in the entourage of these men, you will stand with them and suffer their fate unless you do this. Killing them is the only way to defend yourselves from suffering their fate with them.

Then the invisible Mideast spirit who held Caesar up as their figurehead appeared to retreat for a while. It staged this fake civil war between the Arab Oct•avians = 8•br•ids and the M•arch An•toni=thought•rule New•bigs of Rome. Julius Caesar died in 44 and it was not until 31, 13 years later that the Octavian/Augustus side defeated the other side. Make no mistakes about it. This civil war covers up an extensive purge in Rome. This started out very slowly at first and then over a decade, it purged Rom of its upper and middle class. First it was the upper class and then the upper middle class, and then just the middle class. Then there was nothing but the lower middle class and lower class to oppose the parasite. This will happen again soon if you let it.

Tacitus, Annals, 1.2

"Augustus enticed the soldiers with gifts, the people with grain, and all men with the allurements of peace. Thus he gradually grew in power, concentrating in his own hands the functions of the senate, the magistrates, and the laws. Nobody opposed him, for the most courageous had fallen in battle had already died in battle, or in the proscriptions [where they told people to kill themselves or be tortured to death]. As for the remaining nobles, the readier they were for enslavement, the higher were they raised in wealth and offices. These grew rich thanks to the revolution and preferred the safety of the present to the dangers of the past.

The provinces were not opposed to this state of affairs either. They distrusted the government of the senate and the people on account of their [prior] struggles with the powerful, rapacious officials [of Rome]. At the same time, the protection afforded them by the Roman law didn't work. On top of this, the Roman law was repeatedly thrown into confusion by violence, intrigue and finally bribery...

At home, all was peaceful. The [elected] officials bore the same titles as before [although everything had changed]. The younger generation was born after the victory of Actium, and even many of the older generation had been born during the civil wars. Few were left who had seen the Republic! [Julius Caesar's army attacked Rome in 49BC, and then after 22 years of civil war, Octavian was given the title Augustus.]

The constitution had been transformed, and there was nothing at all left of the good old way of life. Stripped of equality, all looked to the commands of the princeps with no apprehension for the present, while Augustus in the vigor years of his life maintained his power and the power of his [harem] family, as well as maintaining the peace."

Strabo, c. 14AD, Geography, 6.4.2

"Italy has frequently been torn by faction, at least since it has been under Roman rule. And Rome itself has been prevented from growing too corrupt by her superb form of government [The media is always saying this about American democracy] and her rulers. For it would be simply too difficult to administer an empire as large as Rome's except by turning it over to one man, as a father. And indeed, throughout history, never have the Romans and their allies [provinces = because-of-victory] thrived in such great peace and plenty as that which Augustus Caesar provided from the time when he first assumed absolute power.

And today, this [same state of affairs] is being given to them by his son and successor Tiberius, who is now presiding [acting as president]. Tiberius made Augustus the model of his administration and decrees, as have his children Germanicus and Drusus, who are helping their father." [Julius Caesar was the 1st Roman emperor and ruled for 4 years before he was stabbed to death by a mob. His adopted nephew Augustus ruled for 41 years (27BC to 14AD). Augustus's son Tiberius ruled for 23 years.]

Tacitus, Annals, 1.74.1

"Caepio took up a way of life that the miseries of the age and the shamelessness of men soon made popular. Indigent, unknown, and restless, he first wormed his way, by means of his private reports, into the confidence of his pitiless sovereign. It was not long before he had become a terror to the entire nobility. He acquired the favor of one man [Emperor Tiberius] and the hatred of all, and those who followed the example that he set rose from beggary to riches, from objects of contempt to objects of fear, until at last, they crowned the ruin of others with their own."

Tacitus, Annals, 4.30.3

"It was proposed the informers should get no reward when a person accused of treason committed suicide before the trial was over. The motion was on the point of passing when Tiberius... spoke for the informers, complaining that the laws would be ineffective and the state brought to the brink of disaster. He said, 'better to subvert the constitution than to remove its guardians.' Thus the informers, a breed invented for the public ruin and never adequately curbed even by penalties, were lured on by reward."

Seneca, On Benefits, 3.26

"Under Tiberius Caesar, there was such a common and almost universal frenzy for bringing charges of treason that it decimated the Roman citizenry more severely than did the whole civil war. It seized upon drunken conversations, upon

innocent words spoken in jest. Nothing was safe. Anything served as an excuse for venting this rage, and the fate of the accused was never in doubt, for there was only one outcome."

Seneca, Crowds (letter 7)

[Seneca died in 65AD and the colosseum was built in the 70's AD. Today, instead of seeing people die for real in shows, we go to see film shows where make-believe 'fantasy' death, is depicted up close, and often in rapid-fire sequences. And of course sometimes we see this in our own homes during "family time".]

"Nothing harms one's character so much as lounging at the games/ shows. This pleasure paves the path for vice to creep in. What, specifically, do I mean? I come home more greedy, more self-seeking, more pleasure-loving, yes, but even more cruel and more inhuman because I have been among humans. [Important thoughts are missing here]

[Recently,] I arrived during the noon interlude at the arena, expecting some clever comedy or parody, some break from the human gore. The show was the opposite. The fighting that had gone before was charity by contrast. Now there was no nonsense about it, this was pure murder. The men were completely unarmed and their bodies completely exposed and every stroke was a tell [tele=end, completion]. Many spectators prefer this to the usual competition and to the championship matches. Why shouldn't they? There is no helmet or shield to parry the steel. Why armor? Why skill? Such things delay the kill. In the morning, men are thrown to the lions and bears. At noon, to the spectators. They order those who have made a kill to be thrown to others who will kill them, and the victor is kept for fresh slaughter. The conclusion of every fight is death. No quarter is given. And this goes on even when the stands are empty. [the first purpose is to purge the host society of the troublemakers, the second priority is to make a spectacle of it.] 'But the fellow was a highwayman. He killed a man!' So what. Because he killed a man he deserves this fate?

But what did you do, my poor man, to deserve having to look at this? 'Cut him, Drive him out [to fight] with a whip and firebrand [a piece of wood with burning red charcoal at one end]

Why are his strokes so hesitant? Why is he so timid about meeting the blade? Why is he so reluctant to die? Scourge [whip/ beat] him so he will face up to his slashing! 'Make them trade blows, bared breast to bared breast!' Then comes the intermission: 'Let's have a little throat cutting; we must have some action!'

Epictetus, Lectures Collected by Arrian 4.13.5

"In Rome, reckless men are trapped by soldiers [secret police forces] in the following manner. A soldier [officer] in civilian clothing sits down beside you and begins to criticize the emperor. Then if... you add what's on your mind, you will a moment later be bound and lead away." [Epictetus was expelled by the administration of emperor Domitian in 89AD, 20 years after Judaeen Arabia was massacred. By this time, Rome was clearly a police state, run by the parasite. It was a place where the enemies of the parasite became the enemies of its figurehead.]

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities, 4.24.4

[This is a picture of Rome's problems with Arab immigrant desperadoes.]

"Things have come to such a state of confusion and the noble traditions of the Roman commonwealth have become so debased and sullied [corrupt and sordid] that some who have

made a fortune by robbery, housebreaking, prostitution, and every other base means, purchase their freedom with the money so acquired and thus immediately become Romans. Others, who have been confidants and accomplices of their masters in poisonings, murders, and crimes against the gods or the state, receive from them this reward. Some are freed so that they can receive the monthly allowance of grain given at the public expense, or any other largess distributed by the leading men to the poor among the citizens, and bring it to those who have granted them their freedom. And others owe their freedom to the levity of their masters and to their vain thirst for popularity. I, at any rate, know of some men who have allowed all their slaves to be freed after their death, so that when dead they might be called good men and their funerals might be attended by a throng of mourners wearing liberty caps [The pilleus, a cap worn by an emancipated slave as a symbol of their freedom.] on their heads...

Such...disgraces...should not be allowed into the body politic. I would like to see the censors...or...some important magistrates take this matter in hand, inquiring into those freed each year. Who are they and why and how were they freed?"

Augustus purged the Roman senate in 29/28BC, 18BC, and again in 13BC

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus

This volume contains books 50-56, running from 32BC to 14AD.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, Penguin introduction

"It is clear enough to us, and was clear enough to Tacitus that the periods of temporary mastery over the state enjoyed by such as Sulla and Caesar were a logical prelude to the establishment of the permanent and institutionalized dominion [monarchy] which we call the principate [the Roman Empire]. But this must have been far from clear to the participants in the events of the dramatic 60-years between 91 and 21BC. [In other words, the Romans didn't realize that their democracy was being steered down the tubes by the many Mideast immigrants in leadership and herd-steering positions in their land. And surely this was no more obvious to the Romans than to people today.]

The republic had existed for over 400 years, ever since the expulsion of the last king at the end of the 6th century. [Rome began as a democracy, just like Athens and just like the US.] During that time, there had been major changes in the constitution, and major changes in the way in which power was exercised in society. There had been many internal and external crises in which ambitious and fortunate men had challenged for [FE = Foreigner english], or actually enjoyed for a while a share of power greater than would ordinarily have been tolerated. Yet the republic had survived them all...

A conspicuous characteristic of their state was its capacity to absorb and resolve conflict within the framework of a set of institutions which retained the names, and often apparently the powers, which they had always had, but which in practice were perceptibly modified. Adaptation there might be, but the basic elements endured: a pair of annual consuls elected by popular assembly... governing with the advice of a senate composed of those who had been, were, or aspired to be magistrates themselves, while legislation came before the popular assembly...

[1] Here is one reason why the Arabs are so insistent about

having a monarch somewhere in every democracy. It is so the powers of this monarch can later be expanded, and the democratic parts of government made impotent. In governments around the world we again and again see the eternal struggle of the Arabs pushing to expand the powers of the front-man monarch. So it is easy to see this process going on today. So it never stopped, did it?

2) Everyone, please, no more monarchs or oligarchs anywhere on earth. These individuals are so weak and easy for the democrats of the world to eliminate. And we should all realize that with regard to tyrants and monarchs that the prime directive is Arab propaganda. We must take action, if only to prevent the Kim Arab Moles of the world from starting WW3. We must take action, if only to prevent Arab fronting tyrants from feeding and keeping Ishtar alive.]

and all citizens except the poorest had an obligation to serve as required in the army for a certain number of campaigning seasons. [The Arab were purging Rome of all but its poorest over many generations through endless wars with barbarians.] So there was no necessity to suppose that with a modification here, an adjustment there, the state could not last indefinitely, [And it was obvious to all the wise guys on the Arab side that Rome was going down the tubes] still recognizably the republic, still the same but different. [It still looked like the same republic, but it was actually a murderous Arab-fronting tyranny. Nothing new was happening.] Even the civil war which broke out in 49BC between Pompey and Caesar had its predecessor in the far bitterer conflict between Sulla and the supporters of Marius in the eighties. So the bout of armed struggle which lasted, with changes of protagonists and intervals of uneasy calm, from Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon [A river that is oddly on the east side of Italy, when Caesar came from France. Caesar crossed the Arabi-con and seems to have been fighting in the East.] down to Augustus's capture of Alexandria in 30BC, was surely not seen by contemporaries as the 'death of the republic'. [The Arabs tried very hard not to alarm the host democracy.]

It was a great achievement of Augustus to perform a kind of conjuring trick, by which all the traditional organs of the state continued to function, while he himself, taking no power that was without precedent, retained a position [as monarch] within the state — that is, the *res publica* [or democracy of Rome].

Augustus, by contriving that Tiberius should succeed to all his powers, established at his death a quasi-hereditary monarchy; and it was not until then that the conceptual difference, familiar to us, between 'republic' and 'empire' could be formulated. The idea that principatus, 'the principate' (in effect, a soft term for 'monarchy', which Roman political susceptibilities did not allow), can stand in opposition to, and not simply describe a form of *res publica*, does not appear until a hundred years later, in the writings of Tacitus. So if Augustus or his supporters ever claimed — and they probably did not — to have 'restored the republic', they were not trying to gull and unsuspecting public.

What Augustus had done, by his victory over Antony and subsequent diplomatic arrangements, was to bring a period of freedom from threat by internal or external enemies. Peace and a measure of de facto political stability, allowed the normal organs of government, the consuls, Senate and people [che Roma, SPQR], to resume their accustomed roles. Augustus came to occupy a somewhat special place, but other great men of the recent past had likewise enjoyed positions which strayed outside the bounds set by strict application of constitutional norms. Principis indeed he was, but not the first in

Rome's history. All societies possess their 'leading men', which is all the word means. However, he remained sole princeps for the whole of the rest of this life, and Dio is Right when he remarks that 'from this time, a monarchy strictly speaking, was established (53.17.1).

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, Penguin introduction

"It was an important peculiarity of the Roman constitution that the authority (imperium) with which it invested its highest magistrates, the consuls and praetors, was simultaneously civil and military, so that a Roman general was inescapably also a 'career politician'.

Since organized parties were unknown, success in politics depended on the ability to build up personal support and to form effective links with others who could command it for you. The alliance between Marius and Saturninus had shown how powerful the votes of the soldiers who identified their interest with those of Marius could be. They made this identification because they depended on Marius's ability, a politician, to pass the legislation necessary to give them their hoped-for rewards. Marius had not in fact wished to use his army in an improper manner, but the political link between commander [politician] and soldier had been created [in Roman culture]. Sulla by his march, brought out its full implications. The army of the state no longer behaved like the state under arms. It had become an alienated part of the state. In the civil wars that followed the murder of Caesar, soldiers were repeatedly induced to change sides by promises of better rewards.

Looked at in another way, this behavior means that the army was willing to use its strength to seize back some of the agricultural wealth of Italy which in the economic changes of the second century had diverted into richer hands. This truth was never expressed in such terms by the Romans, but it was the fundamental fact which underlay the escalating struggle for power that characterized the 50-years between Sulla's death and Augustus's ending of the civil wars. [So all of Rome's wealth became concentrated in the hands of a tiny over-class. And Julius Caesar, the man who finally ended Roman democracy used this injustice to establish a murderous dictatorship with an even greater concentration of power. Isn't this exactly what happened in the communist revolutions of Russia, China, Vietnam, Cambodia, and so many other nations?]

There were of course many other factors: the greed, ambition and quarrelsome pride of the Roman aristocracy; the vast scale of the rewards to be wrung from the provinces; the huge gap between rich and poor; the continued existence of political institutions which were unsuitable for governing Italy, let alone an empire; the growth of the city of Rome into a metro-polis [mother-city], the inbuilt militarism of the state; and the social acceptance of violence as a means of self-help — to name only some of the more important. But in the breakdown of politics into armed struggle, the allegiance of armies to their commanders rather than to Rome (for what had 'Rome' done for them?) was crucial."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, Penguin introduction

"The murder of Julius Caesar by Brutus, Cassius and other disaffected senators on the Ides of March 44BC, brought his 18-year old heir and great-nephew Octavian [later renamed Augustus] back to Rome to demand vengeance on [FE] the murders, to claim his inheritance, and to challenge the consul Antony for the leadership of the Caesarian party. Claiming adoption by [Julius] Caesar's will and assuming the potent

name of Caesar, he won the favor of the city plebs and was able to raise a private army from among his 'father's' veterans to such good effect that before the end of 43, he and Antony, with Marcus Lepidus, had established a tyranny sanctioned by law, holding quasi-dictatorial powers as 'Triumvirs for the Organization of the State' and [for] carrying out a savage purge of their political opponents [and for a program of land and wealth reform] After Brutus and Cassius were defeated... in 42BC, Antony... dealt...with the eastern provinces... and Lepidus dealt with the western provinces. Octavian had the thankless job of taking land in Italy from ordinary Italians in order to fulfill the promises the triumvirs used to induce their troops to fight against their fellow citizens.

This stirred up a hornet's nest. Antony's wife Fulvia and brother Lucius expressed the outrage of Italy by raising [an] armed revolt against the triumviral authority of Octavian. They were almost successful [thanks to the support of the secret third party that always struggles to kill as many Rumi as possible on both sides], but in the end were besieged in Perugia and starved out in the spring of 40BC." [but in the end, the monarchy had to win, so that is what the Arabs all struggled for.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, Penguin introduction

"The Roman plebs continued to elect Augustus to the consulship every year. His popularity with them was overwhelming, and the office of course gave him all the constitutional power he needed in Rome, but it had certain disadvantages as a means of running a state. Repeated holding of the consulship [as in the US and China today] was against the law and practice of the last [prior FE] 150 years"

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, Penguin introduction

"None of the foregoing should obscure the fact that the constitutional arrangements were merely a vessel to accommodate Augustus's mastery of the state, won by violence and justified by success."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, Penguin introduction

"Augustus's real power was unchallengeable, based solidly on three chief elements: his popularity with the people of Rome, his support among the non-political upper classes of the Italian towns and the loyalty of the army to the name Caesar. These were reinforced in many ways. The soldiers swore a personal oath of loyalty to their commander, who was in nearly all cases Augustus himself. After 12BC, the spirit (Genius) and household gods of Augustus were not only worshipped empire-wide by all, but shared shrines in the legionary [Army] camps with those talismanic objects of military reverence, the eagles.

Until 6AD, the emperor funded [military] discharge pensions out of his won resources. All appointments to officer service in the [army] legions were in [FE] his gift, and with it membership of [in or to FE] the equestrian order, which in turn gave access to a senatorial career, or to responsible and privileged posts in the service of the emperor. The [Roman] army was thus [an] avenue to the status sought by men whose families were locally prominent but aspired to higher things.

The regions of Italy had suffered badly in the civil wars, but had nothing to gain from them— except finally a more rational system of government. Julius Caesar had made it a point of cultivating them, and now they had every reason to offer their support and gratitude to the regime.

And as for the people of Rome, [the Arab run] Augustus [administration] looked after them handsomely. He provided food, water supplies, shows, splendid new buildings

and proper administration of the city. Not for nothing did he receive the title 'Father of his Country' (Pater Patriae). His power and patronage were all-pervasive, his [Saddam Hussein like] images in public places and on the coinage ubiquitous, his very father a god. His [frontman] control of the state went deep, and rested on far firmer foundations than constitutional legality; but constitutional legality was still necessary."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 51.17

"After this, he [Augustus] imposed a tribute on Egypt, and entrusted it to Cornelius Gallus to govern. [This fellow, Mr. Corn World was probably very aggressive in taxing any wealth or harvest surplus he saw] Because of the great size of the population, both in the cities and in the countryside, and of the impressionable and fickle nature of the inhabitants, the quantity of the grain supply, and the wealth of the whole country, so far from venturing to entrust the territory to any senator, he would not even allow one to live there, unless he personally gave permission to the individual by name. [So it was only the in-it, or innie senators that managed Egypt for Rome.]

Dio Cassius, Roman History, 51.20.6

"Meanwhile Octavian, besides attending to the general business [of the empire], gave permission for the dedication of areas sacred to Rome in Ephesus and Nicaea [both in Turkey] in honor of his father Caesar, whom he named as the deity Julius.

He ordered the Roman residents of these places to pay honor to this god. But the aliens, who he called Greek, he allowed to consecrate certain precincts to himself, the Asians [that is] in Pergamum, Bythnia, and Nicomedia [all in Turkey]. This practice, [applicable to] not only among the Greek peoples, but also among all the other subjects of the Romans, began under him, and continued under other emperors. In the Capitol itself, and in the rest of Italy, no emperor, however worthy of renown, has dared to do this. Still, even there, various divine honors are bestowed after their death upon such emperors as have ruled uprightly and in fact shrines are even built to them."

[1] It is a Mideast custom to deify emperors. This custom began with the Romans when the Caesar seized power in 48BC.

2) It is simply wrong to revere monarchs living or dead with deification, memorials, and even statues.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 51.21

[Octavian/Augustus] "Granted the populace 400 sesterces each. This was first to the grown men, and then to the young men... Octavian refused to accept gold from the Italian cities... and not only paid all the debts which he owed... but cancelled all the debts owed to him. Because of these concessions, the Romans forgot all the hardships they had suffered and accepted his triumph with pleasure, as though the enemies he had conquered had all been foreigners. Indeed the quantity of money circulating everywhere in the city was so huge that the price of goods increased, and loans for which the borrower had willingly paid 12% could now be obtained for 4%."

[1] The fact that no money seems to have been paid to female Romans matches up with both the high rates of female infanticide and the shortage of women we read about in Rome of this era.

2) When the Arabs want everyone to feel good, they flood the market with their stolen money, like in the film Water-world.

3) They slashed interest rates from 12% to 4%.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.9

"in democracies, the greater the number of men who are endowed with wealth and courage, the more they compete for honor, and thereby strengthen the state."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.9

"in democracies, the greater the number of men who are endowed with wealth and with courage, the more they compete for honor, and thereby strengthen the state..." The fact that this is so, and that democracies are greatly superior to monarchies, is shown by the example of Greece. So long as the GREEKS were subject to monarchies, they achieved nothing of consequence, but once they began to live under popular [democratic] rule, their fame spread throughout the world. The history of other races bears out the same principle. Those which live under tyrannies are always in a state of slavery [to their Arab front rulers]... Those who are governed by annually elected leaders are both free and independent [of Arab rule and Arab taxes. Note how it says annually elected.]

But why should we look at the examples of other nations when we have our own at home. We Romans first lived under a different form of government. Then, after enduring many harsh experiences, we longed for our liberty. After we won this, we rose to the position of proud authority we enjoy today. And yet our supremacy depends upon nothing else but the virtues bred by our democracy. On the power of those [democratic] principles, the [corrupt] Senate deliberates, the people [manipulated by a corrupt media] confirm their proposals, the soldiers are fired with ardor, and their commanders with ambition. None of these things could be achieved under a tyranny. At any rate, the ancient Romans hated [unchecked Arab fronting] tyranny so passionately for these reasons that they declared that form of government to be accursed."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.13

"It would be an immensely hard task to bring this city which has known democratic government for so many years, and which rules a huge empire to a state of slavery..."

They deposed Scipio [Africanus, Mr "African Ships"], after condemning him for some overweening action. And you will remember how they treated your own father, Julius Caesar [Seizer], because of the mere suspicion that he was trying to make himself a monarch... Having said this, I advise you to simply lay aside [your claim to] the monarchy. [Instead] you should first take on all those measures which the public interest demands, and settle all outstanding problems by decrees and laws, as was done by Sulla."

[When the Arabs get their first monarch in power over a democracy, they back off on all the strife they have caused the democracy. They throw everything into reverse and try to help fix everything they can in the democracy. They also don't call the first monarchs as monarchs. They are instead men with temporary or emergency powers, They are a brilliant leader with a mandate, or anything but a monarch. And they claim to rule only temporarily, for a short time. And they try to make a huge show of not wanting to renew this power. Otherwise the democracy will not accept the monarch. Here is an Arab heuristic guide to these ideas.]

I repeat... the Romans [Rumi] would find monarchic rule far more intolerable than my solution. If we considered all the possible misfortunes a nation might suffer, it would be absurd to be more frightened by the disagreements that naturally arise in a democracy, than by the tyrannical regimes that are the natural outcome of monarchy.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.16

"So long as our numbers were not large and we did not differ in any important respect from our neighbors, our system of government worked well, and we brought almost the whole of Italy under our rule. But ever since we ventured beyond our native soil, crossed the water, set foot on many islands and many continents, and filled the whole sea and whole earth with our name and power, we have experienced nothing but ill-fortune.

At first it was only at home that we split into factions and argued with one another. But later we introduced this sickness into even the army. For this reason, our city, like a great merchant vessel, manned with a crew of every race but lacking a pilot, has now for many generations continued to roll and plunge as it drifted here and there in a heavy sea, a ship without a ballast. Do not, then, allow her to be exposed to the storm any longer, for you can see that she is waterlogged. And do not let her be smashed to pieces on a reef, for here timbers are rotten and she will not be able to hold out much longer. But since the gods have taken pity on her and appointed you [Augustus, the prototypical Arab frontman] as her arbiter and overseer do not betray her. Act so that with your support she may continue her course in safety for the ages to come."

[1] When they spoke of Rome, it was not her overseas possessions or even Italy. However, it probably included the suburbs, the sub orbs, the county, or the places in the countryside where the city's count-ees lived. In other words, Rome count-ee.

2) The Arabs have difficulty infiltrating and bringing down nations when those places have no new Arab settlers.

3) Note how the terrifying shipwreck propaganda is melded with monarch propaganda.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.22

"I advise you to arrange these appointments as follows. The whole of Italy, that is the whole area beyond a radius of 100-miles from Rome, and likewise all those territories which acknowledge our rule — the various islands and continents — should be divided into districts, according to their separate races and nations. Those cities which are sufficiently strong and independent should be administered by one man with full powers and should also be treated as separate entities. You should then station a military force in each district or independent city, and send out as governor one of the former consuls, who will exercise overall authority, and two of the former praetors."

[It would appear that when Augustus says that Rome had a population 5-million in Res Gestae, he means the city of Rome, an area 200-Roman miles across.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.22

"you should not be surprised at my proposal to divide Italy as well as the other territories into these administrative regions. The country is so large and its population so numerous that it cannot be administered efficiently by magistrates residing in Rome."

[Again we see that Rome with a population of 5-million was not regarded as Italy, but only one of many cities/counties within Italy.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.27

"We must also maintain a standing army to be recruited from the citizen body, the allies and the subject nations. Its strength in the different provinces will vary according to the demands of the situation, and these troops should always be under arms

and continually training for active service."

[It should be noted here that this standing imperial Roman Army is exactly what Patrick Henry and other freedom lovers campaigned against around the time of the American revolution. Here is the force that the Arabs use to en-force their matrix governments and purge members of their flock that start to wake up from the matrix.]

... a standing army is necessary because... we have enemies living near our border on every side... [remember, barbarian is an anagram of Arrabian, and the Arabs stirring all these people up against Rome.]

[but we can't] allow everyone of military age to bear arms and train for combat, or rebellions and civil wars will constantly arise from their dissensions. But if we prevent them one and all from becoming soldiers and then afterwards need their help in war, we will be in constant danger, since we will only have untrained troops.

For this reason, it is my opinion that most men of military age should spend no part of their lives under arms or [receiving training] in military camps. [Only] the hardest among them, and those in greatest need of a livelihood should be enlisted and given military training. This class will be better soldiers if they spend all of their time in this one occupation, while the others will find it easier to pursue their farming, seafaring and other peacetime occupations if they are not obligated to serve on campaigns but have others to defend them. In this way, the most active men in the population, those who are in their physical prime, who are often compelled to win a livelihood by brigandage [crime and land piracy], will be maintained without harming others, and the rest will live their lives free from danger.

[1] It is vitally important for the Arab cause that some host nations always have enemies of the state, even if they are tiny terrorist cells. This is the justification for the giant armies that are:

- a) Highly profitable for the parasite's supply rackets.
- b) A way to stage highly profitable wars.
- c) A tool for intimidating the people.
- d) A tool for purging troublemakers here and there in times of peace.
- e) A way to stage massive purges in times of war.
- f) A way to punish other nations for moving away from Arab tyranny.

2) The Arabs desperately want their front governments to have a monopoly on power. They want their front governments to have the only army and the only police force. The Arabs absolutely hate the US second amendment. For this reason they endlessly struggle against the right to bear arms by endlessly sponsoring violent media and martyrdom media like the film Dear Wendy, as well as an endless stream of first-person shooter games. Then when a native American acts as a mass shooter, all their people in the media never let it die. They talk about it endlessly.

3) Note the line "most men of military age should spend no part of their lives under arms or [training] in military camps". This supports the comments in item #2 above.

4) Note the line "those in greatest need of a livelihood should be enlisted and given military training". And note how these men would be otherwise "often be compelled to win a livelihood by crime". So here the prototypical Arab frontman dictator is being advised to take the good-for-nothing criminal element of his society and give them military training, and exclude everyone else from military training. Thus these amoral criminals will be the unquestioning and loyal military supporting the prototypical Arab-fronting dictator.

5) Note how reasonable this all sounds. This is typical of the way the devil, the Arab de•ex•pull lies, turning pure black evil into lily whiteness over a few sophistic or wise-guy steps.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.28

"We cannot survive without soldiers, and soldiers will not serve without pay. But we should not worry about the idea that the need to raise money is confined to a monarchy, nor should we be led by such an argument to turn our backs on that system. Rather, we should begin from the assumption that, whatever form of government we adopt, we are still obliged to obtain funds [for the military].

I therefore propose that you should first sell the property which belongs to the state [the Arabs always want everything privatized. This way they can buy public property cheaply and make money on it for decades or even centuries.] — and I notice that in consequence of the wars that this has increased to a great extent... [One reason the Arabs like wars is that in wars they frequently get to sell things for much more than they are worth and buy things for much less than they are worth.]

[Then you should] lend out all the money obtained from these sales at a moderate rate of interest. In this way, not only will the land return to cultivation, as it is transferred to owners who will cultivate it themselves; but they will also in the process acquire a capital and become more prosperous, and the treasury will gain a permanent revenue which will cover its expenditure. [If government does this, very often, the Arabs will end up owning all the prime property. As well, the yield on money lent is generally lower than the yield on property that is leased.]

Next, I advise you to estimate the income from this sector [the farming sector] , and all the other sectors, such as the mines [which were all owned by the Roman government] You should then balance these [many incomes] against the estimate of total expenses. This should cover not only military expenses, but the state's other expenses, and it should have a reserve for unforeseen or emergency contingencies. After this, we will cover any revenue shortfalls by imposing a tax on all property without exception which yields a profit for its owners. [an income tax, or rather, an imputed income tax on all assets.] We will also set up a system of taxation for all the peoples over whom we rule. For it is only just and proper that no private individual or community should be exempt from these taxes, since they will enjoy the benefits provided them on the same basis as the rest. [Thus all of Europe was paying taxes to the Arabs at this time.]

You should appoint tax collectors to oversee this business in each region, and ensure that they bring in the total sum which falls due from all sources of revenue...

[It is best if] the taxpayers...pay their contributions in the small [monthly] installments assessed to them. But if they are late even for a short period, the entire [annual] payment is totalled up and demanded from them in a single payment."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.29

"Some people will be bitterly resentful if this system of [Arab] assessments and taxes is established. But...if they suffer further abuses and can [be made to] understand that their payments will contribute to their security and give them peace of mind to enjoy... their property... they will be deeply grateful to you. After all, they will only be deprived of a small fraction of their resources...

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.30

"Spare no expense in making the capital beautiful. And enhance its magnificence with festivals [games and military parades] of every kind [1]. It is right for those who rule over so many peoples to surpass all others in every field of endeavor [2], and displays of this sort tend to impart respect for us in our allies and to strike terror into our enemies [3].

The affairs of the provinces [Roman colonies] should be managed as follows: Firstly, the people [of the colony] should have no [governmental] decision making powers whatsoever [4]. Nor should they have the right to assemble [5]. Nothing good will ever come out of their proceedings, and they will constantly be causing [political] disturbances [6]. On the same principle, I think that even our own Roman people should not [have the right to] come together either as a court, or to elect the officers of a state, or indeed to hold any assembly whose purpose is to transact business.

Secondly, the [various] cities [in the Roman empire] should not build more public buildings than strictly necessary... nor should they waste their resources providing a large number of public games. Otherwise they risk dissipating their energies in futile enterprises [7]."

- 1) It is frequently only the super expensive Mafia contractors that get the fat contracts for government beautification work in the capital.
- 2) This fits into how Julius Caesar and Marcus Tullius Cicero were originally one person.
- 3) The gladiatorial games imparted fear for the locals, and the military parades imparted fear into both locals and foreigners.
- 4) This matches with English King's attitude towards the American colonies. Also note the way that one Arab-fronting monarchy can be used to rule over a 'worldwide' empire.
- 5) The Arabs hate the right of free assembly in their oppressed lands. Without this right, it is so much harder for the people they oppress to rebel against their oppressive parasitic feeding.
- 6) Rather, nothing good for the Arabs or their front governments will ever come out of these proceedings, and they will constantly be causing political problems for the Arabs.
- 7) Especially in the provinces, don't waste too much money on temples, cathedrals, and forbidden cities or there will be less to send back to Arabia.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.30

"Whatever pleas and petitions they may have should pass through the governor, who will decide which are worthy of your attention."

[Here is how an Arab front government works if we give it a chance to do so. They have this imperial front man for the world, and these little frontmen for each province. The entire government apparatus is not supposed to look like anyone can influence or sway it. This way the apparatus is more free to work for the Arabs.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.31

"All foreign embassies should be introduced to the Senate whether they come from allies or hostile nations [1], and whether they represent kings or democracies [2]. Among other reasons, the ceremony is in itself imposing [3]. And it is important to emphasize the fact that the Senate is [ostensibly] sovereign in all matters, and that those delegations which press their case in a reckless manner will face a large body of opponents.

- [1] Note how there is nothing between being an ally or enemy. This sort of on/off, totally cleaved, best friend or worst enemy

worldview is not normal for the host part of the world. It is however normal for the parasite part, and generally wherever you see it, it is the parasite pulling the strings.

2) In Roman times as today, the world was comprised of free and un-free nations. And long after the time when the Arabs had installed their seizer/Caesar dictators, the world thought of Rome as free, when it actually was not.

3) A great strength of democracy is how a large number of lawmakers making a decision need not fear the Arab powers that be.]

Secondly, all laws should be enacted through the Senate and no laws should be imposed upon the people except the laws of this body. If this principle is observed, the dignity of the empire will be more securely established, and in the eyes of the whole people, the judgements handed down in accordance with these laws will be placed beyond any possibility of dispute or uncertainty.

[In other words, make sure you go through the motions and send all new laws through the legislature. If you do this, all the Rumi will respect our Roman front empire, and none of them will disobey its orders. When Arabs talk about how much they respect the law, this is what they mean.]

My third point concerns members of the Roman Senate. If any of them, or any of their wives or children is charged with a serious crime, where the penalty is disenfranchisement, exile, or death, you should lay the matter before the Senate without making any prior judgement yourself [other than charging them for the crime, which by itself is usually enough to assure conviction], and you should entrust the entire decision of the case to the Senate, uninfluenced by your opinion. This you are doing for a reason. It is that since the wrongdoers are being tried by a jury of their peers, they may be punished without any hate or blame falling on you. And the others [the other Senators] when they see this [when they see these trumped up charges against other Senators], they will improve their conduct out of fear of being publicly disgraced themselves.

[1] The Arabs have been experimenting with sham legislature matrixes for thousands of years.

2) Sometimes a great deal of power lies in the power to merely scandalize our leaders.

3) If we had a million Sub-Senators, 100,000 Main-Senators and 10,000 Over-Senators, the Arab infiltrators in our media would not be able to have much effect scandalizing our annually elected leaders.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 52.40

"If you want a monarchy but fear the accursed title, you can avoid the title by ruling as a Caesar... In this way you can enjoy the reality of a monarchy without the stigma that is attached to the name."

[Doesn't this sound like Vladimir Putin and so many other Arab-fronting world leaders?]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.2

"he [emperor Augustus] gave sums of money to a number of senators. This was because many of them had become so poor that they could not take on even the office of aedile, because of the large expenditures demanded of the office holder."

[1] Thus the emperor fronting for the Arabs was able to pick senators in the legislature supposed to watch over him.

2) Try to see this Cassius Dio document as a heuristic Arab textbook on a) How to have a tyranny but call it something else.

b) How to have an Arab-style constitutional monarchy — a monarchy checked by an toothless constitution and corrupt legislature.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.11

"the first action he took was to have a decree passed granting to the members of his future bodyguard twice the rate of pay which was received by the rest of the army."

[1) Elite royal and presidential bodyguards generally exist to keep the perennially unpopular Arab fronting monarchs from getting whacked by his own people. Without the bodyguards, the pretorian guard, the secret service, the perennially unpopular Arab-fronting monarchs can't really survive and be an effective tool for the Arabs.

2) The world would really be a much better place if every young boy was programmed to kill all those men who rise to the position of monarch or temporary monarch. Imagine what a wonderful world it would be if everyone was afraid to be a monarch either in name or in fact.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.11

[Emperor come from L. imperator, from L. imperare = to command, or to issue imperatives that had to be obeyed. It was a term used by the Roman military under the Roman Republic and the very title suggests that Rome had become a military dictatorship under the Caesars/Seizers.]

"Augustus wanted to be thought of as democratic and a representative of the people. So although he seized total control of all government business, he said it was because it needed a special degree of attention.

He also announced that he would not personally govern all the provinces, and that this scheme would be permanent.

Thus he gave the weaker provinces to the Senate to control, on the grounds that they were peaceful and free from war. But he kept the stronger provinces under his control. He argued that these were unstable and explosive, and either had hostile neighbors near their frontiers, or were capable of starting a serious rebellion on their own.

He told the Senate he did this so that they could enjoy the best territories of the empire without anxiety, while he would confront the hardships and the dangers. But in truth he did this as part of his plan. He really wanted the Senate unarmed and unprepared for war, while he alone possessed arms and controlled the military..."

[1] The Arab sham governments will always try to look democratic if they can.

2) The Arabs took over all government business and minimized their actions by calling them "care and supervision".

3) The Arabs also minimized their power grab by calling it partial and temporary.

4) The Roman Senate had no power to command the military and the Arab figurehead Caesar/Seizer had both the military and his personal bodyguard. Thus the Arabs held a monopoly on the use of force in the mighty and world-dominating Roman government.

5) The reason all the world's armies are under the command of one monarch, or one president, is not so the nation can be better defended. It is mostly because the Arabs desperately need control of this aspect of government, so they can kill their opponents.

6) Again, here we see this Cassius Dio document as a heuristic Arab textbook on how to have a monarchy but lie and call it something else.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.13

"the governors that the emperor appointed were to be called pro-praetors, and to hold office for much longer than a year if he wanted [if the emperor's administration wanted]. They were also to wear [a] military uniform and wear a sword, with which they have the authority to execute even soldiers. Nobody else, it should be noted... who is not empowered to put a soldier to death, has been granted the right of wearing a sword"

[1] the Roman governors were called proprietors, a word today that means the owner of a business or property. These men were actually front proprietors for the Arabs.

2) Pretty much everyone, except the top people in government were prohibited from wearing a sword as a side-arm. This is the Arab way. only the Arabs and their military, police and imperial guards get to be armed. Everyone else is disarmed. The way of people in the land of the free is that everyone gets to bear arms.

3) The Arabs absolutely hate our right to bear arms. It is a high priority for them to struggle against this right where they can. So it is easy to imagine that they fund and produce much media like the child's film "Dear Wendy". In this film some kids talk about how they find guns, and how they love their guns, and how the love the feeling of power when they are carrying their guns, and how they eventually die in an unnecessary martyrdom shootout with law enforcement. So who is ultimately behind all the shocking school shootings that are so threatening to undermine our right to bear arms?]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.15

"the proconsuls levy tribute from the people they govern. The emperor issues instructions to the procurators, the proconsuls, and the pro-praetors, so that they go out to their provinces in possession of clearly defined orders. Both this practice and the award of salaries to these and other officials were established in Augustus' time. At an earlier date a system had existed whereby contractors farmed the taxes from the public treasury, and provided the government with such funds as it needed to function. Under Augustus, however, these officials began to receive a fixed salary for the first time. [1]

This was not paid to them all on an equal scale, but roughly according to their needs, and the procurators in fact derive the title of their rank from the size of the salary allotted to them. [2]

A number of regulations were laid down for all these officials alike. They were not empowered to conscript soldiers, nor to demand taxes beyond the amount specified, unless the Senate should pass a decree or the emperor issue an order. As soon as their successor arrive they were to leave the province forthwith, and not delay on the homeward journey but return to Rome within 3-months."

[1] The old tax farming system involved a few giant Arab-owned Roman corporations bidding against one another to buy the right to squeeze the people of a province for their Roman taxes. This system was apparently much hated until Augustus ended it. This change must have given hope of a better future to just about the entire Roman world. And it must have also made Augustus immensely popular. But we must realize how this backing-off was just what the Sphinx did when the Oedipus, or Odious Rex answered the unsaid riddle of the Sphinx Mafia: namely what does the Sphinx Mafia want? It wants its frontman ruling over your people as a monarch with absolute life and death power over all your people. Once the Arab Sphinx gets what it wants, it back off on its feeding for a few decades, and instead focuses on whacking all the men who might make trouble for it. Once these are all gone, the

Sphinx resumes its feeding, even more aggressively than before. In fact, once the Sphinx has absolute power, it will grind your people down until they are all dead and buried and replaced with Arabs if it can.

2) Instead of tax farming, the Augustus administration gave its taxation service raises and status for being efficient. There is a lesson to be learned here.

3) The old tax farming corporations could apparently conscript young men into the military at will. They could also apparently demand any amount of taxes, and stay on to collect old unpaid debts from prior years. This way of doing things seems to have been designed to provoke people into hating Rome as front empire for the Arabs.]

Dio Cassius, Roman History 53.16

"As events turned out, Augustus eventually had absolute power in all [state] matters for the rest of his life. This was because he was not only in control of the treasury but also the military. And while public funds were supposedly separate from his own [private funds], in practice they were spent as he saw fit." [Thus the Arab gained control of the Roman government, the Roman treasury, the Roman Military, and the Roman world]

At any rate, when his 10-year [tenure] term ended, they voted him another 5 years, then 5 more, then 10, then another 10, and then 10 for the 5th time. Thus by the succession of 10-year periods he continued to be sole ruler for life. Later emperors were not appointed for limited periods, but for their entire lives—once and for all. Nevertheless they always celebrated their reign every 10-years, as if they were once more renewing their sovereignty each time, and this practice continues even today."

[1] The Arabs frequently struggle or jihad for life-long monarchs by struggling or jihading for back to back terms of their leaders. Just look at how they cleared the way for this with their frontman Xi of China in 2018.

2) Note how the Arab struggled or jihaded to turn the re-elections of their monarch into a mere formality.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.16

"the name Augustus was conferred upon him by the Senate and people [que Roma, SPQR] At the time, they wished to give him a title of special eminence."

[In reality Au•gust (silent -us ending) mean golden•flow, or gold•liker. So the fellow started out as Octavian, or "8-way", or a monopoly in every direction. Then he ended up being called Au•gustus, or gold lover, or golden flow.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.17

"In this way, the power of both the people and the Senate was entirely transferred into the hands of Augustus. And it was at this time that a monarchy, to use the correct term, was established. It would certainly be most truthful to describe it as a monarchy even if two or three men held supreme power at the same time. It is true that the Romans hated the actual word monarch so vehemently that they did not refer to their emperors either as dictators or kings or anything similar. But since the final decision in the government process is referred to them, it is impossible that they should be anything other than kings."

[Where the people will not allow kings, the Arabs give them temporary kings called by another name. Then they eternally struggle, or jihad to expand the powers of those kings.]

And of course, the original [elected] offices established under the old constitution, still exist and are being

kept in existence even today, except the office of censor. However, the entire administration and direction [of Roman government] affairs depends upon the wishes of the one man who holds [dictatorial] power at that time.

[And it is important to realize, my Arab brothers, that] the Caesars, [seizers] maintained the illusion of having this authority, not through their [violent seizure of] power, but by [ostensibly] working within the law[s of Rome]. Thus, with the consent of the people, they seized all the government offices, except they didn't call it a dictatorship."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.17

"Instead of using the title 'king' or 'dictator', the title imperator [Emperor] is given to them for life. And this is not only for those who have won victories in battle, but also for the rest — to indicate their absolute power [to issue imperatives to anyone]. Rulers have not used these titles last since they first fell out of style in the running of government. Besides, all the prerogatives of those offices was secured by them in the title of imperator.

This title [of emperor] gives them the power to collect taxes, create new taxes, draft men as troops, declare war, make treaties, rule foreigners and citizens alike, at all times and in all places. [note the parasite-orientation of priorities] In fact they could even execute [kill, purge] both equestrians [knights] and senators inside the pomerium [city limits], as well as doing everything else that was once allowed to the consuls and other magistrates.

And because they are Censors, they can investigate our private lives and morals, take the census, compile property lists, enroll men in the equestrian and senatorial orders, and remove others, as they see fit. [Thus all parts of Roman imperial government could be appointed and fired at will by the administration of the emperor fronting for the Arabs. And these would frequently add fresh green harem bros and removed old yeller Jews that had become at dogs.]

And because they were consecrated in all the priesthoods [as the pontifex maximus, the big pontiff, the big bridge] ...they exercise supreme authority in all matters both sacred and profane [pro•fanum = outside-the-temple, secular].

The tribune's power, as it is called, was once held by the most influential and promising men. These men had the power to veto the measures taken by any other government official if they do not approve of them. [The host seeks to create, the solvent parasite only seeks to block. It therefore covets an absolute veto more than almost any other power. Here is why it is so fixated on possessing a presidential veto, and a de-facto veto at the UN, and a Nazi Chancellor's (cancellor's) veto as well.]

[This tribune's power also] made their persons inviolable against insult or abuse. Thus if they seem to have suffered, any abuse, even to the most trivial extent, not only by deed, but even by word, they may destroy [de•struere = reverse•build, tear apart] the perpetrator as one guilty of sacrilege, without trial... [destroy = to rip the perpetrator limb from limb, or crucify them, or feed them to the lions, or hack them to death as colosseum entertainment.]

[In reading the following, try to imagine the Arabs as termites. They work for decades undermining and gnawing, leaving the outside of the branch alone. This looks strong from the outside, but is in fact turned to sponge. Then when the wind blows too hard, the branch breaks 'inexplicably'.]

These then are the offices which they [the Arab fronting Roman emperors] have arrogated to themselves from the republic. Each essentially [remains] in its old traditional

form and with the same title, so as to give the impression of possessing no power that has not been granted them...

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.18

"but besides this status, they have acquired another, which was granted to none of the ancient Romans outright and absolutely. And the possession of this alone would enable them to exercise the powers I have mentioned above and the others as well. They have been set free from the laws, as the very words in Latin express it: that is, they are exempted from all binding tradition, and are not liable to any of the written provisions of the laws. Thus, by assuming these democratic names and titles, they have clothed themselves with all the authority [and credibility] of the [old democratic] government, so that they actually possess all the power of kings, but without the vulgar and repugnant name. For the name 'Caesar' or 'Augustus' confers upon them no actual power, but merely shows on one hand, that they are the successors of their family line, and in the other that they are of a majestic or illustrious rank."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.20

"Pacuvius... declared that he intended to make Augustus his heir on the same terms as his own son — not that he had so much to bequeath, but because he hoped to receive even more [from the gods], and so it turned out."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.21

"Augustus...passed many laws... In introducing these laws, Augustus did not rely wholly upon his own judgement. Some of them he laid before the popular assembly in advance, so that if anything caused displeasure, he would have time to discover and correct it. He encouraged all comers to offer suggestions in case anybody could think of some improvement, and he allowed them complete freedom of speech. Indeed he even changed certain provisions in the proposed laws. Most important of all, he called in the consuls... to advise him...together with one of the holders of each of the other offices of state, and 15 men chosen by lot from the rest of the Senate. Consequently it became a practice that all legislation put forward by the emperors is communicated... through these advisers to all the other senators. Augustus would still bring certain matters before a full session of the Senate, but he generally followed the plan just described, preferring to consider most business and especially the most important items in a quiet preliminary consultation with a few advisers, and sometimes he even sat with these men when he was deciding on a matter."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.21

[In reading the following it should be repeated that the Roman Senate continued to meet until the total collapse of European civilization in around 600AD.]

"The Senate as a body continued to sit in judgement as before. And in certain cases it conducted business with embassies and heralds [envoys] from both democracies and monarchies. Besides this, the [Roman] people and the plebs continued to hold elections, but nothing was actually done that Augustus [As Arab front-man] did not approve of.

At any rate, he himself selected and nominated some of the candidates for office [in the Senate]. And he [made sure to] leave the election of the rest [the Arab innies that looked to win anyway] in the hands of the people and the plebs, in accordance with traditional practice. But he made sure than nobody should hold office who was unfit or elected as the

result of bribery, or conspiracy." [Thus all those who might re-institute a democracy, or hold any real power, were accused of crimes, or scandalized, or otherwise purged by the secret masters of Rome.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.25

"These events caused Augustus... to dispatch Terentius Varro... Varro launched his attack... [Once he] forced them to surrender, he first demanded a fixed sum of money, as though he intended to impose no other punishment. Then he dispatched soldiers all over the country apparently to collect the money. But then [after the money was collected, he] also arrested all the men of military age. These were sold into slavery on the condition that none of them should be set free within 20-years. The best of the land was given to some of the Praetorian Guard."

[Here is an Arab tip from the past on how to squeeze a flock for all its money once it has surrendered to their front empire. It is also a tip on how to not only get rid of all the men, but be able to get money for them as slaves.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 53.21

"The expedition [military invasion] against the country known as Arabia Felix, ruled by a king named Sabos, was led by Aelius Gallus [Mr. World Alias], the governor of Egypt. At first Gallus's expedition could find no people anywhere, and yet their advance was by no means easy. His men suffered great hardship from the desert. The sun and the water [especially] seemed to contain some strange property [substance] that killed most of the army. The disease which attacked them proved to be unlike any known ailment. First of all, it affected the head, causing it to become parched, and most of the victims died from this affliction immediately. For those who survived this stage, this symptoms passed by the intermediate parts of the body and descended to the legs, causing great pain in them. There was no remedy for it... Also, in the midst of these hardships the barbarians [Arrabbians] attacked them. Up until then, we defeated the enemy wherever we had come within reach, causing them to abandon a number of villages. But now, with the disease as their ally, they recovered their territory and drove the survivors of the [Roman] expedition out of their country. These were certainly the first of the Romans — and I believe the only ones to penetrate so far into Arabia in order to make war, for they advanced as far as the place called Athloulou a name which is well known."

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.1

"A plague struck all of Italy and nobody worked the land. Thus the people suffered both from plague and famine. I suppose that the same plague also struck the rest of the world.

[Strange comment. It seems more likely that the opposite was true and the plague only affected Italy, causing much death among the Romans or Rumi as the Arabs call us. Meanwhile, the Arab-run media calls it an omen, the will of the gods that Augustus be frontman monarch of Rome, the Empire ruling the world.]

The Romans reasoned that these disasters had befallen them for no other reason than that they did not have Augustus serving as consul at that time. So they therefore wished to appoint him dictator. They locked the Senate up in its chamber and forced them to pass this measure, threatening to burn down the building with them in it. Then they took the 24-fascies, went to Augustus and begged him to agree to be named as dictator and become commissioner for the corn supply, as Pompey had once been. He reluctantly accepted the

later post, and ordered that two men [innies] be selected annually to supervise the distribution of grain.... as for the dictatorship he refused to let himself be named, and even tore his clothes when he found that he could not curb the people's desire for his appointment in any other way, either by reasoning or by pleading with them. He knew that the authority and the honor he already possessed raised above the position of past dictators, and he was rightly on his guard against the jealousy and hatred which the title would provoke.

He acted in the same way too when the people sought to appoint him censor for life. He refused to take on the office himself, and at once appointed others to hold it, namely Paulus Aemilius Lepidus and Lucius Munatius Plancus.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.9

"the people of India, who had previously announced their intention of seeking a friendship treaty, now concluded it. [At this time there was apparently free trade between Europe and Asia. Thus the world's dirtiest secret seems to have gotten out.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.13

"he [Augustus] again carried out a review of the Senate. He thought its numbers too large, and he could see no point in such a large number of senators [1]. Besides, he hated those [senators] who were notorious for some vice [spread by the Arab rumor mills], as well as those who called attention to themselves through their self-promotion [and increased power. In other words there were many troublesome senators to be gotten rid of]. But, as on an earlier occasion, nobody would volunteer to resign. And Augustus again didn't want the hatred for his reforms to fall on him alone. He therefore selected the 30 best men... then he cast lots... with the winners becoming senators, and nominating others to be senators... Later after various malpractices came to light, Augustus.... abolished the selection... by lot. Instead, he selected and nominated [all] the senators himself, bringing the total up to 600. He had originally imagined a total of 300, which was the number elected in early times."

[1] The Arabs hate broad democracies because they are so hard to corrupt. They generally try to narrow democracies where possible using any excuse. Here are some ideas for the president shrinking the size of the legislature.

2) If Rome had a population of 5-million people, half of which were free and half of which were men, and 2/3 of which were of voting age, that comes to about 830,000 voters. If they had 600 senators, their representation ratio would have been a representation ratio of 1:1,400.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.15

"Starting around this time, many people were accused of plotting against Augustus and Agrippa [and executed in various painless and torturous ways]. The charges may have been true or false, for it is impossible for those on the outside to obtain an accurate picture of such matters. Much of what a ruler does to punish men for alleged conspiracy against him, whether he takes action personally or through the Senate, is suspected to have been prompted by spite, however well justified it may have been." [In other words, according to this Arab gazette, when a monarch kills his citizens for conspiracy, treason, or sedition, it matters little whether it is through the Senate, everyone will still think it was prompted by spite]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.16

"Augustus imposed heavier penalties upon unmarried men and

women. He also offered rewards for marriage and having children. And since the free-born population contained far more males than females, he allowed all those who so desired—with the exception of senators—to marry freedwomen [freed 'Greek' slaves from the Mideast], and directed that their children should be regarded as legitimate."

[1] Much like today, the better Romans did not reproduce and countless lines died out.

2) Among the non-slave population, men greatly outnumbered women.

3) Female infanticide seems to have been much more common in Rome, than it is in China today.

4) When a Roman married a slave or freedwoman, he was very often having children with a woman from and loyal to the Mideast harems.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.16

"At this time, too, some men were becoming betrothed to very young girls, and in this way enjoying the privileges to which married men were entitled, but without fulfilling their duties. Augustus made an order that no betrothal should be valid unless the man could marry within two years of giving his word. In other words, the girl had to be at least 11-years old at the time of betrothal, if the man were to profit in any way from the betrothal. This was because girls are considered, as I have mentioned to have reached marriageable age on their 13th birthday.

[1] It is easy to imagine that ancient Rome is much like some Mideast societies today. In other words, boys brought money and status to the family, and girls only cost money and caused potential shame and loss of status. Many people may have felt differently about their daughters and sisters, but a very large portion of the people followed the ancient media and held that it was only boys that mattered.

2) Because nobody wanted girls, the ancient Romans would expose their baby girls, which would often be adopted by the Arabs (if they were fair, meaning light and attractive) and shipped back to the harems. Thus there was a shortage of Roman free women and many light-skinned Arabs.

3) In this world, girls were something to be gotten rid of as soon as possible. And as a result people married off, or sold their daughters at age 10, 8, 6... or even giving them away, exposing them as infants.

4) What happens to a 10-year old girl that is sold-off to some old man who must buy a bride? After he rapes her repeatedly, does she really want to have sex and babies? When we read about modesty in Roman women, is this what they meant? And modest does certainly look like mode-east, with the Roman women behaving in eastern mode, or Middle-eastern mode, or Greek way.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.17

[Augustus] "permitted all those who possessed property worth 400,000 sesterces to hold office, provided that they were legally eligible to stand as candidates. This was the sum which he first laid down as the property qualification for the Senate. Later he raised this to 1,000,000 sesterces. To some of those who lived upright lives, but possessed less than [the required amount]... he gave the balance. [Thus the administration of the Arab frontman selected everyone in the ostensibly democratic Senate. Our new democracies should make a catalogue of all the many way the Arabs hide their power and influence in their host governments.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.21

"he claimed that December was really the 10th month"

[Oct-ober, Nov-ember, and Dec-ember were clearly the 8th, 9th and 10th months. Strange how they are not the 10th, 11th, and 12th months. It seems the Arabs wanted to divide up the year in this odd way that interferes with continuous government under a democracy. Maybe we should switch back to using teneths of 36.5 days on average.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.22

"When he saw that he had aroused Augustus's anger and was likely to be punished [for viciously plundering his klepto-fifedom], he took the emperor home with him. There he showed him large quantities of treasure in silver and gold, and many other precious objects piled up in heaps. He then told Augustus, 'All this I have brought together on purpose, master, for you and for the rest of the Romans, so as to prevent the native inhabitants, if they were in possession of so much money, from starting a rebellion.'"

[1] Dear bro, the emperor should get super angry when the medium fish make waves in their klepto-fifedom. This way many of them will be compelled to pay in much more.

2) By thoroughly impoverishing a colony the empire is able to hamper the ability of the people to stage rebellions.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 54.24

"Scribonius was holding the Cimmerian Bosphorus under his control. [This appears to be the Sumerian, or sym-mer-ian bro-sporous. In the maps at the end of the Penguin books, there is a map showing the Thracian Bosphorus at present day Istanbul.

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 55.6

"Augustus "extended the city limits and changed the name of the month which had been hitherto known as Sextilis to August. [Thus the 6th month became the 8th.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 55.7

"Maecenas had proved himself to be of the greatest value to Augustus when the latter's temper had been uncontrollable.

[So Augustus had this uncontrollable temper like Adolph Hitler for example.] On such occasions, his friends could always dissolve his anger and return him to a calmer state of mind. I will give one example. Maecenas once arrived at a moment when Augustus was judging cases, and when he saw that the emperor was about to condemn many men to death... he wrote on a tablet, the words 'Now rise, at last, executioner!' and threw it, as if it concerned some different matter, into Augustus's lap. At this the emperor passed no death sentences, but rose to his feet and left.

Augustus was by no means offended at such actions, but even welcomed them. This is because whenever his natural disposition, or the pressure of events led him to give way to some excess of anger, it was always corrected by the candid advice of his friends [in true dotard, or de-ot-ard style].

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 56.44-45

[Note how the Arabs describe democratic resistance to their frontman monarchy as civil wars.]

[After Augustus's death] "If any of them remembered Augustus's deeds [widespread purges] during the civil wars, they attributed them to the pressure of circumstances. They judged it right to base their view of his character on what he did after he had come into the undisputed possession of supreme power, for here there was honestly a huge contrast [between his monstrous behavior before killing all the potential enemies

of the Arabs and coming into power and his behavior after, once they were all dead.] [Anyone who examines his actions in detail can confirm this. But to sum them up briefly, I may say that he resolved the strife between the rival factions.](#) [The democrats were dead, and once they were all dead, there was no need for the Arab side to fight any more. That is how the strife between the domestic democratic faction and the Arab-fronting monarchy faction was resolved.] [He also remodeled the system of government in such a way as to equip it with the maximum of strength and power.](#) [He created an Arab-fronting dictatorship that nobody was able to depose for centuries.]

For this reason, even if an occasional deed of [great] violence did occur, such as is apt to happen in exceptional situations [wars], it would be fairer to lay the blame on the circumstances rather than on him. [Translation: When you go for the dictatorship kill as many people as you need because you can just blame it on the civil war between their democrats and our monarchs. And don't forget about killing all the disloyal yellow Jews and all the smart Rumi. This way we will be smarter than them when the killing stops.]

One of the factors that contributed to his glory, and by no means the least, was the [incredible 58-year] length of his reign. [Julius Caesar died in 44BC and Augustus died in 14AD] [The great majority of those who had lived under the \[democratic Roman\] Republic were now dead, and the most influential of them too. The later generations knew nothing of that form of government: they had been brought up entirely or very largely under the conditions which prevailed during the principate, and so not only did they find no objection to them since they were now familiar, but even rejoiced in them, since they saw that their present situation was preferable and more free from fear than those times of which they knew from hearsay.](#) [The Arab media goes into overdrive cursing democracy once a dictator gets into power. In the last century we can observe this in so many nations that have gone down the path of tyranny.]

Although the people recognized these things during Augustus's lifetime, they understood them more completely after his death, for human nature is so constituted that it is not so keenly aware of its good fortune in times of prosperity as it is of what it has lost when misfortune strikes. This is what happened at that time in the case of Augustus. When they learned by experience that his successor Tiberius was a very different kind of ruler, they longed for the man who was gone. Indeed it was immediately possible for people of intelligence to judge the change in the situation [They started killing even more of the smart members of the flock] ... [At any rate, the characters of the two men were so completely different that the suspicion was current that Augustus knew Tiberius's nature very well, and had deliberately made him his successor to exalt his own reputation.](#)

[If you think Oedipus, the odious rex is bad, wait until you see his successor and then his, and then his. You know, there is no limit to Ishtar's woe and how far down it will take humanity.]

Dio Cassius, Roman History 56.46

["the Senate declared Augustus immoral, assigned to him sacred rights and a college of priests to perform them, and appointed Livia \[his wife\], who was already named Julia and Augusta, to be his priestess"](#)

[In the most primitive cultures, the Arab infiltrators become priests and call for the human sacrifice of their enemies. This enables them to live like kings and mate with all the females they want to. In more developed cultures, they

must engage in other more complicated and less powerful charades. However, if they can degrade the host society enough, they can once again become the priests of the gods and acquire greater and more unquestioned power.]

Cassius Dio, Reign of Augustus, 56.47

["These were the decrees which were passed...nominally by the Senate, but in fact by Tiberius... This was because some men made one suggestion and some another, and finally the Senate decreed that Tiberius should be sent the Senate proposals in writing and he should select whichever he preferred."](#)

Dio Cassius, Roman History 59.42.1

["In addition to other reforms which he \[Augustus\] instituted, he purged the senate. For as a result of the civil wars, a large number of the equestrians and even of men of lower rank were in the senate unjustifiably, so that the membership of that body had swollen to 1,000. Now, although it was his wish to remove these men... he at first persuaded about 50 to withdraw from the senate voluntarily, and then compelled 140 others to imitate their example. ... these men returned to private life... and he made some other men senators...And at the same time, ostensibly at the senate's bidding, he increased the number of patrician families, because the greater part of the patricians had perished, and because the patricians are regarded as indispensable for the performance of our traditional institutions."](#) [First the Arabs expand the senate greatly, then they purged everyone who was not init. In this way they seized power in the senate.]

CAESAR SALAD = seizer salt•ad = seizure-of-power jump towards

William O. Douglass, US Supreme Court Justice 1939-1975

["As nightfall does not come all at once, neither does oppression. In both instances, there is a twilight when everything remains seemingly unchanged. And it is in such a twilight that we all must be most aware of change in the air—however slight—lest we become unwitting victims of the darkness."](#)

[This quote actually is about the rate at which Arab tyranny takes hold of a nation. I find it simplistic and thus obscuring. I see tyranny's overall march like an X-squared curve. Before things progress to the X equals 1 point, the progress of tyranny is flattish and slow. But the moment the X-1 point is crossed, the progress of tyranny rapidly approaches verticalness. We can see this X-1 point in so many nations that have suffered tyrannical coups. It begins when the vocal and the potentially vocal (the intelligentsia) are rounded up and jailed or killed by the Arab front administration. Then the people become afraid to speak out and then it is all over.

You know, how the Arabs have ended our democracies is one of the most important things that free men should teach their children in school. We should all have a very clear picture of how this has happened in the past and what we must do to prevent it in the future.]

Naomi Wolf

["Most of us have only a faint understanding of how societies open up or close down, become supportive of freedom or ruled by fear, because this is not the sort of history \[knowledge\] that we feel, or that our educational system believes, is important](#)

for us to know."

5) The decline of Rome and collapse of Europe. Note how this happened right when the Arab front man stayed in power.

Tacitus, Annals, 1.72

[This is about Tiberius Julius Caesar Augustus r. 14AD -37AD, Augustus' successor.]

"Tiberius gave new energy to the law of treason. This law had the same name in olden times. However, other matters came under its jurisdiction, things like betrayal of an army, or inciting the plebs to riot... But only deeds were subject this accusation, and words went unpunished. Augustus was the first to conduct trials for libel within the scope of this law. ...Next Tiberius, when asked... about whether such trials for treason should be placed on the [court] schedule, replied that the laws must be enforced. He too had been exasperated by verses, which were circulated anonymously, attacking his cruelty, his arrogance, and his estrangement from his mother."

(1) Democracies don't have the crime of libel.

2) The crime of libel is the stuff of dictatorships.

3) Augustus was a dictator that could not be criticized.

4) Tiberius was a dictator that could not be criticized.

5) Those who spoke risked becoming a colosseum spectacle, a spectacle intended to engender respect in the audi-hence=listening-hence.]

The true meaning of Seditio

se-diction = self-speaking = thinking/speaking for yourself instead of saying/thinking what those in power want you to say/think.

Suetonius, The reign of Domitian, 12

"Having spent all the gold on buildings and public spectacles, along with increasing military salaries, he tried to reduce the size of the army, in order to lower the military budget. But perceiving that he would thereby expose himself to the insults of the barbarians and still be unrelieved of his burdens, he plunged into every manner of robbery and extortion [of the public] to raise money. The estates of the living and the dead were seized on any charge [at all], by whomsoever [his administration] preferred. It was sufficient, if any word or deed whatsoever were charged against a man, to make it high treason against the emperor. Inheritances no matter how far off, and no matter to whom they belonged, were confiscated if anyone ever came forward and said, 'that he [the deceased] made the emperor his heir'."

Skippable

Suetonius, The reign of Domitian, r. 81-96AD

"18. He was tall and seemed modest [humble] though he was prone to becoming red-faced [with anger]. He had large eyes, though his sight [vision, understanding] was dim. His was attractive and graceful, especially in his youth, although his he was somewhat pigeon-toed. Over time, he became disfigured by baldness, fatness and thin legs, which were reduced by a long illness. He was quite aware of how much his modest [go with the flow] bearing was to his advantage, that he once made boast to the Senate, 'Thus far you have approved both of my disposition [divinely dispensed powers] and my countenance [tolerance]'."

His baldness bothered him so much, that he would be offended if anyone ever said anything about it, either jokingly or in earnest. Although, in a small tract he published,

addressed to a friend, 'concerning the preservation of the hair', he uses for their mutual consolation the words following: "Do you see my graceful demeanor, my stately form? And yet the fate of my hair awaits me. Thus with a heavy and brave heart I endure how the bush of my head disappeared in my fresh youth. And I would have you know that nothing is more pleasing, and nothing more fleeting, than beauty'."

19. He so disliked exertion and fatigue that he scarcely ever walked through the city on foot. In his expeditions and on a march, he seldom rode on horseback, but was generally carried [by 8 slaves] on a litter. He had no disposition towards the exercise of [weapons], but delighted in the use of the bow and arrow. Many person have seen him often kill a hundred wild animals, of various kinds, at his Alban retreat [a giant place near Rome, but off limits to food production], and fix his arrows in their heads with such dexterity, that he could, in two shots, plant them, like a pair of horns, in front. [In other words, the animals were no running away, they were tied up] ...

20. In the beginning of his empire, he neglected the study of all liberal sciences, though he took care to restore, at huge expense, the libraries which had been burned down; collecting [rounding up] manuscripts from all parts, and sending scribes to Alexandria, either to copy or correct them [with palimpsests]. Yet he never gave himself the trouble of reading history or poetry, or of employing his pen even for private purposes. Except for the commentaries and acts of Tiberius Caesar, he never read anything. His letters, speeches, and edicts, were all written by others, though he could converse with elegance, and sometimes voiced memorable original sentiment. For example: 'If only I was as attractive and well liked as Maecius considers himself to be'. And he once said of a graying redhead: 'that it was snow mixed with mead or honey-wine'. He would often say that princes were a miserable lot, because they never discovered the conspiracy until their own death.

[He was afraid of getting whacked, so he didn't rock the boat.]

21. When he had free time, he amused himself with dice, even on days that were not festivals, and in the morning. He bathed early and made a plentiful dinner, in that he seldom ate more at supper than a Matian apple, to which he added a glass of wine from his own flask. [because he was afraid of being poisoned.]

...

22. He was excessive in sexual lust and the normal ways of Venus [Venus=sex]—as if it was a kind of exercise. This he called bed-wrestling, or Clinopale. He was widely known swim around with the lowest of whores, and use pincers to depilate them [because they were all hairy women from the Mideast]. His niece Julia was offered to him in marriage when she was a virgin. ... he was the cause of her death, by causing her to miscarry while she was pregnant with his child. [The Brotherly administration accidentally killed her when they were trying to deal with the succession issue.]

23. The people were indifferent about his death, but the military [the Brotherly establishment] were much saddened. They immediately tried to deify him. They were also ready to revenge his loss, if there had been an obvious leader. However they soon remedied this by resolutely demanding the punishment of all who had been concerned [scapegoated] in his assassination.

The Senate on the contrary was so overjoyed that they all met immediately. There in full assembly they reviled his memory in the most bitter terms. They brought in ladders and took down his portraits and emblems. [Recall those giant Saddam Hussein and king of Thailand portraits]. These they smashed to pieces on the floor of the Senate. At the same time, they passed a decree to obliterate [blacken? Nero=black]

his name everywhere, and abolish all memory of him.

Tacitus, d.120AD, Annals, 14.20

"Pompeius [Peh-on-peh-us = say-on-say-us] had been censured by the older men of his day for building a permanent theatre. For before the building of the Pompey theatre, theatrical performances used to be given on a temporary stage, and an audience on temporary bleachers. And, if you go back farther [in time], audiences stood to watch events. This way, the people would not, by sitting in the theatre, become accustomed to a life of idleness and sloth. The character of the ancient shows should have been preserved [it wasn't]... and no citizen should have been compelled to attend [the gladiatorial "games". Translation: there was an ongoing political purge renamed as a spectacle and attendance was sort of obligatory, just like in North Korea today.

Little by little, our traditional moral values weakened. Then they were completely subverted by an imported licentiousness. [This sounds like the half decade before the Arab oil embargo, 1968-73] We began to see here in our city everything that could corrupt or be corrupted. Our young men were ruined by their eagerness for foreign ways, their enthusiasm for athletics, idleness [partying], and perverted sex. All this under the watch of the emperor and the senate. These not only granted permission for such offensive behavior, but they even applied pressure on the better Romans to disgrace themselves with stage performances of speeches and poetry. [Perhaps they were accused of disloyalty. It was completely preposterous. But they had to get up on stage and read something or perform something to get off] What else was left but for them to strip naked and put on boxing gloves and train for sports matches instead of for war." [You know what boxing gloves are? They are so the dumb Rumi can get invisible brain damage instead of visible cuts on their faces. This way boxing produces permanent brain damage instead of obvious damage.

Here we have a culture that was totally permissive with respect to sex. In this culture the parasite made it normal to strip naked and smack one another with boxing gloves. Here was everyone's opportunity to look good in front of all their future sex-partners, so they all oiled up and went at it full-throttle. So here is a culture where many men were as brain-damaged as boxers. Also, don't forget to notice how the Romans began to care more about sports training than war training.]

Pliny, Pangyric to Trajan 65-80

[Trajan ruled 98 to 117AD. This quote shows how the Arabs actually like a moderate freedom of speech where they can find out who among their flock is capable of leadership in opposition to them. This way they can find out who to whack, addle, purge, or otherwise get rid of.

The freedom discussed here are comparable to the great freedom enjoyed in Poland between WWI and WW2, when everyone spoke freely. This then enabled the Arabs to know who to whack. So they made their anti-kal-laws list and checked it twice. Then when they raised their Nazi police state. Then they killed all the bad little boys and girls who violated the rules of the anti-kal-laws and thus purged the nation of its smartest.

This is also comparable to today's Google and Facebook enabled lists for the next wave of purges, top to bottom. These will start at the top and work their way down so that the only people left are incapable of organizing opposition to their Arab masters.]

"Hardly had the first day of your reign dawned when you entered the senate house and urged us all as both individuals and as a society, to resume our liberty, to take up the duties of imperial administration shared, so to speak, between yourself and us, to watch over the public interests, to rouse ourselves. [Translation: When you came to power, you immediately went to the senate. You urged us one-and-all, to be free again, and to take on our share of government duties, and to watch over the public interests.]

All emperors before you said about the same thing, but none before you was believed. People had before their eyes the shipwrecks of many men who sailed along in a deceptive calm and sank in an unexpected storm ... but you we follow fearlessly and happily, wherever you call us. You order us to be free and so we will be. You order us to express our opinions openly and so we will pronounce them. It is neither through cowardice nor laziness that we have kept silent until now. Fear and prudence born of danger forced us to turn our attention away from matters of government —in fact, there was no government at all. But today, relying on your promises and gestures, we unseal our lips closed in long servitude, and we [turn] loose our tongues paralyzed by so many ills...

Here is the picture of the father of our state as I for my part seem to have discerned it both from his speech and from the very manner of its presentation. What weight in his ideas, what unaffected genuineness in his words, what earnestness in his voice, what confirmation in his face, what sincerity in his eyes, bearing, gestures, in short his whole body! [The Arabs chose a really nice and genuine looking figurehead to lure people into speaking their minds.] He will always remember his advice to us, and he will know that we are obeying him whenever we make use of the liberty he has given us. And there is no fear that he will judge us reckless if we take advantage unhesitatingly of the security of the times, for he remembers that we lived otherwise under and evil emperor" [The reign of terror under emperor the prior emperor Domitian.]

Pliny, c. 110AD, letters between Emperor Trajan and Pliny

Pliny to Trajan: " ... a huge fire broke out in Nicomedia [across from Istanbul Turkey] destroyed many... buildings... The fire spread as far as it did thanks to both high wind and because the... bystanders chose to do nothing but watch the fire burn. But apart from that, the town has no pumps or buckets, or any kind of fire fighting equipment at all. These I have ordered to be procured. But please consider, Sir, whether you think a corps of professionals should be formed, limited to 150 persons. I will undertake to make sure that none but actual firemen are allowed, and that they do not misuse the right of assembly granted them. As this body of men will be so small in number, it will be easy enough to keep them under proper control. (10.33)

Trajan to Pliny: Your idea that a company of firemen could be formed at Nicomedia has many precedents in other cities. But we need to remember that these associations have [a record of] greatly disturbing the peace [the Islamic slave's peace] in these provinces and cities. Whatever name we give them, and for whatever purposes they may be founded, those who come together for a purpose will not fail to form themselves into political associations before long. Therefore it is safer to provide equipment which will be useful in fighting fires. However, tell the residents to use these themselves, and if circumstances require, they can call in help from the populace." (10.34) [No matter what the cost or consequent to the host, the parasite is in a life or death struggle to keep its

hooks in and keep the blood flowing]

Ulpian, d. 228AD, The Digest of Laws, 1.12.1-13

[Ulpian was from Lebanon/ Syria]

"The prefect of the city [of Rome, the emperor's appointee and his administration] has the authority to punish all crimes, not only those which are committed in the city [of Rome], but also those which are committed outside the city but within Italy. ...

It is also the responsibility of the prefect of the city to maintain public order and discipline at the games [where disobedient slaves and political prisoners were killed as intimidating public spectacle]. He should certainly keep soldiers stationed at various locations to maintain public order and to report to him anything which happens anywhere. [Rome was a police state.]

The prefect of the city can forbid entrance into Rome or into any [nearby] districts. And he can deny permission to engage in business or professional or legal activity, either temporarily or permanently." [The last sentence is the most important part for the parasite.]

Procopius, Secret History, 19.11

"As soon as he [Roman emperor Justinian] had denuded the country of all its public wealth, he turned his eyes towards his individual subjects, and lost no time in stripping most of them of their estates.... He hauled up those who were thought to be well off in Constantinople and in every [other] town [in the empire] as well. Some he accused them of polytheism, some of professing unorthodox beliefs about Christ, some of offenses against boys, others of love-affairs with nuns or other improper forms of intercourse, others of provoking faction-fights, or of attachment to the green party, or of disloyalty to himself, or of anything else in the catalogue of crimes." [Justinian died in 565AD. By 595AD the eastern half of 'Rome' in Constantinople/ Istanbul had joined the western half of the empire in collapse. This is the year the lights went out in the West, the year when the dark ages began, the year when we start having practically no historical information. In other words, less than 30 years after these words were written, Europe entered the dark ages. Mohammed was 25 in 595AD.]

In 626 AD, the barbarian Avars (supposedly nomads from Northwest Russia led by a Khan) lay siege unsuccessfully to Constantinople. The Avars plunder and burn the surrounding agricultural lands. The Avars also cut the aqueducts leading to Constantinople, which stayed out of use for 140 years. Here we see that the lowest days for Roman/ Byzantine power were between 626 to 766. The Islamic conquest began in 637, about 11 years after the aqueduct was cut. Then they ran out of steam in Poitiers France in 732. This was 30 years before the aqueduct was repaired. Thus we see how the Arab parasite's agenda and its religion named Islam=submission expands only in a vacuum.

Wake up people. We are still having the same bad dream — repeating it over and over again — aren't we? History will repeat itself if we don't all wake up now from the dream/ matrix we are living.]

Code of Justinian, Digest, 47.22.1

"Governors of provinces are directed by imperial mandate not to permit political associations to exist and not to allow soldiers to form associations in camp. ... The deified [emperor] Severus also stated in an edict that these provisions applied not only in the city [of Rome] but in Italy and the provinces as well. But they are not prohibited from assembling for religious purposes [and burning Arab sacraments], provided however

that nothing is thereby done contrary to the senate's decree by which illegal associations are prohibited. ... Anyone who maintains an illegal association is liable to the same penalty as a person who has been condemned for seizing government buildings or temples by force."

T.E. Lawrence (Lawrence of Arabia), Seven Pillars of Wisdom Ch.6

"the Arabic peoples... a prolific Semitic agglomeration... great in religious thought, reasonably industrious, mercantile, politic, yet solvent rather than dominant in character."

What America is to the parasite

The harem knew that they could not win against the will of people to be free. So what they did was hold these far away continents as settlement lands to draw off the people who wanted to be free. This way, they would not be so much trouble for the Parasite's main holdings, at least not for a while. And the parasite has done all this before many times, not just in Athens and Rome.

Tacitus, Annals, 1.2

"They distrusted the government of the senate and the people on account of their [prior] struggles with the powerful, rapacious Roman officials." [SPQR = Senate and People Qui are Rome = senate and people who are Rome.]

SPQR

Of course when the Arabs took-over and installed their murderous dictatorship, they announced nothing. In fact, they tried as hard as they could to keep this a secret. And they never stopped saying Senate and People who are Rome, or putting it on all public property. Indeed the modern manhole covers in Rome still say this, even today. So centuries after Rome ceased to be a democracy, the people running it were still calling it a democracy. And they still used the world democracy to hide how Rome had become the exact opposite, a rapacious front dictatorship for the Arabs.

Eventually the Arabs killed enough people to get the upper hand and then they just ground European civilization into the ground and brought about a Dark Ages. This was like two sides of the same coin, the great age of Islam, perfectly bracketed. The Islamic conquest started in 636, only 10 years after the aqueducts in Rome's capital city were cut. The Islamic conquest ended in Poitiers in 732. Then only 34 years later in 766, the Aqueducts were re-connected. Then only 2 years later, we see the Carolingian Renaissance in 768. Don't let this happen to the world again

COLOSSEUMS AND CRUCIFIXION

Tacitus, Annals, 6.13

[In 32AD] "The excessive price of grain almost led to an insurrection. For several days, the theatre was the scene of public protests. Many demands were shouted with greater frequency and boldness than was customary towards the emperor [note how the people assembled in the theatre to organize against the Arab puppet government. It is notable that the Roman colosseum, called the Flavian=yellow amphitheater was built only 43 years later so our Arab masters could massacre the people engaged in such protests.]

Isocrates, Panegyricus 40

[In Athens, the theaters apparently started as a way to inform. In fact, there seems to have been prizes for the best lectures.

However after some time, they seem to have degenerated into Greek "art" plays, the worthless propaganda-heavy television of the day.]

"A further gift of Athens is the chance to find the surest friendships, the most varied of associations. [In Athens we] see contests not only of speed and strength, but intelligence and explanation, and all sorts of other activities, for which high prizes are awarded. In addition to the rewards that Athens actually offers, she incites other elsewhere, because awards made by Athens [like those of America today] are held in such esteem as the object of universal admiration. Festivals/ parties everywhere are periodic gatherings which quickly disperse. But Athens is an ongoing festival/party for visitors which will last until the end of time.

Philosophy [the love of knowledge] took a part in the discovery and development of all these, and gave us education in the field of [commercial and government] affairs and civilized society. It helped us distinguish between the misfortunes [inequality] due to ignorance and those due to necessity. It taught us to be wary of the former and bear the latter bravely. [Here the context show us how philosophy is really knowledge and learning]

Our city showed the way to it, and also gave honor to skill in words [knowledge, mass communication], for which she became the desire and the envy of the entire world. She realized that this alone is naturally the particular [tiniest and most powerful] possession of mankind [pro-men-thean eu-man·idi], and that this [one] development led to all other superiorities [of the Athenians. With this one innovation, Athens] saw that [all] other activities showed such confusion in practice, and that ignorance was often the [main] cause of failure in them. [She saw her] folly [and turned it] into success. [No longer] was an organized mind and the power of speech [effective communication] outside the scope of the ordinary men. [Thus the Greeks saw] knowledge [Gr. sophia, normally translated as wisdom] as the opposite of ignorance. [Thus the Greeks loved knowledge and hatred ignorance so powerfully that their word for their love of knowledge and its public dialogue could never be erased, but only blurred into something else — the impersonization of Athenian Isocracy called Socrates.]

The Greeks also saw a] liberal and free education as a birthright of everyone, and what was said [at the democratic forum] was the clearest proof of education [and democratic leadership skill. No longer were] courage, wealth and similar distinctions [valued].

These communication skills gave not only domestic advantages, but international honors. Athens had so far outrun the rest of mankind in thought and speech, that her disciples were the masters of the rest [of the world]. And it is due to her that the word 'Greek' is not so much a term of birth as of mentality — one applied to a common culture, rather than a common descent.

Colosseums = co·lysi'ums = together·liquidate'ums

Long before the Greeks built that large one-sided speaking theatre on the Acropolis they must have been built lots of smaller ones. And it is the parasite's way of doing things that broad and dynamic market is consolidated into a few oversized 'cartel' or ak·our·tel players. So it seems that the big theaters and the great plays were the parasite's idea. Firstly this gave them the main TV channels and internet video sites. These offered immense prizes on and subsidized admissions to get rid of the small-fry theaters. Then, once the smaller theaters were eliminated, the Arabs had control of the Greek media.

Instead of having maybe 15 of of 25 venues engaged in documentary, educational programming, it became none of 3 massive venue chains (I surmise judging from Television) re-running the same old crap, mostly worthless fiction and drivel = bri·pull. This drivel appealed to the lowest common denominator just like our TV does today. This included practically nothing useful, just like TV today tells us practically nothing useful.

They know about media from all the times they did it before

They also did it in Rome and in London right after the English defeated the Spanish armada. This is the propaganda garbage attributed to William Shakespeare. It is real easy to see in the media. The more media, the more history, the more we have gotten away from our secret masters and the more that needs to be covered up. The less media and history, the closer the host is to its parasite. For example the dark ages and simultaneously the great of Islam. They did everything before, they are absolute experts at it.

The media is not dominated by Jews, it is dominated by Arabs

And their films are full of subtle propaganda like Casablanca. And once upon a time, the studio frontmen of the Arabs owned pretty much all the movie theaters in the US. After that, Arab frontman corporations owned/controlled pretty much all the radio stations. Then they owned/controlled pretty much all the TV networks.

Roman theater innovations

Note the big difference between Greek-style half-open theaters and Roman-style closed theaters. The Roman-style offers some major improvements for the parasite:

- 1) In Rome, there was an inside wall around the spectacle ring. This was a wall too high to climb out of. This allowed the Roman theaters to be used for the execution of political prisoners as public spectacle. This must have greatly intimidated many Romans into keeping quiet about their parasite-fronting emperors.
- 2) The height of the outside walls in most Roman amphitheaters is notable because it is too high to jump from without injury. Also, Roman amphitheaters go all the way around so that a limited number of people can massacre all the unarmed guests as they came out, or vomited out of the L. vomitori. These rapidly filled and clogged with bodies. Thus we see that Roman amphitheaters were designed by the Arabs to facilitate mass murder.

Amphi-theaters = two sided theaters with no means of escape

Vomitories or omit·ories = omit·mouths

What percentage of ground floor openings to Roman two-sided theaters have been omitted or covered over by seating?

The **COLOSSUS of ROADS** = the co·lysi of hodos, the massacre on the hodos peninsula.

America is full of colosseums

The same parasite is using the same playbook on you america. Sports, wine women, song, theatre...

Plutarch (d. 120AD), Sulla 3

"He then summoned the senate to meet in the Temple of

Bellona, and at the same time as he rose up to speak, those who had been given the job, began to butcher the 6,000 men in the Circus [Circus=ring=arena. clearly a great number were murdered at an entertainment venue. Perhaps that is why the parasite channels billions into building these places all over the world. Perhaps it is angling for future massacres, or simultaneous bombings. Note how isolated all the modern stadiums are. Note how all these places are surrounded by great fields of parking lot and located far away from people.]

The noise of their shrieks, so many men being massacred in so small a space, was as might be expected easily heard and the senators were astonished and dumbfounded. Sulla however, continued to speak with the same calm and unmoved expression [You are reading a heuristic guide on how to do such things]. He told the senators to listen to what he had to say and not to bother with what was going on outside. Some criminals, he said, are being corrected. It is being done on my orders. This made it clear at once to even the dumbest Romans that, far from escaping tyranny, they had only exchanged one tyrant for another."

Seneca, Crowds (letter 7)

[Seneca died in 65AD and the colosseum was built in the 70's AD. Today, instead of seeing people die for real in shows, we go to see film shows where make-believe 'fantasy' death, is depicted up close, and often in rapid-fire sequences. And of course sometimes we see this in our own homes during "family time".]

"Nothing harms one's character so much as lounging at the games/ shows. This pleasure paves the path for vice to creep in. What, specifically, do I mean? I come home more greedy, more self-seeking, more pleasure-loving, yes, but even more cruel and more inhuman because I have been among humans. [Important thoughts are missing here]

[Recently,] I arrived during the noon interlude at the arena, expecting some clever comedy or parody, some break from the human gore. The show was the opposite. The fighting that had gone before was charity by contrast. Now there was no nonsense about it, this was pure murder. The men were completely unarmed and their bodies completely exposed and every stroke was a tell [tele=end, completion]. Many spectators prefer this to the usual competition and to the championship matches. Why shouldn't they? There is no helmet or shield to parry the steel. Why armor? Why skill? Such things delay the kill. In the morning, men are thrown to the lions and bears. At noon, to the spectators. They order those who have made a kill to be thrown to others who will kill them, and the victor is kept for fresh slaughter. The conclusion of every fight is death. No quarter is given. And this goes on even when the stands are empty. [the first purpose is to purge the host society of the troublemakers, the second priority is to make a spectacle of it.] 'But the fellow was a highwayman. He killed a man!' So what. Because he killed a man he deserves this fate?

But what did you do, my poor man, to deserve having to look at this? 'Cut him, Drive him out [to fight] with a whip and firebrand [a piece of wood with burning red charcoal at one end]

Why are his strokes so hesitant? Why is he so timid about meeting the blade? Why is he so reluctant to die? Scourge [whip/ beat] him so he will face up to his slashing! 'Make them trade blows, bared breast to bared breast!' Then comes the intermission: 'Let's have a little throat cutting; we must have some action!'

Seneca, On the Shortness of life 13

"Pompey was the first to stage a [mock] battle in the circus [ring] involving 18 elephants, fighting criminals in a mock battle. A leading man of the state, and according to report, distinguished among the foremost citizens of old for the kindness of his heart. He thought it a noteworthy kind of spectacle to put men to death by a novel fashion. Are they fighting to the death? It is not enough. Are they torn to pieces? It is not enough: Let them be crushed to a pulp by creatures of enormous size! It would have been better to consign the whole episode to oblivion for fear some future ruler might hear of it and emulate its barbarity. Oh what darkness does great prosperity cast over our minds!" [always leave an escape goat]

The Greek Theaters were not for plays at first

They were the meeting place for the people. If everyone sat quietly, nobody talking and nobody getting up, then 10,000 people could hear the words of one. What a massive thing this was for the Greeks. Everyone suddenly realized what everyone thought and then they know what "god" wanted and just all did what they thought was best. It was a pure form of democracy, at least at first.

The parasite made sure however to ruin it and to keep control of the scribe-based press. So most communication happened orally. Then they set to work to glorify oral communication and disparage written and permanent communication.

Transformed from god-mechanism to death-camps

It may have been possible to hear god in a Greek theatre when the Athenian Iso·cracy met. But in Rome, the colosseums were the parasite's death camps.

Thus the even a god mechanism was transformed by the parasite in Greek and Roman times. Thus Rome's colosseum was not where good ideas were rewarded — it was where good ideas were punished and punished horribly.

Thus we understand that Rome had stadiums where its democracy might work, but which were repurposed for murdering political prisoners. Officially this was called entertainment, even though it scared the shit out of anyone who might say something about Mideast Inc.'s ever changing front emperor.

During the Nika or 'Victory' riot (below) the Emperor's administration surrounded a small number of exits and killed all the mostly unarmed people as they came out. And, of course, this was part of the design of the colosseums. This is why they were so high and completely walled. It was so that the people inside could be more easily massacred if need be. Here we imagine perhaps 75,000 people in a standing-room only stadium. I think there are something like 12 or 16 exits that are perhaps 3 meters across.

It is important to realize that throughout history. Whenever there were large numbers of people murdered either during time of war or peace, it was the parasite pulling the strings. Also, I bet there were more mass murders of an entire stadium audience than history records. Maybe this is why Benito Mussolini cleared the areas around the Colosseum. Maybe it was to get rid of the mass graves.

Epictetus, Lectures Collected by Arrian 4.13.5

"In Rome, reckless men are trapped by soldiers [secret police forces] in the following manner. A soldier [officer] in civilian clothing sits down beside you and begins to criticize the emperor. Then if... you add what's on your mind, you will a

moment later be bound and lead away." [Epictetus was expelled by the administration of emperor Domitian in 89AD, 20 years after Judaeen Arabia was massacred. By this time, Rome was clearly a police state, run by the parasite. It was a place where the enemies of the parasite became the enemies of its figurehead.]

The Roman Colosseum and political prisoners

These enemies of the figurehead were sent to die in the town stadium, or colosseum. Here some of the audience were probably entertained. But generally, these were either fools or people loyal to their government and their system — no matter how obviously corrupt and malignant, like in North Korea today. Most people were in some way intimidated by their government through the "games". What a doublespeak term that is.

It is so easy to connect the dots. There were these brotherly informer deletores. They would go around and try to entice people into saying something bad about the Roman (pro•men) government. If you said something, you would be lead to the murder arena, where your execution would serve to intimidate the others who were thinking of saying anything bad about the parasite's front-man emperor. Here is a totalitarian that was so totally enslaved that the first human right did not exist.

Now flash for a moment to the idolatry for that Mideast figurehead running North Korea. Here it is dangerous not to attend the many stadium events. This is because important people who didn't attend, might have been thought to be planning something. Perhaps it was also dangerous not to go to the Roman "games".

And doesn't "games" fail a bit as a descriptive term? but as a doublespeak term, it fits nicely with the idea that "regular attendance is strongly suggested."

Who were the victims? Many were just people who saw an economic opportunity, taking a bite out of a Mideast racket. Funny word entrepreneurs is, it comes from entre•br'n•oo•ours = between•bros•nest-egg•ours.

Of course everyone knew these rackets as the property of the figurehead emperor's business. Thus people thought the emperor, or his administrators were greedy. Few people suspected that the Roman emperor was actually a frontman for a foreign parasite race from a land of no resources of its own.

And if anyone dared to speak out about the system they would die horribly as a public spectacle.

Led Zeppelin 4, Battle of Evermore

"The pain of war cannot exceed the woe that I demand"

What prophets are

A profit or a prophet is a pro•eff•it = for•shout•it. These are the people who would shout out to anyone who would listen about something the harem/harm brotherhood had to keep secret.

Laws of Manu 9.288

"(The king) should have all the prisons built on the royal highway, where the suffering and mutilated evil-doers can be seen."

Crucifying prophets

Prophets have always been terribly dangerous for a parasite dedicated to its own carefully fabricated status quo. So the parasite has always treated prophets to "special treatment", killing prophets in the most painful way as an example.

The method that became the parasite's favorite was

crucifixion. Here the prophet, disobedient Arab slave, or other person would have hand-made fat iron nails driven through his hands and into a wooden crossbar. This crossbar is the cross the victim would bear through the town.

The crucifixion field was really just an orchard on the road out of town. This was the parasite's choice for a location because it wanted the victims to be seen. Here the trees has been cut off maybe 2-meters (6.6 feet) above the ground and groves cut in the stumps down to say 1.4-meters (4.5 feet). The crucifix pole would be dropped into the groove and pinned into place so it could not be slid either left or right by the victim as he wreathed in agony.

Now scavenging birds usually hung around the crucifixion grounds. These would land and perch on the crucifixion bar in addition to the arms and shoulders of the victim. From this location they would proceed to pick on and tear at the accessible flesh of the victim. So the birds would start with the eyes and face and hands — some of the most sensitive parts of the body. These people would have most the skin and musculature ripped from their head and hands by the birds, long before they actually died. This was/is the fate of many pro•eff•its like me who dared speak out against the harm of the haremi, or harem people.

And Jesus wasn't a real man. He is the impersonization of a movement, or a pirate insurgency. He is the Arabians that were crucified by Roman operation Bridge Pilot at it tried to secure the Red Sea for trade (also imposing immense poverty on the Arabians.)

Finally it became myth, all the jews•us who were crucified in Arabia and along the Red Sea.

A 4-story jump

The first ledge above the first arches at the Flavian Amphitheater, is quite deceptively high. In fact, it is 12m over the present ground level. This is about 4.1 stories up and too high to jump. I argue that both the height and the its deceptiveness is intentional.

Now people might have unwound their togas and tied them together, but most Romans people did not wear togas. Only the wealthy as a sort of business suit. And besides who wears a business suit to a soccer game?

Gladiators were regarded as scum

Ignore the legends about how Roman women would pay to have sex with gladiators. Imagine that it is propaganda. Now what do you think of gladiators? They were like the man chopping people's heads off for the king, no?

The GLADIATORS, or BLADE•I•AIDERS and BLEEDI•AIDERS were the equivalent of a corps of hangmen, or secret-police executioners. They were not at all liked, in fact they were hated by the Romans. So it is not hard to imagine that the Brotherly gladiatorial victims who could fight well in the ring were given a second chance if they swore absolute allegiance to the Brothers and had their vocal cords cut, the Gr. GLOTTIS cut (same word). These were men who were just GLAD to be alive. These grateful dead were willing and eager to kill people as directed — just like the Musslemen (the Polish word for Muslims, and also the word for the Jewish collaborators at Auschwitz. These were Jews collaborated and worked for the Nazis so they could live on. They did what the Germans instructed.

The gladiators did what their masters told them to do. They were completely dependent on their masters. They were branded as gladiators, and the could not talk, and they were

despised by all of Rome. When their masters said go and surround the colosseum and kill anyone who comes out, they did what they were told.

Procopius' history of the wars, 532AD.

[This is from a different book by Procopius. There seems to be much text missing.]

"At the this time, an insurrection broke out unexpectedly among the people of Byzantium, and, contrary to expectation, it proved to be a very serious affair, for it ended in great harm to the people and to the senate, as the following account shows.

In every city [of the eastern empire] the population has been divided for a long time past into the Blue [blue bloods] and the Green [green Arabian?] factions [Humans and Gremlins]. But in recent times it came about that, for the sake of these names and the [legislative] seats which the rival factions occupy in watching the [governmental] games, they spend their money and abandon their bodies to the cruelest tortures. Nor do they think it unworthy to die in this most shameful way. And they fight one another not knowing what end they will come to. But knowing well that, even if they win a battle, the matter will [frequently] end with them being carried straight to the dungeon, and finally, after suffering extreme torture, death.

So there grows up in them a hostility against their fellow men which has no [apparent] cause, and at no time does it cease or disappear, for it displaces the ties of family, marriage and friendship. ... [text missing]

At the time, the officers of the city administration [the Homeland security officers.] were leading some rioters away for execution. But the members of the two factions, conspiring together and declaring a truce, seized the prisoners and then the prison, releasing all those who were in confinement there. ... [text missing, probably something about torture.] Fire was applied to the city [little doubt by the Brothers] as if it had fallen under the hand of an enemy. ... [text missing]...

...All hopes of the emperor were centered upon his general Belisarius, who had recently returned from the Persian war bringing with him a following which was both powerful and imposing, and in particular he had a great number of battle-hardened soldiers.

[New subject] When Hypatius [the new emperor the people of the supposed democracy chose] reached the hippo-drome [horse•run, horse•track], he immediately went up to the emperor's seat, on the royal throne from where the emperor always viewed the entertainment. ... [text missing]

Belisarius [and his battle hardened soldiers], with difficulty and not without danger and great exertion, made his way over ground [in Byzantium] covered by ruins and half burned buildings ... [text missing] ... he drew his sword from its sheath, and commanding his soldiers to do the same with a battle cry he advanced at a run. The disorganized crowd [in the hippodrome] was milling about when it saw the armored soldiers charging with their weapons drawn, soldiers who were well known for their bravery and experience in war. When they saw these use their weapons unsparingly, they beat a hasty retreat. ... [text missing] Mundus charged right into the the stadium/ sports arena though the entrance which they [now] called the Gate of Death. ... [text missing] There perished among the populace on that day more than 30,000 ... [text missing]... The soldiers killed both Hypatius and Pompeius the next day and threw their bodies into the sea [actually the lack of bodies probably means that the brothers ate them alive, cannibale-style, over many years. ... text missing] This was

the end of the insurrection in Byzantium."

The Colosseum of Rome — major additions

Look at the Colosseum of Rome. It seems to have been built in phases.

Phase-1: A single circle of arches and seating to the top of those arches.

Phase-2: A second row of arches and the raising of the seating area.

Phase-3: There is the addition of a brick sun parapet on top of the two rows of arches.

Phase-4: On the North half, there are additional structures and arcades for more seating.

The Colosseum of Rome — a 4-story jump

When looking at the Roman colosseum, the scale of the thing tricks the eye. The level above the first floor arches is about 4-stories up. This is simply too high to get out from uninjured. So everyone had to use one of the rather narrow exits. How easy it must have been to station a rather small number of well armed men in a battle line at the exits.

And clearly the Colosseum was modified from a 3-story jump out to a 4-story jump out. Just look at the structure. Look at how the seating was raised above the arc and the space between the columns was filled with cement. The original design for the Colosseum was not subject to massacre and the design was modified to make it subject to massacre.

Find the graveyards

The bones from the colosseum where did they go? Can you find a heap somewhere when you drill Rome 150m on center (where exposed)? If you can't find the bone pile, it strongly suggests that Arabs were eating the victims.

Funny how the Arabs never attack our headball stadiums

The way the Arabs don't use suicide bombers on stadiums bespeaks central control. Apparently, they don't want to 1) Stop us from playing headball. 2) Ruin the surprise of Nika-style attacks. 3) Get us thinking about the Nika Revolt of 532 AD where they killed 30,000 people in Constantinople, the then capitol of the world. This was about 62 years before the lights went out in what remained of Rome and the European Dark Ages began. The Nika revolt was also 38 years before Mohammed was born.

APPENDIX—4

DEMOCRACY AS INCIPIENT GOD

An integrated government

This form of government is intended to arise out of, and be fully integrated with the people, being actually part of them — much the same way that your brain is part of your body.

Machiavelli's discourses on Livy 1.58

"Concerning prudence and stability, the people are more prudent, more reliable, and have better judgement than a prince does. And it is not without reason that the voice of the people is likened to that of God: for it is evident that popular opinion has marvelous powers of prediction, so much so that it would appear to foresee its own good and evil fortune through some hidden ability. As for its judgment in various matters, when the people hear two equally able speakers, each arguing different opinions, only very rarely does it happen that they do

not choose the better opinion and are incapable of understanding the truth of what they hear. And if they err in matters of courage or profit, as mentioned above, a prince will often err because of his own passions, which are much stronger than those of the people. It is also evident that the people make better choices in electing magistrates than does a prince, for one can never persuade the people that it is good to elect to public office an infamous man of corrupt habits — something that a prince can easily be persuaded to do in a thousand ways. Also, when the people begin to feel an aversion for something, we see them persist in this aversion for many years -- something we do not observe in a prince."

The mute voice of goodness and its spirit

Recall the moment of silence after the September-11 attacks. We were all pointed in the same direction, but without voice and direction. The only voice and direction we had was from George, our odious rex, and he took us all in the direction of the find all the patriots act, and the 2nd Arab oil embargo.

The voice of a group spirit

How do you hear the voice of a group spirit? You listen to it. You develop this mechanism for listening to all the remarkable micro-voices of all the individual cells when they express anything. Then these feed together into Centi-Nomes as an intermediary step. These consolidates and analyze and elevate good ideas to one of the 10 main consciousnesses.

We will probably multiply the number of group consciousnesses to a high number, perhaps thousands of them, like bulletin boards, only able to resolve things fairly and intelligently as a group, and bulletin boards that will run the world fairly and intelligently.

This is the singularity mechanism

The singularity mechanism is social in nature. It is a form of democracy actually — a far less corruptible form of democracy, that is all.

The god mechanism is a democracy

It is a democracy of sufficient breadth and sufficiently free from corruption. This is how we will hear the incipient voice of god. Now if we look at mankind's evil spirit, it is focused like a laser beam on its parasitic agenda. By contrast, mankind's good spirit is thousands of times more popular and thus potentially thousands of times more powerful. However, thanks to the ex-pull efforts of our evil parasite, our true good spirit has been kept unfocused, disorganized, uninformed, and under corrupt government. Essentially, the parasite keeps its host in a self-canceling state like the noisy din of voices in a large cafeteria. This allows our parasite's chorus to run the show in the narrow areas it directs its efforts.

Once we have an incorruptible, pure and clear democratic design; a form of government that cannot be corrupted or hijacked, the greater group spirit of mankind will finally find, listen to, and learn to recognize its own true voice. Rapidly this voice will grow in power and volume once it learns how to recognize itself. Almost instantly, it will grow louder than nearly all aspects our parasite's devilish chorus.

This event will be far more important than developing a better form of government. This incorruptible, pure and clear democratic design is ultimately the mechanism that will enable us to hear the great spirit of all mankind. Some call this spirit god, but if you want to be both-feet-on-the-ground about it, it is just the cooperative group spirit of our humanity. This is the "voice" that will direct us on our destiny to become the meta-

creature, or "good spirit" so many people sense exists among their fellow man.

In this context, we come to understand that democracy is not merely a form of government. Democracy in its purest and most incorruptible form is a listening and decision making mechanism for mankind's cooperative spirit.

To me, this group drive, this group spirit shared by men is god. To me, all the other pre-theist gods and Mideast prophets are lies. And to me, any book that hides ideas damaging to the cause of the Arabs is probably a lie. I mean, isn't it obvious that Moses parted the Red Sea in a north-south direction by terrorizing the Egyptian side? And doesn't the tale of Noah's ark hid the immense yet infrequent danger of living near the sea? Look how your bible muddles away these two vitally important tales from history.

Ubiquity is the bringing about of god

The thoughts we democratically choose to ubiquitize will become the thoughts of all mankind. These will come slowly at first, but then accelerate, like an exponent curve. These thoughts will product the change-wave that will send up upward.

Khaled Abou El Fadl, P. 88

[Here is supposedly one of the world's most respected Islamic scholars.]

"A Muslim scholar spending a six-month sabbatical in a Saudi Arabian university would make more money in the course of this sabbatical than he would make in ten years of teaching at the Azhar university in Egypt. Similarly, writers or imams espousing pro Wahhabi positions would qualify for very lucrative contracts, grants and awards... In fact, the most alarming development of the 1980s was that even Muslim scholars who were known for their liberalism and rationalism wrote defending Wahhabism -- portraying it as a movement most capable of confronting the challenges of modernity."

Democracy amplifies god's faint voice

The Muslim slaves of the world believe something like this already. They believe in Islam's Umma and its pseudo democratic voice. But in fact, Islam's Umma is even more corrupt than America's democracy (see quote above). There exists a huge back door for the Arabians to use money to pretend to speak for God.

Please, everyone, lets all stop listening to god's voice through corrupt social mechanisms and through corrupt Middle Eastern religions. Lets all stop listening to the pretend voice of god as purchased in Islam's Umma. Instead, lets all start listening to our own group mind though the incorruptible mechanism I explain herein.

Lets stop being stupid as societies

It is not the stupidity of people as individuals that is such a big problem for the world. The real problem is the way that we are so stupid as groups, as societies, as governments, as scientific establishments, and as business entities. This is the big problem for our society. This is the issue that is blocking the evolution of humanity.

God mechanism 1.0

America's first constitution of 1777 was based on over 2000 state senators in 13 state legislatures. That little mechanism despite its flaw as a meta-democracy was probably good enough as a god mechanism — at least to start. I think that probably would have sent humanity over the edge and into the

recursion had our parasite not intervened and instituted the 1789 US constitution, the current constitution.

My god doesn't exist yet

Many Mideast religions cast mankind as god's children — and god as a father wanting his children to behave well. They also say that Arab prophets from thousands of years ago have god's true message. They also say that "gods" approved priests will tell you all about god's will and his perfect religion. They also command you to pay upwards of 10% of your income to your Mideast religion.

The way I see it, god doesn't exist yet, and all these Mideast religions and churches are all self-serving lies of the desperado slaves of Mideast Inc.

Fighting for the truth

Every single war over religion or political ideology has been a war over the truth. One group of men believes one set of our Mideast-fostered lies, the other believes another set of the Mideast-fostered lies. Here I offer a broad democratic design that will silence all our parasite's many lies and liars — a democracy that will allow the truth to be heard accurately and honestly.

Are we ready for the reigns yet?

This question is absurd. Its like asking when the right point is to turn back because you realize you are on the wrong path. As soon as you realize you are on the wrong path, you need to stop and turn back. There is no waiting to get smarter or stronger or anything like that. You turn back as soon as you realize you are on the wrong path.

Feel my god

Right now, at this time, my god is merely a spirit shared by men. It is the feeling we get when we find a way to conquer a disease. It is the feeling of first putting a man on the moon. It is the feeling that the internet gave us at first. It is the feeling that we are going to make things better for ourselves and for our species.

Feel Ishtar and Mohammed

If you want to feel the spirits of the parasite, think about the feeling we all shared when Arabs Inc attacked the World Trade Center buildings and the Pentagon. This is the spirit of Mohammed, Ishtar and the devil's d'ex•pull,

My church

I am going to end this section with one of its most important parts. I hope you decide to worship the spirit I show you here. You may listen to this spirit's voice as expressed by a broad and incorruptible democracy, or you may follow your own internal compass. But you should never allow any other voice in. Never accept anyone as a priest, or an expert on what I have said. Such an idea will enslave you to your teachers instead of liberating you from slavery as I seek to do.

The prophet doesn't speak the word of god

He speaks the way to become as god

You are free as broad democracies to overwrite anything I say. For I am just one man, and once I have said what I have to say, and set everyone on the right path, I am no longer smarter than all of you. I am just one man with one consciousness, and you are all collectively the nascent god.

It is God's voice that will kill the parasite

Soon the entire world will muster up into broad democracies. When that happens, we will finally know what humanity's great spirit thinks is best. Finally, we will hear this spirit's true voice and not what the parasite wants. When that happens the great spirit of eu•man•idi will rule the earth, and not the evil ex•pull parasite spirit of the land of no resources.

The energy of the god mechanism

The adulation you show Senators and Ubiqs is some important stuff. It is this adulation and the sense of duty that is the primary fuel of the god mechanism. Without adulation, any eu•tropic government would be sub-optimal. We should therefore do what we reasonably can to use and magnify this energy for the common good.

Conscious and autonomic

Politics and economics are a dualism like god's conscious and autonomic nervous system.

Cells in the mind of our god mankind

Ponder individual humans as cells in the mind of a mankind becoming god. The key part of the meta-creature's intelligence are the few original cells that first express valuable thoughts. So make sure that your education system helps develop the original minds that are capable of having fresh and new ideas. There will always be plenty enough repeater cells, and they will be plenty accurate. It is the cortical origination cells that are always scarce.

A few suggestions for god's first decisions

Once you have mustered up, as the inventor of the god mechanism, I hope you will all allow me to suggest the first thoughts for this mechanism:

- 1) That it move as fast as possible towards preparing for the end of bright sunny days on earth.
- 2) That it put aside all the previous differences that have afflicted mankind.
- 3) That it move un-reservedly towards a world of more and better, making the continued obedience of Ishtar and Islam into a tortuous capital offense.
- 4) That everyone commits to expeditiously moving ALL of the people living in parts of the world that are uninhabitable or untenable.
- 5) That up to 25% of all exhods may be comfortably housed on same sex islands and bread out.
- 6) That we not worry much about earth's blue skied environment, because this environment will not exist once the ice age starts.
- 7) That god does not exist yet, and that all religions that say that god already exists are self-serving lies of the devilish parasite spirit of the land of no resources.
- 8) That all Mideast immigrants who do not know our language and customs like a native must go back where they came from and stand for re-settlement again.
- 9) Only 555 broad democracies may decide on what group action is to be taken for past actions that occurred in a time of ignorance.
- 10) No action shall be off the table for a national broad democracy.
- 11) Simply holding the office of monarch, president, prime minister, king or economic oligarch shall be considered as working for Ishtar in a key role. All such people shall immediately resign and donate all their family's property to their nation immediately. If they fail to do so within 24-hours, they

shall die by hell.

12) Those who act as individuals and wrongly harm repentant innies and Arab for their activities during the time of ignorance shall die by hell.

13) That Mn•ham•mid is a false prophet, and Jesus was born of the harems by his mother the "br•gen".

APPENDIX—5

A HISTORY OF US CORRUPTION

Prefacing thoughts

In reading the following, you will see many mentions of huge organizations and ultra-rich people that exploit enslave and impoverish the people. Ask yourself these questions:

- 1) Are these ultra-rich people Arab front-men
- 2) Are these huge organizations Arab fronts?
- 3) Who has such a crazy megalomaniacal (mega•al•loo•maniacal) greed but the Arabs and their endless need to feed on the outside world?
- 4) Who else could this endless greed be, but the single unified parasitic agenda of the Arabs from the land of no resources?

Also Note all the underlined foreigner English [FE] in addition to other underlined sections.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.1

[page 1] "Nearly all the [American] colonies were settled by chartered companies, [fronting for the Arabs] organized for purely commercial [money extracting] purposes and the success of which largely depended upon the emigration which they were able to promote. These corporations were vested with enormous powers and privileges [by the kings corrupt royal court] which, in effect, constituted them as sovereign rulers, although their chartered were subject to revision or amendment. The London Company, thrice chartered to take over to itself the land and resources of Virginia and populate its zone of rule, was endowed with sweeping rights and privileges which made it an absolute monopoly. The impecunious noblemen [poor swart Harem spawn] or gentlemen [gentile fair people from Europe] who transported themselves to Virginia to recoup their dissipated fortunes or seek adventure, encountered no trouble in getting large grants of land especially when after 1614, tobacco became a fashionable article in England and took rank as a valuable commercial commodity. [The Arabs were responsible for introducing this addictive and hence valuable commodity.]

Over this colony now spread planters who hastened to avail themselves of [rushed to take advantage of] this new-found means of getting rich. Land and climate alike favored them, but they were confronted with a scarcity of labor. The emergency was promptly met by the buying of white servants in England to be resold in Virginia to the highest bidder. This however, was not sufficient, and complaints poured over to the English government. As the demands of commerce had to be sustained at any price, a system was at once put into operation of gathering in as many of the poorer English class as could be impressed upon some pretext, and shipped them over to be held as bonded laborers. [the Arabs made this happen in the London to increase profits.] Penniless and lowly Englishmen, arrested and convicted for any one of the multitude of [petty] offenses, then provided for severely in law, were transported as criminals or sold into the colonies as slaves for a term of years. The English courts were busy grinding out human material for the Virginia plantations. And as the objects [objectives] of

commerce were considered paramount [most important], this process of disposing of what was regarded as the scum element was adjudged necessary and justifiable. No voice was raised in protest.

[The Arabs introduced tobacco to England, and their friendlies generally owned the plantations to produce it. There were not enough people to meet demand, so they got the corrupt English monarchy to impose ridiculously strict laws designed to ensnare as many free people as possible, and ship them off as white slaves for the Arab tobacco plantations. Also, note those last underlined words. They are so critical to understanding why this happened and how to prevent it in the future. There was no widespread objection to this state of affairs, so it continued on. You must all stand up and protest the Arab feeding or it will not stop.]

But as fast as the English courts might work, they did not supply laborers enough. It was with exultation [happiness, rejoicing] that in 1619 [only 5 years later] the plantation owners were made acquainted with a new means of supplying themselves with adequate workers. A Dutch ship arrived at Jamestown with a cargo of Negroes from Guinea. The blacks were promptly bought at good prices by the planters. From this time forth the problem of labor [for the Arab tobacco plantations in the American south] was considered sufficiently solved...

After 1620, when the London Company was dissolved by royal decree, and the commerce of Virginia made free... the big planters contrived to get the laws and customs their self-interest called for. There were only two classes—the rich [Arab-fronting] planters, with their gifts of land [who were all beholding or beheld by their benefactors], their bond-servants and slaves and, on the other hand, the poor whites. A middle class was entirely lacking."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.1

"These restrictions were in the interest of the Dutch West India Company, a commercial corporation [in name Dutch, but fronting for the Arabs] which had well-nigh dictatorial powers [as the evil ex-pull of the Arabs always seeks]. A complete monopoly throughout the whole of its subject territory [again, as the evil ex-pull of the Arabs always seeks], it was armed with sweeping powers, a formidable equipment, and had a great prestige [FE]. It was somewhat of a cross between legalized piracy and a body of adroit colonization promoters [how the Bros see themselves]. Pillage and butchery were often its auxiliaries, although in these respects it in nowise [no way] equalled its twin corporation, the Dutch East India Company, whose exploitation of Holland's Asiatic possessions was a long record of horrors.

The policy of the Dutch West India Company was to offer generous prizes for peopling the land while simultaneously forbidding competition with any of the numerous products or commodities dealt in by itself... Native industries were forbidden or their output monopolized, not only by the Dutch West India Company in New Netherlands, but by other companies elsewhere in the colonies [The Arab way of business.] ... law after law paralyzed or closed up many forms of colonial manufacture. The feudal character of Dutch colonization, as carried on by the Dutch West India Company, necessarily created great landed estates, the value of which arose not so much from agriculture, as was the case in Virginia, Maryland and later the Carolinas and Georgia, but from the natural[ly occurring] resources of the land. The superb primitive [old growth] timber, brought colossal profits in export, and there were also very valuable fishery rights where an

estate bounded [bordered] a shore or river. The pristine rivers were filled with great shoals of fish, to which the river fishing of the present day cannot be compared."

(1) This is a summary of what the Arab-fronting company did in the slave colonies of North America.

2) The Arab-fronting company welcomed people who would come over and pay the Arab commodity taxes.

3) Note the foreigner English underlined.

4) As today, many companies are nominally English and Dutch, but the Arabs are the chief beneficiaries.

5) Note how the Arab fronting companies don't care about the environment or sustainability, and only want to harvest and profit. They are just like the locust aliens in the Independence Day sci-fi films.

6) It was the tyranny of one of these Arab-fronting corporate franchises, and its exorbitant prices for imported tea that lead to the Boston Tea Party and the American Revolution.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.1

"Anything conducive to profit, no matter if indiscriminate murder, was accepted as legitimate and justifiable functions of trade, and was imposed alike upon [frontman] royalty, which shared in the proceeds, and upon the people at large."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.1

"In the old country, the soil [land] had long since passed into the hands of a powerful few [fronting for the Arabs] and was made the chief basis for the economic and political enslavement of the people. To escape from this thralldom [enslavement], many of the immigrants had endured hardships and [de]privation to get here [to America]. They expected that they could easily get land, the tillage [plowing, farming] of which would insure [ensure] them a measure of independence. [Instead] Upon arriving they found vast available parts of the country, especially the most desirable and accessible portions bordering shores or rivers preempted [already-purchased]. An exacting [demanding, onerous] and tyrannous feudal government [fronting for the well-organized Arabs] was in full control. Their only recourse in many instances was to accept the best of unwelcome conditions and become tenants of the great landed functionaries and [thus] worked for them.

The patroons [patr•oo•uns = father•egg•ones, the Arab friendlies in charge] naturally encouraged immigration [of people who would be their semi-slaves]. Apart from the additional values created by increased population, it meant a quantity of labor which, in turn, would precipitate [drive, push] wages to the lowest possible scale [levels]. [The Arabs generally struggle/jihad to max-out over-population. This not only increases desperation, but it drives the wages of their poor slave laborers to the lowest levels.] At the same time, in order to stifle every aspiring quality in the drudging laborer... a mere menial undeserving of any rights, the whole force of the law was made use of to bring about sharp discriminations. The laborer was purposely abased [degraded, humbled] to the utmost, [greatest extent] and he was made to feel in many ways his particular low place in the social organization. [The Arab way]

Far above him, vested with [clothed by the legal system with, legally possessing] enormous personal and legal powers, towered the [Arab frontman] patroon. While he, the laborer, did not have the ordinary burgher [citizen] right, that of having a minor voice [the right to vote] in public affairs. The burgher right was made entirely dependent upon property,

which was a facile method [and easy way] of disenfranchising [depriving] the multitude of poor immigrants and of keeping them down. Purchase [of a large-enough piece of land] was the one and only means of getting this right. To keep it [the burgher and political class] in as small and circumscribed [limited] a class [group] as possible, the price [of land] was made abnormally high. [This is a common Arab tactic.] It was enacted in New Netherlands in 1659, for instance, that immigrants coming with cargoes had to pay a thousand guilders for the burgher right [and the right to trade and vote]. As the average laborer got two shillings [a tenth of a guilder] a day for his long hours of toil, often extending from sunrise to sunset, he had little chance of ever getting this sum together. [Thus it was 10,000 day's pay, 27 years pay to obtain the burgher right. Only those who had access to Arab 'monopoly money' could afford this. Thus the Arab front men dominated both politics and trade/economy in early America.]

The consequence was that the merchants [Arab trading class] became the burgher class. And all the records of the time seem to prove conclusively that the merchants were servile instruments of the [Arab-fronting] patroons whose patronage and favor they assiduously courted. This deliberately pursued policy of degrading and despoiling [plundering] the laboring class incited bitter hatreds and resentments, the effects of which were permanent."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

"While this seizure of land was going on in New Netherlands, vast areas in New England were passing suddenly into the hands of a few men [fronting for Arabs Inc.]. These areas sometimes comprised what are now entire States, and were often palpably [obviously] obtained by fraud collusion, trickery or favoritism..."

Some US colonial geography trivia

- 1) Massachusetts included present day Maine, and New Hampshire did not touch the ocean
- 2) Georgia included present day Alabama and Mississippi.
- 3) North Carolina included present day Tennessee.
- 4) Virginia included present day Kentucky
- 5) New York included present day Vermont

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

"Describing how the English tiller had been expropriated from the soil Wallace says: 'The ingenuity of lawyers and direct landlord legislation steadily increased the powers of great landowners and encroached upon the rights of the people, till at length the monstrous doctrine arose that a landless Englishman had no right whatever to enjoyment even of the unenclosed commons and heaths and the mountain and forest wastes of his native country, but is everywhere in the eye of the law a trespasser whenever he ventures off a public road or pathway.' By the sixteenth century the English peasantry had been evicted even from the commons, which were turned into sheep walks by the impoverished barons [bar•ons] to make money from the Flemish wool market. The land at home wrenched from them, the poor English immigrants ardently [burningly] expected that in America land would be plentiful. They were bitterly disappointed. The various English companies [fronting for the Arabs], chartered by royal command with all-inclusive powers, despite the frequent opposition of parliament, held the trade and land of the greater part of the colonies as rigid monopoly. In the case of the New England

Company, severe punishment was threatened to all who should encroach upon its rights. It [the Arab fronting company] also was freed from payment for 21 years, and was relieved from taxes forever." [There is no limit to how much the Arab parasite race will take from their hosts. They certainly will try not to pay taxes to their hosts.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

"The New England colonies were carved out into a few colossal private estates. [complete centralization is the Arab way] The example of the British nobility was emulated; but the chartered companies did not have to resort to the adroit, disingenuous, subterranean methods which the English land magnates used in perpetuating their seizure, as so graphically described by S.W. Thackeray in his work, 'The Land and the Community'. The land of New England was taken over boldly and arbitrarily by the directors of the Plymouth Company, the most powerful of all the companies which exploited New England. The handful of men who participated in this division..."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

[This book, like so many Arab gazettes has a twin function:

- 1) It is an Arab heuristic guidebook on maintaining Arab power, and keeping the parasitic feeding going strong.
- 2) It is an explanation to the outries of the horrible things that the Arabs did.]

"There might be a superficial show of changed conditions, an apparent infusion of democracy, but, in reality, the substance remained the same. This was nowhere more lucidly or strikingly illustrated than after New Netherlands passed into the control of the English and was renamed New York. Laws were decreed which seemed to bear the impress[ion] of justice and democracy. Monopoly was [officially, in law] abolished, every man was given the much-prized right of trading in furs and pelts, and the burgher right was extended and its acquisition made easier.

However well-intentioned these altered laws were, they turned out to be shallow delusions. Under English rule, the gifts of vast estates in New York were even greater than under Dutch rule... But still the people imagined that they had a real democratic government. Had not England established representative assemblies? These, with certain restrictions, alone had the power of law-making for the provinces. These representative bodies were supposed to rest upon the vote of the people, which vote, however, was determined by a strict property qualification.

What really happened was that, apparently deprived of direct feudal power, the landed interests [fronting for the Arabs] had no difficulty in retaining their law-making ascendancy by getting control of the various provincial assemblies. Bodies supposedly representative of the whole people were, in fact, composed of great landowners, [and] of a quota of merchants who were subservient to the landowners, and a sprinkling of farmers [for show] ... the land magnates [fronting for the Arabs] had devised to set themselves up as the law-making class. Three of the large land grants contained provisions guaranteeing to each owner the privilege of sending a representative to the General Assembly. These landed proprietors, therefore, became hereditary legislators...

[And] what Colden wrote of the landed class of New York was substantially true of all the other provinces. The small, powerful clique of great land-owners [fronting for the

Arabs] had cunningly taken over to themselves the function of government and diverted them to their own ends. First the land was seized, and then it was declared exempt from taxation.

Inevitably there was but one sequel [outcome]. Everywhere, but especially so in New York and Virginia, the landed proprietors became richer and more arrogant, while poverty, even in new country with extraordinary resources, took root and continued to grow. The burden of taxation fell entirely upon the farming and laboring classes; although the merchants were nominally taxed, they easily shifted their obligations upon those two classes by indirect means of trade. Usurious loans and mortgages became prevalent.

It was now seen what meaningless tinsel the unrestricted right to trade in furs was. To get to furs, access to the land was necessary; and the land was monopolized. In the South, where tobacco and corn were the important staples, the worker was likewise denied the soil except as a laborer or tenant. And in Massachusetts colony, where fortunes were being made from timber, furs and fisheries, the poor man had practically no chance against his superior advantages of the landed and privileged class [fronting for the Arabs]. These conditions led to several reprisals. Several uprisings [occurred] in New York, Bacon's rebellion [occurred] in Virginia, after the restoration of Charles II, when the king granted large tracts of land belonging to the colony to his favorites, and subsequently, in 1734, a ferment in Georgia... [These] were all really outbursts of popular discontent largely against the oppressive form in which land was held and against discriminative taxation, although each uprising had its local issues differing from those elsewhere."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

"The landed magnates had not only created an abysmal difference between themselves and the masses in possessions and privileges, but also in dress and air, founded upon strict distinctions in law. The landed aristocrat, with his laces and ruffles, his silks and his gold and silver ornaments and expensive tableware, [All traditionally overpriced Arab concession products like nearly luxury products today] his consciously superior air and tone of grandiose authority, was far removed in established position from the mechanic or the laborer, with his coarse clothes and mean habitation. [Sumptuary] Laws were long in force in various provinces which prohibited the common people from wearing gold and silver lace silks and ornaments. Belmont noted the sense of deep injustice smoldering in the minds of the people and set out to confiscate the great estates, particularly, as he set forth, as many of them had been obtained by bribery."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

"The seizure of these vast estates and the arbitrary exclusion of the many from the land produced a combustible situation. And instantaneous and distinct cleavage of class divisions was the result." [You see, the 'master-mind' Arabs set up their frontmen as evil tyrants or loan holders. Then when the frontmen don't do as they are supposed to, they are easy for the Arabs to get rid of, because they are hated tyrants or loan holders.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

"the farm laborer, with his 16 hours work a day for 42 cents wage, the carpenter straining for his 52 cents per day, the

shoemaker drudging for his 73 cents a day and the blacksmith for his 70 cents" [These men worked all day, 6 days a week, or about 80 hours a week. Thus the carpenter made \$161/year, but worked twice as hard. If we compare this to a \$22/hour skilled carpenter today, working 40 hours a week, we have \$80.50 vs \$44,000, or money worth about 550 times as much.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.2

[George] "Washington's fortune, amounting at his death, to \$530,000, was one of the largest in the country and consisted mainly of land. He owned... land on the Ohio River in Virginia... on the Great Kenawa, and also land elsewhere in Virginia and in Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, Kentucky, the City of Washington and other places... [Thus in today's money, George Washington was worth about \$290-million by the probably conservative estimates of his Arab-friendly biographers. It must also be pointed out Washington stood to profit handsomely from moving the nation's capital to the new distant city of Washington D.C in Virginia where it was maximally isolated from the American people and where Arab power would be strongest.]

... After a long career, Benjamin Franklin acquired what was considered a large fortune. But it did not come from manufacture or invention, which he did so much to encourage, but from land. His estate in 1788, two years before his death, was estimated to be worth \$150,000 mostly in land." [Thus in today's money, Benjamin Franklin's estate was worth about \$83 million.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.3

[Here we see a description of the American colonies from c.1625-1775. But it is also a concise general explanation of the Arab parasite's eternal agenda for enslaving its host.]

"The land magnates [the big-shots fronting for the Arabs] exacted tribute [payment] for the slightest privilege granted. [the Arab way] Drastic laws forbade competition with the companies [fronting for the Arabs], and the power of law and the severities of class government were severely felt by the merchants. The chartered corporation and the land dignitaries [fronting for the Arabs] were often one group with an identity of [with the very same] men and interests. Against their [Arab-backed] strength and capital the petty trader or merchant could not prevail. Daring and enterprising though he could be, he was forced to a certain compressed routine of business. He could sell the goods which the [Arab fronting] companies sold to him but could not undertake to set up manufacturing. And after the [chartered royal] companies had passed away, the landed aristocracy [fronting for the Arabs] used it power to suppress all undue initiative on his part.

This was especially so in New York, where all power was concentrated in the hands of a few landowners. 'To say', says Sabine, 'that the political institutions of New York formed a feudal aristocracy is to define them with tolerable accuracy. The soil was owned by a few. The masses were mere retainers or tenants as in the monarchies of Europe.' The feudal lord was also the dominant manufacturer and trader. He forced his tenants to sign covenants [agreements] that they should trade in nothing else than the produce of the manor; that they should trade nowhere else but at his store; that they should grind their flour at his mill, and buy bread at his bakery, lumber at his sawmills and liquor at his brewery. Thus he was not only able to squeeze the last penny from them, by exorbitant prices, but it was in his power to keep them everlastingly in debt to him.

He claimed, and held, a monopoly in his domain of whatever trade he could seize. These feudal tenures were established in law; woe to the tenant who presumed to infract [violate] them! He became a criminal and was punished as a felon. The petty merchant could not, and dared not, compete with the trading monopolies of the manorial [feudal] lords within these feudal jurisdictions. In such a system, the merchant's place for a century and a half [1625-1775] was a minor one, although far above the drudging laborer."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.3

"It would appear that in New York, at least, the practice of the most audacious usury was an early and favorite means of acquiring the property of others. These others were invariably the mechanic or laborer... Money... was loaned at frightfully onerous [burdensome, heavy] rates. [If] The loans unpaid, the lender swooped mercilessly upon the property of the unfortunate and gathered it in."

[1] Then as today, it always made a big difference if the nest-egg of Arabs Inc., their Gr. oo = egg grew through being lent at interest.

2) The Arabs don't like competition in any of their rackets = our-ak-its and this is especially so with money lending. So they always tried to forbid everyone else from lending money. Hence all the many kooky prohibitions in Mideast religions against money lending at interest.

3) The objectives of Arab money lending are two-fold. On one hand they want to extract the highest interest possible, but on the other hand they wanted to seize the assets pledged for collateral.

4) The Arabs would always pull as hard as they could with respect to foreclosures because they could always set-up and blame their disloyal cousins the Jews for the economic crisis.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.3

"Heavy export duties were now declared on every colonial article which would interfere with the monopoly which the British trading class [fronting for the Arabs] held, and aimed to hold, while the most exacting [burdensome] duties were put on non-British imports. Colonial factories were killed off by summary legislation." [The Arab feeding process relies heavily on political power, or rather corrupting power in the governments of their host societies. They use this power to enact laws with hard-to-see stupidity, like the "depletion allowance" of the pre-embargo decade. The ultimate goal is the killing-off competition for their monopolies and cartels. Thus their monopolies/cartels become highly profitable/prophet-able.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.3

"In 1699, [British] Parliament enacted that no wool yard or woolen manufactures of the American colonies should be exported to any place whatever. This was a destructive bit of legislation, as nearly every colonial rural family kept sheep and raised flax [linen] and were getting expert at the making of coarse linen and woolen cloths. No sooner had the colonists begun to make paper than that industry was likewise choked. With hats it was the same. The colonists had scarcely begun to export hats to Spain, Portugal and the West Indies before the British Company of Hatters called upon the Government to put a stop to this colonial interference with their trade. An act was thereupon passed by Parliament forbidding the exportation of

hats from any American colony, and the selling in one colony of hats made in another. Colonial iron mills began to blast. [But] they [too] were promptly declared a nuisance, and [the Arab-fronting British] Parliament ordered that no mill or engine for slitting or rolling iron be used, but graciously allowed pig and bar iron to be imported from England into the colonies. Distilleries were common; molasses was extensively used in the making of rum and also by the fishermen. [However, a] heavy duty was put upon molasses and sugar as also on tea, nails, glass, and paints. Smuggling became general [widespread in the American colonies]; a narrative of the adroit devices [tricks] restored to would make an interesting tale.

These restrictive acts brought about various momentous results. They not only arrayed the whole trading class against Great Britain, and in turn the great body of the colonists, but they operated to keep down in size and latitude the private fortunes by limiting the ways in which the wealth of individuals could be employed. [Then as in 1973-2017] Much money was withdrawn from active [productive] businesses and invested in land and mortgages. [that produced nothing. Again we see another Arabs strategy for getting its host to slow down, so it can be better dominated.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.4

"Many of the members of the Continental Congress were ship merchants, or inherited their fortunes from rich shippers, as, for instance Samuel Adams, Robert Morris, Henry Laurens of Charleston, S.C., John Hancock, whose fortune of \$350,000 came from his uncle Thomas Francis Lewis of New York and Joseph Hewes of North Carolina." [Many of these men were either bros or their pawns.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.4

"these millionaires created nothing except the enterprise distributing products made by the toil and skill of millions of workers the world over. But while the workers made these product, their sole share was meager wages, barely sufficient to sustain the ordinary demands of life. Moreover the workers of one country were compelled to pay exorbitant prices for the goods turned out by the workers of other countries. The [Arab fronting] shippers who stood as middlemen between the workers of the different countries reaped the great rewards."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.5

"The Constitution of the United States was so drafted as to take as much direct power from the people as the landed and trading interest dared."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.5

"Since the laws favored the propertied interests [fronting for the Arabs], it was correspondingly easy for them to get direct control of government functions and personally exercise them. In New England, rich ship owners rose at once to powerful elective and appointive officers. Likewise in New York, rich land owners, and in the South, plantation men were selected for high offices. Law-making bodies, from Congress down, were filled with merchants, landowners, plantation men and lawyers, which last class was trained, as a rule, by association and self-interest, to take the views of the propertied class [fronting for the Arabs] and vote with, and for, it. A puissant [influential] politico-commercial aristocracy developed which, at

all times, was perfectly conscious of its best interests. The worker was regaled [entertained] with flattering commendations of the dignity of labor and sonorous [impressive and rich-sounding] generalizations and promises, but the ruling class [fronting for the Arabs] took care of the laws.

By means of these partial laws, the propertied interests early began to get tremendously valuable special privileges. Banking rights [monopolies], canal construction [monopolies], trade [monopolies] privileges, government favors [gifts], public franchises [monopolies], all came in succession.

At the same time that laws were enacted, or were twisted to suit the will of property [owners fronting for the Arabs], other laws were long in force oppressing the poor to a terrifying degree.

Poor debtors could be thrown in jail indefinitely, no matter how small a sum they owed. In law, the laborer was accorded few rights. It was easy to defraud him of his meager wages, since he had no lien upon the products of his labor. His labor power was all that he had to sell, and the value of this power was not safeguarded by law. But the products created by his labor power in the form of property were fortified by the severest laws. For the laborer to be in debt was equal to a crime, in fact, in its results, worse than a crime. The burglar or pickpocket would get a certain sentence and then go free. The poor debtor, however, was compelled to languish in jail at the will of his creditor. [Again, this is the Arab way]

The report of the Prison Discipline Society for 1829 estimated that fully 75,000 persons were annually imprisoned for debt in the United States and that more than one-half of these owed less than \$20."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 1.5

[Translation: Theoretically, all men have an equal chance in the courts. However we struggle to make litigation so expensive that justice really becomes a one-sided thing. Thus the rich [Arab front]man can easily wear out the poor [Rumi] litigant. This, however, is not the proper place to discuss that most remarkable of Arab sorcerer's arts: How to make justice into an expensive luxury, while still deluding the people with notions that the law is impartial.]

"Even where, in civil cases, all men, theoretically, had an equal chance in courts of equity, litigation was made so expensive, whether purposely or not, that justice was really a one-sided pastime, in which the rich man could easily wear out the poor contestant. This, however, is not the place for a dissertation on that most remarkable of noteworthy sorcerer's arts, the making of justice an expensive luxury, while still deluding the people with the notion that the law knows no preferences."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.1

"Up to 1825, it was a moot question whether the richest landowners would arise in New York, Philadelphia, Boston or Baltimore. For many years Philadelphia had been far in the lead in extent of commerce. But the opening of the Erie Canal [which made New York the port of the Great Lakes and the Midwest] at once settled this question. At a bound [in a single jump] New York attained the rank of the foremost commercial city in the United States, completely outstripping its competitors. While the trade of these [other cities] fell off precipitately, the population and trade of New York City nearly doubled in a single decade. The value of land began to increase stupendously. The swamps, rocky wastes and

[tsunami] flats and the land under water of a few year before became prolific sources of fortunes [for the Arabs]. Land which had been worth a paltry sum ten or twenty years before sprang to a considerable value and, in course of time... [came to have] a value of hundreds of millions of dollars." [Thus the Arabs made great sums selling worthless land to the Jews living in the jaws of death.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.1

"An analysis of the United States census of 1900, compiled by Lucien Sanial, shows that while the total wealth of the country was estimated at about \$95-billion, the proletarian class, composed chiefly of wage workers and a small proportion of those in professional classes... owned only about \$4-billion."

[So at this period of time, around 4% of the nation's wealth was owned by the good eu•man people of the US, while 96% of the nation's wealth was owned by evil, ex•pull Arabs of foreign nations. The reality of the developing world today is probably much like this. And if I had to guess about Arab wealth in the 'rich' part of the world today, I would put it in the 92% to 94% range, with the real Americans and real Europeans owning 6% to 8% of the wealth of their own nations.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.3

"When it came to laws which, in the remotest degree, could be used or manipulated to swell profits or buttress property, Astor [Gr. Aster = star. This is about John Jacob Aster an uber-rich Arab front man] and his class were untiring and vociferous [vocal] in demanding their strict enforcement. Successfully ignoring or circumventing laws objectionable to them, they, at the same time, insisted upon the passage and exact construction and severe enforcement of laws which were adjusted to their interests. Law breakers, on the one hand, they were law makers on the other. They caused to be put into statutes, and intensified by judicial precedent, the most rigorous laws in favor of property rights. They virtually had the extraordinary power of choosing what laws they should observe and what they should not. This choice was invariably at the expense of the working class.

Law, that much-sanctified product, was really law only when applied to the property-less. It confronted the poor at every step, was executed with summary promptitude [speed] and filled the prisons with them. Poverty had no choice in saying what laws it should obey and who it should not. It [the poor], perforce [necessarily], had to obey [the Arab laws] or go to prison. Either one or the other, for the laws were expressly drafted to bear heavily upon it [the poor]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.3

"From the foundation of the Government up to 1837, there were nine distinct commercial crises [60 years, 9 crises = a crisis every 6.7 years. Wow the Arabs were struggling against early America.] which brought about terrible hardships to the wage workers. Did the Government step in and assist them? At no time. But during all those years the Government was busy in letting the shippers dig into the public funds and in being extremely generous to them when they failed to pay up. From 1789 to 1823 the Government lost more than \$250 million in duties, all of which sum represented what the shippers owed and did not, or could not pay. And no criminal proceedings were brought against any of these defaulters.

This however, was not all that the Government did for the favored, pampered class that it represented. Laws were severe against labor union strikes, which were frequently judicially adjudged conspiracies. Theoretically, [the] law inhibited monopoly, but monopolies existed, because law ceases to be effective law when it is not enforced; and the propertied interests [fronting for the Arabs] took care that it was not enforced. Their own class was powerful in every branch of Government. Furthermore, they had the money to buy political subservency [from a government sensitive to money] and legal dexterity" [from professional court corrupters commonly called lawyers].

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.3

[Note the foreigner English use of articles, underlined]

"Astor profited richly from his monopolies. His monopoly of furs in the West was made a basis for creation of other monopolies. China was a voracious and highly profitable market for furs. In exchange for the cargoes of these that he sent there, his ship would be loaded with teas and silks. These products he sold at exorbitant prices in New York. His profits from a single voyage sometimes reached \$70,000; the average profit from a single voyage was \$30,000. During the War of 1812-15, tea rose to double its usual price. Astor was invariably lucky in that his ships escaped capture. [The Arabs have always been in with the pirates and able to get though unharmed.] At one period, he was about the only merchant who had a cargo of tea in the market. He exacted, and was allowed to exact his own price.

Meanwhile, Astor was setting about making himself the richest and largest land owner in the country. His were not the most extensive land possessions in point of extent but in regard to value. He aimed at being a great city, not a great rural, landlord."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.3

"The action of the city officials in disposing of city land to themselves, to political accomplices and to favorites (who, it is probable, although not a matter of proof, paid bribes) took two forms. One was the granting of land under water, the other the granting of city real estate. At that time the configuration of Manhattan Island was such that it was marked by ponds, streams and marshes, while the marginal [tidal] lines of the Hudson River and the East River extended much further inland than now.

When an individual got what was called a water grant, it meant land under shallow water, where he had the right to build bulk heads [seawalls] and wharves and to fill in and make solid ground. Out of these, water grants was created property now worth hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars. The value at that time was not great, but the prospective value was immense. This fact was recognized in the official reports of the day, which set forth how rapidly the city's population and commerce were increasing. As for city land as such, the city not only owned large tracts by reason of old grants and confiscations, but it constantly came into possession of more because of non-payment of taxes.

The excuses by which the city officials covered their short-sighted or fraudulent grants of the water rights and the city land were various. One was that the gifts were for the purpose of assisting religious institutions. This, however, was but an occasional excuse. The principal excuse which was persisted in for forty years was that the city needed revenue. This was a fact. The succeeding city administrations so

corruptly and extravagantly squandered the city's money that the city was constantly in debt. Perhaps this debt was created for the very purpose of having a plausible ground for disposing of city land. So it was freely charged at the time. ...

...Having obtained the water grants and other land by fraud, what did the [Arab fronting] grantees next proceed to do? They had them filled in, not at their own expense, but largely at the expense of the municipality. Sunken lots were filled in, sewers were placed, and streets opened, regulated and graded at but the merest minimum of expense to their landlords. By fraudulent collusion with the city authorities they foisted much of the expense upon the taxpayers. How much money the city lost by this process in the early decades of the nineteenth century was never known. But in 1855, Controller Flagg submitted to the common council an itemized statement for the five years from 1850, in which he referred to the 'startling fact that the city's payments, in a range of five years (for filling in sunken lots, regulating and grading streets, etc.), exceeded receipts by the sum of more than two million dollars'. ...

...one of the original conditions was that they were to construct terminal streets — a provision which they never performed. In consequence, they had no clear title. They remedied this situation by lobbying through the [Civil War] Legislature, in 1865, a law, allowing them to pay a designated sum to the city in lieu of that non-performance. By the payment of a small amount, most of them obtained from the city a full and clear title. In developing the water front, the Department of Docks had to buy back such of these waterfront grants as were needed for wharves and bulkheads, and it had to pay exorbitant sums. From the organization of the Department of Docks down to 1906, inclusive, New York City expended \$70-million for the purchase of bulkhead and wharf property."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.3

"The money that Astor secured by robbing the Indians and exploiting the workers by means of monopolies, he thus put largely into land. In 1810, a story runs, he offers to sell a Wall Street lot for \$8,000. The price is so low that a buyer promptly appears. 'Yes, you are astonished', Astor says. 'But see what I intend to do with that \$8,000. That Wall Street lot, it is true, will be worth \$12,000 in a few years. But I shall take that \$8,000 and buy 80 lots above Canal Street and by the time your one lot is worth \$12,000, my 80 lots will be worth \$80,000' ...

... This version bears all the impress[ion] of being undoubtedly a fraud. [It is probably a fake story.] Astor was remarkably secretive and dissembling, and never revealed his plans to anyone. [like a typical Arab front man] That he bought the lots is true enough, but his attributed loquacity [chattiness] is mythical and is the invention of some gushing eulogist. At that time, he was buying for \$200 or \$300 each many lots on lower Broadway, then unoccupied waste [land]. What he was counting on was the certain growth of the city and the vastly increasing values not that he would give his land, but which would accrue from the labor of an enlarged population. These lots were later occupied by crowded business buildings.

Throughout those years, in the first decade of the 19th century, he was constantly buying land on Manhattan Island, Practically all of it was bought, not with the idea of using it, but of holding it and allowing the future populations to make it a thousand times more valuable."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.3

[Note the foreigner English in the first sentence.]

"With his incessant inflow of surplus wealth, Astor was in a position where on the instant [on the instant?] he could take advantage of the difficulties of less rich men and take over to himself their property. A large amount of Astor's [Arab] money was invested in mortgages. In times of periodic financial and industrial distress, the mortgagors were driven to extremities and could no long keep up their payments. These were the times that Astor waited for, and it was in such times that he stepped in and possessed himself, and comparatively small expense, of large additional tracts of land.

... Any one with sufficient security in land who sought to borrow money would find Astor extremely accommodating. But woe betide the hapless borrower, whoever he was, if he failed in his obligations to the extent of even a fraction of the requirements covered by the law! Neither personal friendship, religious considerations nor the slightest feelings of sympathy availed.

...where law was insufficient or non-existent, new laws were created either to aggrandize [increase] the powers of landlordship, or to seize hold of land or enhance its value, or to get extraordinary special privileges in the form of banking charters.... Not a single one of Astor's biographers has mentioned his banking connections. Yet it is of the greatest importance to describe them, inasmuch as they were closely intertwined with his trade, on the one hand, and with his land acquisitions, on the other."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"Astor flourished at that precise time when the traders and land owners, flushed with revenues, reached out for the creation and control of their highly important business of professionally dealing in money, and of dictating, personally and directly, what the supply of the people's money should be. [So the Arab frontman Astor was 'dictating' the money supply in the early United States.]

This signaled the next step in the aggrandizement [increasing] of individual fortunes. The few who could center in themselves, by grace of [the corrupt] Government, [upon the] the banking and manipulation of the people's money, and the restricting or inflating of money issues, were immediately vested with an extraordinary power. It was a sovereign power at once coercive and proscriptive. [Thus the Arab front-men could coerce people out of certain industries. They could proscribe or bar them from entering certain industries.] and a mighty instrument for transferring the produce of the many to a small and exclusive coterie [to a small clique or in-crowd]. Not merely over the labor of the whole working class did this gripping process extend, but it was severely felt by that large part of the landowning and trading class which was excluded from holding the same privileges. The banker became the master of the master. In that fierce, pervading competitive strife, the banks were the final exploiters. Sparsely organized and wholly unprotected, the worker was in the complete power of the trader, manufacturer, and land owner; in turn, such of these divisions of the propertied class as were not themselves sharers in the ownership of banks were at the mercy of the banking institutions.

At any time upon some pretext or other, the banks could arbitrarily refuse the latter class credit or accommodation, or harass its victims in other ways equally as destructive. As business was largely done in expectations of

payment, in other words, on credit, as it is now, this was a serious, often desperate, blow to the lagging or embarrassed [no•bro•support] brothers in trade. [Thus the Arabs benefit greatly from the credit system, in fact, it is probably their creation.]

Banks [then as today] were virtually empowered by law to ruin or enrich any individual or set of individuals. [What power our secret Arab masters have because we allow them to run our financial system.] As the banks were then founded and owned by men who were themselves traders or landholders, this power was crushingly used against competitors [people competing with Arabs Inc.] Armed with the strong power of the law, the banks overawed the mercantile world, thrived on the industry, misfortune or ruin of others, and swayed politics and elections [for their Arab masters]. The bank men loaned money to themselves [other Arabs] at an absurdly low rate of interest. But for loans of money to all others, they demanded a high [usurious] rate of interest, which, in periods of commercial distress, overwhelmed the borrowers. Nominally banks were restricted to a certain standard rate of interest. But by various subterfuges, they easily evaded these provisions and exacted usurious rates.

These however, were far from being the worst features. The most innocent of their great privileges was that of playing fast and loose with the money confidently entrusted to their care by a swarm of depositors [We have the same problem today don't we?] who either worked for, or... often stole it. [Thus, all the stolen assets trickled down to the Arabs.] Bankers, like pawnbrokers, ask no questions. The most remarkable of their vested powers was that of manufacturing money. [In other words, the Arab fronting banks produced money themselves through the fractional lending system, which they lent at interest.]

The industrial manufacturer could not make goods unless he had the plant, the raw materials, and the labor. But the banker, somewhat like the fabled alchemist could transmute airy nothing into bank-note money, and then, by law, force its acceptance. The lone trader or land holder unsupported by a partnership with law could not fabricate money. But let trader and land holder band in a company, incorporate, then persuade, wheedle or bribe a certain entity called a legislature to grant them a certain bit of paper styled a charter, and lo! they were instantly transformed into money manufacturers.

The simple mandate of law was sufficient authorization for them to prey upon the whole world outside of their charmed circle. With this scrap of paper the could go forth on the highways of commerce and over the farms and drag in, by the devious, absorbent process of the banking system, a great part of the wealth created by the actual producers. As it was with taxation, so was it with the burdens of this system; they fell largely upon the worker, whether in the shop or on the farm. When the business man and the landowner were compelled to pay exorbitant rates of interest, they but apparently had to meet the demands. What these classes really did was to throw the whole of these extra impositions upon the working class in the form of increased prices for necessities and merchandise and in augmented rents.

But how were these State or Government authorizations, called charters, to be obtained? Did not the Federal Constitution prohibit States from giving the right to banks to issue money? Were not private money factories specifically barred by the at clause of the Constitution which declared that no State 'shall coin money, emit bills of credit, or make anything but gold or silver a tender in payment of debts.'

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"Here, again, the power of class domination of Government came into compelling effect. The onward sweep of the trading class was not to be balked by such a trifling obstacle as a Constitutional provision. At all times, when the Constitution has stood in the way of commercial aims it has been abrogated [repealed, evaded], not by repeal, nor by violent overthrow, but by the effective expedient of judicial interpretation. [Read that a couple times and let it sink in. This is called judicial review. It is when some appointee, some celebrated priest from the openly-corrupt paid judicial system vetoes the pronouncement of our democratic legislatures. Here we see why we allow this.]

The trading class [fronting for the Arabs] demanded State created banks with the power of issuing money. And, as the courts have invariably in the long run responded to the interests and decrees of the dominant class, a decision was quickly forthcoming in this case to the effect that 'bills of credit' were not meant to cover banknotes. This was a new and surprising construction; but judicial decision and precedent made it virtually law, and law a thousand-fold more binding than any Constitutional insertion.

The trading class had already learned the importance of the principle that while it was essential to control law-making bodies, it was imperative to have as their auxiliary the bodies that interpreted [the] law [as well]. To a large extent the United States since then has lived not under legislative-made law, but under a purely separate and extraneous form of law which has superseded the legislature product, namely, court law. Although nowhere in the United States Constitution is there even the suggestion that courts shall make law, yet this past century and more they have been gradually building up a formidable code of interpretations which substantially ranks at the most commanding kind of law. And these interpretations have, on the whole, consistently followed, and kept pace with, the changing interests of the dominant class [fronting for the Arabs], whether traders, slaveholders or the present trusts."

This decision of the august [respected and impressive] courts opened the way for the greatest orgy of corruption and the most stupendous frauds. In New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and other States, a continuous rush to get bank charters ensued."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"Most of the legislatures were composed of men who while perhaps, not innately corrupt, were easily seduced by the corrupt temptations held out by the traders [fronting for the Arabs]... the legislatures were approachable. Some members who were put there by the rich families needed only the word as to how they should vote, while others, representing both urban and rural communities, were swayed by bribes. By one means or another the traders and landholders [fronting for the Arabs] forced the various legislatures into doing what they wanted. ..."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"There was something sternly impressive in the way in which this rising capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs] went forward to snatch what it sought, and what it believed to be indispensable to its plans. There was no hesitation, nor were there any scruples as to niceties of methods. The end in view was all that counted. So long as that was attained, the means used were considered paltry side-issues. And, indeed, herein

lies the great distinction [divide, cleft] of action between the world-old [ancient Mideast] propertied classes and the contending proletariat [workers in the land of the free]. For whereas the former have always campaigned irrespective of law and particularly by bribery, intimidation, repression and force: the working class has had to confine its movement strictly to the narrow range of laws which were expressly prepared against it. And the slightest violation of which has [these laws] called forth the summary vengeance of a society ruled actually, if [and] not theoretically, by the very propertied classes which set at defiance all law" [up its legal system and government].

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"By 1799, New York City had one bank, the Bank of New York; this admixed the terrorism of trade and politics so overtly that presently [soon] an opposition application for a charter was made. This solitary bank was run by some of the old [Arab fronting] landowning families who fully understood the danger involved in the triumph of the democratic ideas represented by [Thomas] Jefferson. [This was a] danger far overestimated, however, since win as democratic principles did, the propertied class continued its victorious march... The Bank of New York injected itself virulently into politics and fought the spread of democratic ideas with sordid but effective weapons. If a merchant dared support what it denounced as heretical doctrines, the bank at once blacklisted him by rejecting his notes when he needed cash most."
[The Arabs need sway over lending in our land.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"There is no evidence that he, himself, [John Jacob Astor, Aster=star] did the actual bribing or was in any way concerned in it. In all of the legislative investigations following charges of bribery, the invariable practice was to throw the blame upon the wicked lobbyists, while professing the most naive astonishment that any imputations should be cast upon any of the members of the honorable legislature. As for the bribers behind the scenes, their names seldom or never were brought out or divulged. In brief, these investigations were all of that rose-water order, generally termed whitewashing'."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"Trinity Church began buying in or taking over the ground leases, and by 1936 it had hundreds of millions of dollars worth of land and buildings under its direct control as well as in its ownership." [Why do we allow charities to engage in land banking?]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"It was by the aid of the banking system that the trading class was greatly enabled to manipulate the existing and potential resources of the country and to extend invaluable favors to themselves. In the system, Astor was a chief participant. For many yeas the banks, especially in New York State, were empowered by law to issue paper money to the extent of three times the amount of their capital... [the fractional banking system.] By 1819, the banks in New York had issued \$12.5-million, and the total amount of specie [gold] to redeem this fiat stuff [arbitrary paper money] amounted to only \$2-million. [thus they multiplied the gold 625%] These banknotes were nothing

more or less than irresponsible promises to pay. What became of them?

What, indeed, became of them? They were imposed upon the working class as payment for labor. Although these banknotes were subject to constant depreciation, the worker had to accept them as though they were full value. But when the worker went to buy provisions or pay rent, he was compelled to pay one-third [again], and often one-half [again] as much as the value represented by those banknotes. Sometimes, in crises, he could not get them cashed at all; [and] they became pitiful [worthless] souvenirs in his hands. This fact was faintly recognized by a New York Senate Committee when it reported in 1819 that every artifice in the wit of man had been devised to find ways of putting these notes into circulation. That when the merchant got his depreciated paper, he 'saddled it upon the departments of productive labor'. 'The farmer and the mechanic [workman] alike', went on the report, 'have been invited to make loans and have fallen victims to the avarice of the banker. The result has been the banishment of metallic currency, the loss of commercial confidence, fictitious capital, increase of civil prosecutions [due to the economic crisis] and multiplication of crimes'. What the committee did not see was that by this process, those in control of the banks [the Arabs] had, with no expenditure, possessed themselves of a considerable part of the resources of the country and had made the workers yield up twice and three times as much of the produce of his labor as he had to give before the system was started.

The large amount of paper money, without any basis of value whatever, was put out at a heavy rate of interest. When the merchant paid his interest, he charged it up as [an] extra cost on his wares. And when the worker came to buy these same wares, which he or some fellow worker had made, he was charged a high price which included three things all thrown upon him: rent, interest and profit. [Thus] The banks indirectly sucked in a large portion of these three factors. And so thoroughly did the banks control legislation that they were not content with the power of issuing spurious paper money; they demanded and go through, an act exempting bank stock from taxation.

Thus year after year, this system went on, begging [bankrupting] great numbers of people, enriching the owners of the banks and virtually giving them a life and death power over the worker, the farmer, and the floundering, struggling small business man alike. The laws were but slightly altered. 'The great profits of the banks', reported a New York Senate Committee on banks and insurance in 1834, 'arise from their issues. It is this privilege which enables them, in fact, to coin money, to substitute their evidences of debt for a metallic currency and to loan more than their actual capitals. A bank of \$100,000 capital is permitted to loan \$250,000; and thus receive and interest on twice and a half the amount actually invested."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"It cannot be said that all of the workingmen were apathetic, or that some did not see through the fraud of the system. They had good reason for the deepest indignation and exasperation. The terrible injustices piled upon them from every quarter — the low wages they were forced to accept, often in depreciated or worthless banknotes, the continually increasing exactions of the landlords, the high price squeezed out of them by monopolies, the arbitrary discriminations of the law — these were not without their effect. The Workingmen's Party, formed

in 1829 in New York City, was the first and most ominous of these proletarian uprisings. Its resolutions read like a proletarian Declaration of Independence, and would unquestionably have resulted in the most momentous agitation, had it not been that it was smothered by its leaders, and also because the slavery issue long obscured purely economic questions. ...

By 1831, however, it had gone out of existence. The reason was that it allowed itself to be betrayed by the supineness, incompetence, and as some said, the treachery, of its leaders, who were content to accept from a Legislature controlled by the propertied interests various mollifying sops [a sop is a thing given or done as a concession of no great value to appease someone whose main concerns or demands are not being met.] which slightly altered certain laws, but which in no great degree redounded to the benefit of the working class. For a few bits of counterfeit, this splendid proletarian uprising, glowing with energy, enthusiasm and hope, allowed itself to be snuffed out of existence. What a tragedy was there!"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"The panic of 1837 was one of those periodic financial and industrial convulsions resulting from the chaos of capitalist administration [under the Arabs]. No sooner had it commenced, that the banks refused to pay out any money other than their worthless notes. For 33 years, they had not only enjoyed immense privileges, but they had used the powers of Government to insure themselves a monopoly of the business of manufacturing money. In 1804, the Legislature of New York State had passed an extraordinary law, called the restraining act. This prohibited, under severe penalties, all associations and individuals not only 'from issuing notes, but 'from receiving deposits, making discounts or transacting an other business which incorporated banks may or do transact'. Thus the law not only legitimized the manufacture of worthless money, but guaranteed a few banks a monopoly of that manufacture.

Another restraining act was passed in 1818. The banks were invested with the sovereign privilege of depreciating the currency [printing money] at their discretion, and were authorized to levy an annual tax on the country, nearly equivalent to the interest on \$200-million of deposits and circulation. On top of these acts, the Legislature passed various acts compelling the public authorities in New York City to deposit public money with the Manhattan Company. This company, although, as we have seen, expressly chartered to supply pure water to the city of New York, utterly failed to do so. At one stage the city tried to have its chartered revoked on the ground of failure to carry out its chartered function, but the courts decided in the company's favor.

At the outbreak of the panic of 1837, the New York banks held more than \$5.5-million of public money. When called upon to pay only about a million of that sum, or the premium on it, they refused. But far worse was the experience of the general public. When they frantically besieged the banks for their money the bank official filled the banks with heavily armed guards and plug-uglies [thugs] with orders to fire on the crowd in case a rush was attempted. In every State conditions were the same.

In May, 1837, no fewer than 800 banks in the United States suspended payment, refusing a single dollar to the Government whose deposits of \$30-million they held, and to the people in general who held \$120-million of their notes. No specie [gold] whatever was in circulation. The country was

deluged with small notes, colloquially termed shinplasters. Of every form and every denomination from the alleged value of five cents to that of five dollars, they were issued by every business individual or corporation for the purpose of paying them off as wages to their employees. The worker was forced to take them for his labor or starve. Moreover, the shinplasters were so badly printed that it was not hard to counterfeit them. The counterfeiting of them quickly became a regular business. Immense quantities of the stuff were issued. The worker never knew whether the bills paid him for his work were genuine or counterfeit, although essentially there was not any great difference in basic value between the two."

Now the storm [of hyper-inflation] broke. Everywhere was impoverishment, ruination and beggary. Every bank official in New York City was subject to arrest for the most serious frauds and other crimes, but the authorities took no action. On the contrary, so complete was the dominance of the banks over Government, that they hurriedly got the Legislature to pass an act practically authorizing a suspension of specie [gold] payments. The consequences were appalling. 'Thousands of manufacturing, mercantile, and other useful establishments in the United States', reported a New York Senate Committee, 'have been broken down or paralyzed by the existing crisis... In all our great cities numerous individuals, who, by a long course of regular business, had acquired a competency, have suddenly been reduced, with their families to beggary'. New York City was filled with the homeless and unemployed. In the early part of 1838..."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.4

"Laws, inconceivably harsh and brutal, enacted by, and in [on] behalf of property rights were enforced with a rigor which seems unbelievable were it not that the fact is verified by the records of thousands of cases. Those convicted for robbery usually received a life sentence... the ordinary sentence for burglary was the same, with variations... These were the laws in practically all of the States with slight differences.

But they were applied to whites only. The Negro [or black Arab] slave criminal had a superior standing in the law, for the simple reason that while the whites were 'free' labor, Negroes were property, and, of course, it did not pay to send slaves to prison. In Maryland and in most Southern States, where the slave holders were both makers and executors of law, the slaves need have no fear of prison... The slaves...are hardly ever sent to prison. [Negro] Slaves who commit grave crimes are hung; those [Neg•ards and bros] who commit heinous crimes not punishable with death are sold out of the State. [exiled] In selling him, care is taken that his character and former life are not known, because it would lessen his price... [Thus the outie neg•ro was hung for his crimes, but the neg•ard brother was sold to another brother and his record completely expunged.]

But the sentencing of the criminal was merely the beginning of a weird life of horror. It was customary at that period to immure [in•mur, in•walls] prisoners in solitary confinement. There, in their small and reeking cells, filled with damps and pestilential odors, they were confined day after day, year after year, condemned to perpetual inactivity and silence. If they presumed to speak, they were brutally lashed with the whip. They were not allowed to write letters, nor to communicate with any member of their family. But the law condescended to allow a minister to visit them periodically in order to awaken their religious thoughts and preach to them how bad a thing it was to steal! Many were driven stark mad or

died of disease; others dashed their brains out. While others, when finally released, went out into the world filled with an overpowering hatred of Society, and all its institutions, and a long-cherished thirst for vengeance against it for having thus so cruelly misused them. [Thus they became useful to the inverted Arab cause.]

Such were the laws made by the propertied class [fronting for the Arabs]...

Equally severe in their way were the laws applying to mendicants [beggars] and vagrants [homeless people]. Six months or a year in the penitentiary or workhouse was the usual sentence. After the panic of 1837, crime, mendicancy, vagrancy and prostitution tremendously increased, as they always do increase after two events: war, which, when over, turns into civil life a large number of men who cannot get work; and panics which chaotically uproot industrial conditions and bring about widespread destitution. Although undeniably great frauds had been committed by the banking class, not a single one of that class went to jail. But large numbers of persons convicted of crimes against property, and great batches of vagrants were dispatched there, and also many girls and women who had been hurled by the iron force of circumstance into the horrible business of prostitution. [2nd mention of prostitution.]

These were some of the conditions in those years. Let it not, however, be supposed that the traders, bankers and landowners were impervious to their own brand of sensibilities. They dressed fastidiously, went to church, uttered hallelujahs [allel-loo-yeahs], gave dainty receptions [hors d'oeuvre, cocktail parties] formed associations to dole out alms [keeping 95% for themselves] and—kept up prices and rents. Notwithstanding the general distress, rents in New York City were greater [higher] than were paid in any other city or village upon the globe."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"in the panic of 1837... Astor [the Arab front-man] was phenomenally active in profiting from despair. 'He added immensely to his riches', wrote a contemporaneous narrator, 'by purchases of State stocks, bonds and mortgages in the financial crisis of 1836-37. He was a willing purchaser of mortgages from needy holders at less than their face [value]; and when they became due, he foreclosed on them, and purchased the mortgaged property at the ruinous prices which ranged at that time.'

If his seven percent was not paid at the exact time, he inflexibly made use of every provision of the law and foreclosed mortgages. The courts quickly responded. To lot after lot, property after property, he took full title. The anguish of families, the sorrow and suffering of the community, the blank despair and ruination which drove many to beggary and prostitution, [3rd mention of prostitution] others to suicide, all had no other effect upon him than to make him more eagerly energetic in availing himself of the misfortunes and the tragedies of others.

Now was observable the operation of the centripetal [moving towards the center] principle which applied to every recurring panic, namely, that panics are but the easy means by which the very rich [Arab front-men] are enabled to get possession of more and more of the general produce and property. The ranks of petty land owners were much thinned out by the panic of 1837 and the number of independent business men was greatly reduced; a considerable part of both classes were forced down into the army of wage workers.

Within a few years after the panic of 1837, Astor's wealth multiplied to an enormous extent. Business revived, values increased. It was now that immigration began to pour in heavily. In 1843, sixty-thousand immigrants entered the port of New York. Four years later, the number was 129,000 a year. Soon it rose to 300,000 a year; and from that time on kept on ever increasing. A large portion of these immigrants remained in New York City. Land was in demand as never before; fast and faster the city grew. Vacant lots of a few years before became congested with packed humanity; landlordism and slums flourished side by side, the one as a development of the other. The outlying farm, rocky and swamp lands of the New York City of 1812, with its 100,000 population became the thickly-settled metropolis of 1840, with 317,712 inhabitants and the well-nigh [almost] half-million population of 1850. Hard as the laborer might work, he was generally impoverished for the reason that successively rents were raised, and he had to yield up more and more of his labor for the simple privilege of occupying an ugly and cramped habitation.

Once having fastened his hold upon the land, Astor never sold it. From the first, he adopted the plan, since religiously followed, for the most part, by his descendants, of leasing the land for a given number of years, usually 21. [The Arabs apparently find land leases of 21 years optimal] Large tracts of land in the heart of the city he let lie unimproved for years while the city fast grew up all around them and enormously increased their value. He often refused to build although there was intense pressure for land and buildings. His policy was to wait until the time when those whom necessity drove to use his land should come to him as supplicants and accept his own terms. For a considerable time, no one cared to take his land on lease at his onerous terms. But, finally, such was the growth of population and business, that his land was indispensable and it was taken on leaseholds.

Astor's exactions for leaseholds were extraordinarily burdensome. But he would make no concessions. The lessee was required to erect his dwelling or business place at his own expense; and during the period of the 21-years of the lease, he not only had to pay rent in the form of giving over to Astor 5 or 6 percent of the value of the land, but was responsible for all taxes, repairs and all other charges. When the ground lease expired, the buildings became Astor's absolute property. The middleman landlord, speculative lessee or trading tenant who leased Astor's land and put up tenements or buildings, necessarily had to recoup himself for the high tribute [foreigner English] that he had to pay Astor. He did this either by charging the worker exorbitant rents or demanding excessive profits for his wares; in both cases the [domestic] producers had finally to foot the bill.

The whole machinery of the law Astor... used ruthlessly in enforcing his rights as landlord or as lessor... Not a single instance has come down [to us] of any act of leniency on Astor's part in extending the time of tenants in arrears. Whether sickness was in the tenant's family or not, however dire its situation might be, out it was summarily [right away] thrown into the streets, with its belongings, if it failed in the slightest in its obligations.

While he was availing himself of the rigors of the law to oust tenants in arrears, he was constantly violating the law in evading assessments. But this practice was not by any means peculiar to Astor. Practically the whole propertied class did it, not merely once, but so continually that year after year official reports adverted [spoke] to the fact. An Aldermanic [alderman] report on taxation in 1846 showed that 30 million

dollars worth of assessable property escaped taxation every year, and that no bona fide efforts were made by the official to remedy that state of affairs. The state of morality among the propertied classes — those classes which demanded such harsh laws for the punishment of vagrants and poor criminals — is clearly revealed by this report made by a committee of the New York Board of Aldermen in 1847."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"This class [fronting for the Arabs] distorted the powers of government by calling either for the drastic enforcement of laws operating for its interests, or for the partial or entire immunity from other laws militating against its interests and profit."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"These 2,000 firms who every year defrauded the city were the eminently respectable and influential merchants of the city. Most of them were devout church members. Many were directors or members of charitable societies to relieve the poor; and all of them, with vast pretensions of superior character and ability, joined in opposing any movement of the working classes for better conditions and in denouncing those movements as hostile to the security of property and as dangerous to the welfare of society. Each of these 2,000 firms, year after year defrauded the city out of an average of \$150 annually in that one item, not to mention other frauds. Yet not once was the law invoked against them. The taxation that they shirked fell upon the working class, in addition to all of those other myriad forms of indirect taxation which the workers finally had to bear. Yet, as we have noted before, if a poor man or woman stole property of the value of \$25 or more, conviction carried with it a long term in prison for grand larceny. In every city—in Boston, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Baltimore, New Orleans and in every other place—the same, or nearly the same, conditions prevailed. The rich evaded taxation; and if in the process it was necessary to perjure themselves, they committed perjury with alacrity. Astor was far from being an exception. He was but an illustrious type of the whole of his class."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"But how in a Government theoretically democratic and resting on popular suffrage, did the propertied interests get control of Government functions? How were they able to sway the popular vote and make, or evade, laws?

[The real reason stems from the design of our democracy. It was the most corrupt and oligarchic design that the Arabs could get away with. Next we see the explanation/excuse for how people tolerated the Arab predation]

By various influences and methods. In the first place, the old English ideas of the superiority of aristocracy had a profound effect upon American thought, customs and laws. For centuries, these ideas had been incessantly disseminated by preachers, pamphleteers, politicians, political economists and editors. Where in England the concept applied mainly to rank by birth, in America it was adapted to the native aristocracy, the traders and landowners. In England it was an admixture [mixture] of rank and property; in America, where no titles of nobility existed, it became exclusively a token [badge] of the propertied class. The people were assiduously taught in many open and subtle ways to look up to the inviolability of

property, just as in the old days they had been taught to look humbly up to the majesty of the king. Propertied men, it was preached and admonished [advised, urged], represented the worth, stability, virtue and intelligence of the community. They were the solid substantial men. What importance was to be attached to the property-less? They, forsooth [ironically], were regarded as irresponsible and vulgar; their opinions and aspirations were held of small account."

The churches professed to preach to all; yet they depended largely upon men of property for contributions; and moreover [besides] the clergy, at least the influential [ones] of them [the brothers], were propertied men themselves. The preachings of the colleges and the doctrines of the political economists [also] corresponded precisely to the views the trading interests at different periods wanted taught. Many of the colleges were founded with funds contributed or bequeathed by traders. The newspapers were supported by the advertisements of the propertied class. The various legislative bodies were mainly, and the judicial benches wholly, recruited from the ranks of the lawyer class; these lawyers either had, or sought to have, the rich as clients; few attorneys are overzealous for poor men's cases. Still further the lawyers were deeply impregnated, not with the conception of law as it might be, but as it had been handed down through the centuries. Encrusted creatures [protected in shells] of precedent and self-interest, they thoroughly accepted the doctrine that in the making and enforcement of law their concern should be for the propertied interests. With few exceptions they were aligned with the propertied [people fronting for the Arabs].

So that here were many influences all of which conspired to spread on every hand, and drill deep in the minds of all classes, often even of those who suffered so keenly by prevalent conditions, the idea that the propertied men were the substantial element. Consequently with this idea continuously driven into every stratum of society, it was not surprising that it should be embodied in thoughts, customs, laws and tendencies. Nor was it to be wondered at that when occasionally a proletarian uprising enunciated radical principles, these principles should seem to be abnormal and ultra-revolutionary. All society, for the most part, except a fragment of the working class, was enthralled [mentally enslaved] by the spell of property [rather the Arabs spiel about property]. "

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"A virtual censorship was exercised by wealth. If a newspaper dared advocate any issue not approved by the vested interests [fronting for the Arabs], it at once felt the resentment of that class in the withdrawal of advertisements and of those privileges which banks could use or abuse with such ruinous effect."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"both of the powerful political parties were under the domination of wealth [, the wealth of the people fronting for the Arabs]. Not, to be sure, openly so, but insidiously. Differences of issue there assuredly were, but these issues did not in any way affect the basic structure of society, or threaten the overflow of any of the fundamental privileges held by the rich. The political campaigns, except that later contest which decided the eventual fate of chattel slavery, were, in actuality, sham battles..."

Both parties received the greater part of their campaign funds from the men of large property and from the vested corporations or other similar interests. Astor, for example, was always a liberal contributor, now to the Whig party and again to the Democratic. In return, the politicians elected by those parties to the legislature, the courts or to administrative offices usually considered themselves under obligations to that element which finance their campaigns and which had the power of defeating their reelection by the refusal of funds or by supporting the opposite party. The masses of the people were simply pawns in these political contests. Yet few of them understood that all the excitement, partisan activity and enthusiasm into which they threw themselves, generally had no other significance than to enchain them still faster to a system whose beneficiaries were continuously getting more and more rights and privileges for themselves at the expense of the people, and whose wealth was consequently increasing by precipitate bounds [sudden leaps]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"Astor was now the richest man in America. In 1847, his fortune was estimated at fully \$20-million. In all the length and breadth of the United States, there was no man whose fortune was within even approachable distance of his."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.5

"Statistics issued in 1844 of manufactures in the United States showed a total gross amount of \$307,196,844 invested. Astor's wealth, then, was one-fifteenth of the whole amount invested throughout the territory of the United States"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.6

"Corrupt government was welcomed by the landholding trading and banking class [fronting for the Arabs], for by it they could secure with greater facility the perpetual rights, franchises, privileges and the exemptions which were adapted to their expanding aims and riches. By means of it they were not only enabled to pile up greater and greater wealth, but to set themselves up in law as a conspicuously privileged body, distinct from the mass of the people.

Publicly they might pretend a proper and ostentatious horror of corruption. Secretly, however, they quickly dispensed with what were to them idle dronings of political cant [song and dance]. As capitalists they ascribed their success to a rigid application and practicality; and being practical they went about purchasing laws by the most short-cut and economical method. They had the money; the office-holders had the votes and governmental power; consequently the one bought the other. It was a systematic corruption springing entirely from the propertied class [fronting for the Arabs]; they demanded it, were responsible for it, and kept it up. It worked like an endless chain; the land, charters, franchises, and privileges corruptly obtained in one set of years yielded vast wealth, part of which was used in succeeding years in getting more law-created sources of wealth. [this cycle must be broken and kept broken.] If professional politicians had long since got into the habit of expecting to be bought, it was because the landholders, traders and bankers had accustomed them to the lucrative business of getting bribes in return for extraordinary laws."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes,

2.6

"it was undoubtedly true that those who did the world's real services were the lowly, despoiled [pillaged, plundered] and much discriminated-against mass of mankind. Their very poverty was a crime, for they were plundered and expropriated [stolen from], either by the ruling classes of their own country or of the United States, the laws regarded them as semi-criminals, or, at best, as excrescences [an unattractive, abnormal, or diseased outgrowth] to whom short shrift [curt treatment] was to be given. They made the clothes, the shoes, hats, shirts, underwear, tools, and all the other necessities that mankind required; they tilled the ground and produced its food. Curiously enough, those who did these indispensable things were condemned by the encompassing system [matrix] to live the poorest and meanest habitations and in the most precarious uncertainty. When sick, disabled or superannuated [old] they were cast aside by the capitalist class as so much discarded material to eke out a prolonged misery of existence, to be thrown in penal institutions or to starve. Substantially everywhere in the United States, vagrancy laws were in force which decreed that an able-bodied man out of work and homeless must be adjudged a vagrant and imprisoned in the workhouse or penitentiary. The very law-making institutions that gave to a privileged few the right to expropriate the property of many, drastically plunged the man down still further after this process of spoliation [plundering], like a man who is waylaid [ambushed] and robbed and then arrested and imprisoned because he has been robbed.

On the other hand, the class which had the money, no matter how that money was gotten, irrespective of how much fraud or sacrifice of life attended its amassing, stood out with a luminous distinctness. It arrogated [claimed, seized] to itself all that was superior, and it exacted, and was invested with, a lordly deference. It lived in the finest mansions and laved [bathed] in luxuries. Surrounded with an indescribably pretentious air of importance, it radiated tone, command and prestige.

But such was the destructive, intestinal character of competitive warfare, that even this class was continually in the throes of convulsive struggles. Each had to fight, no merely to get the wealth of others, but to keep what he already possessed. If he could but frustrate the attempts of competitors to take what he had, he was fortunate. As he preyed upon the laborer so did the rest of his class seek to prey upon him. If he were less able, less cunning, or more scrupulous than they, his ruination was certain. It was a system in which all methods were gauged not by the best, but by the worst. Thus it was that many capitalists, at heart good men, kindly disposed and innately opposed to duplicity and fraud, were compelled to adopt the methods of their more successful but thoroughly unprincipled competitors. [Thanks to the Arab matrix.] And, indeed, realizing the impregnating nature of example and environment, one cannot but conclude that the tragedies of the capitalist class represented [a natural outcome]...

The workers for the most part, instinctively, morally and intellectually, knew that this system was wrong, a horror and a nightmare. But even the capitalist victims of the competitive struggle... went to their doom praising it as the only civilized, rational system and as unchangeable and even divinely ordained.

If corruption was flagrant in the early decades of the 19th century, it was triply so in the middle decades. This was the period of all periods when common councils all over the country were being bribed to give franchises for various public

utility systems, and legislatures and Congress for charters, land, money, and laws for a grate number of railroad and other projects. The numerous specific instances cannot be adverted here. They will be described more appropriately in subsequent parts of this work. For the present, let this general and sweeping observation suffice.

The important point which here obtrudes [becomes noticeable in an unwelcome way] itself is that in every case, without exception, the wealth amassed by fraud was used in turn to put through more frauds, and that the net accumulation of these successive frauds is seen in the great private fortunes of to-day. We have seen how the original Astor fortune was largely derived by the use of both force and fraud among the indians, and by the exercise of cunning and corruption in the East. John Jacob Astor's immense wealth descends mostly to William B. Astor...[who] used a portion of this wealth in becoming a large stockholder in the New York Central Railroad, and in corrupting the New York Legislature still further to give enormously valuable grants and special laws with incalculably valuable exemptions to that railroad. John Jacob Astor II, never built a railroad in his life; he knew nothing about railroads. But by virtue of the possession of large surplus wealth, derived mainly from rents, he was enabled to buy enough of the stock to make him rank as a large stockholder [shareholder]. And, then, he with the other stockholders, bribed the Legislature for the passage of more laws which enormously increased the value of their stock.

It is altogether clear from the investigations and records of the time, that the New York Central Railroad was one of the most industrious corrupters of legislatures in the country. Although this is not saying much in dealing with a period when every State Legislature, none excepted, was making gifts of public property and of laws in return for bribes, and when Congress, as was proved in official investigations, was prodigal [generous, wasteful] in doing likewise.

In the 14 years up to 1867, the New York Central Railroad had spent upward of a half million dollars in buying laws at Albany and in 'protecting the stockholders against injurious legislation'. As one of the largest stockholders in the [rail]road, John Jacob Astor Jr., certainly must have been one of the masked parties to this continuous saturnalia [party, Christmas] of corruption. And the corruption, bad as it was, that took place before 1867, was rather insignificant compared to the eruption in the years 1868 and 1869. And here is to be noted a significant episode which fully reveals how the capitalist class is ever willing to turn over the managing of its property to men of its own class [fresh new harem bros] who have proved themselves masters of the art either of corrupting public bodies or of making that property yield still greater profits.

In control of the New York and Harlem Railroad, Cornelius Vanderbilt had showed what a remarkably successful magnate he was in deluging legislature and common councils with bribe money and in getting corrupt gifts of franchises and laws worth many hundreds of millions of dollars. For a while, the New York Central fought him. It bribed where he bribed. When he intimidated, it intimidated. But Vanderbilt was, by far, the abler of the two contending forces. Finally the stockholders decided that he was the man to run their system. And on Nov. 12, 1867, John Jacob Astor II, Edward Cunard, John Steward and others representing more than 13 million dollars of stock, turned the New York Central over to Vanderbilt's management on the ground, as their letter set forth, that the change would result in larger dividends to the stockholders... No sooner had Vanderbilt been put in control that these

abilities were preeminently displayed by such an amazing reign of corruption and exaction that even a public cynically habituated to bribery and arbitrary methods was profoundly stirred.

It was in these identical years that the Astors, the Goelets, the Rhinelanders and many other landholders and merchants were getting more water grants by collusion with the various corrupt city administrations. On June 14, 1850, William B. Astor got a grant of land under water for the block of 12th and 13th Streets, on the Hudson River, at the ridiculous price of \$13 per running foot. William E Dodge [of Phelps Dodge fame] likewise got a grant on the Hudson River. Public opinion severely condemned this virtual giving away of city property, and a special committee of the Board of Councilmen was moved to report on May 15, 1854, that 'the practice of selling city property except where it is evident that it cannot be put to public use, is an error in finance that has prevailed too frequently. Indeed, the experience of about 11 years has demonstrated that sales of property usually take place about the time it is likely to be needed for public uses, or on the eve of a rise in value. Every pier, bulkhead and slip should have continued to be property of the city' "

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.6

"We have seen how Connolly made gifts of the city's property to this class of leading citizens. Moreover, a corrupt administration was precisely what the rich wanted, for they could very conveniently make arrangements with it to evade personal property taxation, have the assessments on their real estate reduced to an inconsiderable sum, and secure public franchises and rights of all kinds.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that the rich, as a class, were eager to have the Tweed regime continue. They might pose as fine moralists and profess to instruct the poor in religion and politics, but this attitude was a fraud. They deliberately instigated, supported, and benefitted by, all of the great strokes of thievery that Tweed and Connolly put through."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.7

"In penetrating into the origin and growth of the great fortunes [of Arab frontmen], this vital fact is constantly forced upon the investigator: That Law has been the most valuable asset possessed by the capitalist class. Without it, this class would have been as helpless as a babe [baby]. What would the medieval baron have been without [his] armed force? But note how conditions have changed. The capitalist class, far shrewder than the feudalistic rulers, dispenses with personally equipped armed force. It becomes superfluous. All that is necessary to do is to make the laws, as so guide things that the officials who enforce the laws are responsive to the interests of the propertied class. Back of the laws [FE] police forces and sheriffs and militia, all kept at the expense of the city, county and State—at public expense. Clearly, then, having control of the laws and of the officials, then propertied classes have the full benefit of armed forces the expense of which, however, they do not have to defray. It has unfolded itself [FE] as a vast improvement over the crude feudal system.

In complete control of the laws, the great propertied classes [fronting for the Arabs] have been able either to profit by the enforcement, or by the violation, of them."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.7

"all of the other great fortunes reveal the same, or nearly identical, factors. With the millions made by a career of crime, the original Astors buy land; they get more land by fraud; the Law throws its shield about the property so obtained. They cheat the city out of enormous sums in taxation; the Law does not molest them. On the contrary, it allows them to build palaces and to keep on absorbing more forms of property.

In 1875, William Astor builds a railroad in Florida; and as a gift of appreciation, so it is told, the Florida Legislature presents him with 80,000 acres of land. It is wholly probable, if the underlying circumstances were known, that it would be found that an influence more material than a simple burst of gratitude prompted this gift. Where did the money come from with which this railroad was built? And what was the source of other immense funds which were invested in railroads, banks, industrial enterprises, in buying more land and in mortgages—in many forms of ownership?

The unsophisticated acceptor of current sophistries, or the apologist might reply that all this money came from legitimate business transactions, the natural increase in the value of land, and thus on. But waiving these superficial explanations and defenses, which really mean nothing more than a forced justification, it is plain that the true sources of these revenues were of a vastly different nature. The millions in rents which flowed in to the Astor's treasury every year came literally from the sweat, labor, misery and murder of a host of men, women, and children who were never chronicled, and who went to their death in eternal obscurity." 165

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.7

"It was the fashion of the times to depict and accept the multi-millionaires as marvels of ability, almost superhuman. This was the stuff fed out to the people"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.8

"The founder of the Goelet fortune was Peter Goelet, an ironmonger during and succeeding [after] the Revolution. His grandfather, Jacobus Goelet, was as a boy and young man, brought up by Frederick Phillips, with whose career as a promoter and backer of pirates and piracies, and as a briber of royal official under British rule" [In other words, the Goelets were 'innit'.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.8

"Land acquired by political or commercial fraud was made the lever for the commission of other frauds. The railroads, now controlled by a few men... were surveyed and built to a great extent by public funds, not private money. As time passed a gradual transformation took place. Little by little, scarcely known to the people, laws were altered. The States and the [national] Government, representing the interests of the vested class [fronting for the Arabs], surrendered the people's rights... and great railroad systems passed into the hands of a small cabal of multimillionaires [fronting for the Arabs].

To give one of many instances: The Illinois Central Railroad, passing through an industrial and rich farming country, was one of the most profitable railroads in the United States. This railroad was built in the proportion of twelve parts to one by public funds, raised by taxation of the people of that State, and by prodigal [generous, lavish] gifts of public land grants. The balance represented the investments of private individuals. The cost of the [rail]road as reported by the

company in 1873 was \$48,331 a mile. Of this amount all that private individuals contributed was \$4,930 a mile...

(1) If the railroads were built with public money, why weren't they owned and operated by the people?

(2) Why did we even have these stupid railroad companies that sucked whatever they could from the people.

(3) Why didn't government build railroads the way it built roads for cars?

(4) Why did we let people call a couple steel spaghetti wires on wood trestles and gravel a railroad?

(5) Why are railcars so stupidly heavy weight?

(6) All are aspects of the Arab struggle against the rail-based commerce system that is best for mankind. Instead we have the flat-road system that produces the most money for the Arab parasite race.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.8

"Tracing the history of every vanished civilization makes apparent the fact that in every instance decadence was preceded by urban congestion and by immense land holdings by the aristocrat or the capitalist" [fronting for the Arabs]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.8

"This Rutgers was a lineal descendant of Anthony Rutgers, who in 1731, obtained from the royal Governor Cosby the gift of what was then called the 'Fresh Water Pond and Swamp' — a stretch of 70 acres of little value at the time, but which, a long time later, was covered with busy streets and large commercial and office buildings. What the circumstances were that attended this grant are not now known. The grant consisted of what are now many blocks along Broadway north of Lispenard street."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.8

[Marshall] "Field was the son of a farmer. He was born in Conway, Mass., in 1835. When 21, he went to Chicago and worked in a wholesale dry goods house. In 1860 he was made a partner. During the Civil war this firm, as did the entire commercial world, proceeded to hold up the nation for exorbitant prices in its contracts at the time of distress. The Government and the public were forced to pay the highest sums for the poorest material [as is normal]. It was established that Government officials were in collusion with the contractors. This extortion formed one of the saddest and most sordid chapters of the Civil War (as it does of all wars), but conventional history is silent on the subject, and one is compelled to look elsewhere for the facts of how the commercial houses imposed at high prices shoddy material and semi-putrid food upon the very army and navy that fought for their interests. In the worlds of one of Field's laudatory biographers, 'the firm coined money' "

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.9

"In close similarity to the start of the Astors, and many other founders of great land fortunes, commerce was the original mans by which Marshall Field obtained the money which he invested in land. Consecutively [Next in line] came a ramification [branching] of other revenue-producing properties. Once in motion, the process worked in the same admixed, interconnected way as it did in the amassing of contemporary large fortunes. It may be literally compared to hundreds of

golden streams flowing from as many sources to one central point [one Mecca]. From land, business, railroads, street railways, public utility and industrial corporations—from these and many other channels, prodigious profits kept, and still kept, pouring in ceaselessly. In turn, these formed ever newer and widening distributing radii of investments. The process, by its own resistless volition [will], became one of continuous compound progression."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.9

"Land, in the infancy of the city [Chicago], was cheap. Few settlers there were, and the future could not be foreseen. In 1830 one-quarter of an acre [100' x 100' or 30m x 30m] could be bought for \$20. A few bits of silver, or any currency whatsoever, would secure to the buyer a deed carrying with it a title forever, with a perpetual right of exclusive ownership and a perpetual hold upon all succeeding generations. [Why do we do this? Who put this idea into our heads that this is a good idea?] The more population grew, the greater the value their labor gave the land; and the keener their need, the more difficult it became for them to get land. [And the more valuable the Arab land holdings became]

Within ten years — by about the beginning of the year 1840 — the price of a quarter of an acre in the center of the city had risen to \$1,500. A decade later the established value was \$17,500, and in 1860, \$282,000. [\$28,200?] Chicago was growing with great rapidity. A network of railroads converged there; mammoth factories, mills, grain elevators, packing houses—a vast variety of manufacturing and mercantile concerns set up in business, and brought thither [thee•there]; swarms of workingmen [worker bees] and their families, led on by the need for food and the prospects of work. The greater the influx of workers, the more augmented became the value of land. Inevitably the greatest congestion of living resulted.

By 1870, the price of a quarter of an acre in the heart of the city bounded to \$120,000, and by 1880, to \$130,000.

During the next decade—a decade full of bitter distress to the working population of the United States, and marked by widespread suffering—the price shot up to \$900,000. By 1894—a panic [economic crisis] year, in which millions of men were out of work and in a state of appalling destitution—a quarter of an acre reached the gigantic value of \$1,250,000. At this identical time, large numbers of the working class, which had so largely created this value, were begging vainly for work, and were being evicted by the tens of thousands in Chicago because they could not pay rent for their miserable, cramped habitations.

By exchanging a few hundred, or a few thousand dollars, in Chicago's extreme youth, for a scrap of paper called a deed, the buyer of this land found himself, after the lapse of years, a millionaire. It did not matter where or how he obtained the purchase money: whether he swindled, or stole, or inherited it, or made it honestly—so long as it was not counterfeit, the law was observed. After he got the land he was under no necessity of doing anything more than hold on to it, which same he could do equally well, whether in Chicago or buried in the depths of Kamchatka. If he choose, he could get chronically drunk; he could gamble, or drone in laziness; he could do anything but work. Nevertheless, the land and all its values which others created, were his forever, to enjoy and dispose of as suited his individual pleasure.

This was, and is still, the system. Thoroughly riveted in law, it was regarded as rational, beneficent and everlasting fixture of civilized life—by the beneficiaries [the Arabs]. And as

these later happened to be, by virtue of their possessions, among the real rulers of government, their conceptions and interests were embodied in law, thought and custom as the edict of civilization. The whole concurrent institutions of society, which were but the echo of property interests, pronounced the system wise and just, and, as a reigning force, do still so proclaim it. In such a state, there was nothing abnormal in any man monopolizing land and exclusively appropriating its revenues. On the contrary, it was considered a superior stroke of business, a splendid example of astuteness. Marshall Field was looked upon as a very sagacious business man."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.9

"Poverty grew in exact proportion to the growth of large [Arab fronting] fortunes; the one presupposed, and was built upon, the existence of the other. Chicago became full of slums and fetid, overcrowded districts; and if the density and congestion of population are not as great as in New York, Boston, and Cincinnati, it is only because of more favorable geographical conditions.

Field's fortune was heaped up in about the last twenty years of his life. The celerity [swiftness] of its progress arose from the prolific variety and nature of his possessions. To form even a approximate idea of how fast wealth came in to him, it is necessary to picture millions of men, women and children toiling day after day, year in and year out, getting a little less than two parts of the value of what they produced, while almost nine portions either went to him entirely or in part. [Thus the workers got 18% and the Arabs skimmed 82%] But this was not all. Add to these millions of workers the rest of the population of the United States who had to buy from, or in some other way pay tribute to, the many corporations in which Field held stock, and you get some adequate conception of the innumerable influxions of gold which poured into Field's coffers every minute, every second of the day, whether he were [was] awake or asleep; whether sick or well, whether traveling or sitting stock still.

This one man had the legal power of taking over to himself, as his inalienable property, his to enjoy, hoard, squander, bury, or throw in the ocean, if his fancy so dictated, the revenue produced by the labor of millions of beings as human as he, with the same born capacity for eating, drinking, breathing, sleeping and dying. Many of his workers had a better digestive apparatus which had to put up with inferior food, and, at time, no food at all...

Few of his workers received as much as \$2 a day; Field's income was estimated to be at the rate of about \$500 to \$700 an hour."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.9

"Field [as Arab frontman] was one of the biggest dry goods manufacturers in the world. He owned, a writer set forth, scores of enormous factories in England, Ireland and Scotland. 'The provinces of France', this eulogist went on, 'are dotted with his mills. The clatter of the Marshal Field looms is heard in Spain, Italy, Germany, Austria and Russia. Nor is the Orient neglected by this master of fabrics.'"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.10

[Lets look at] "one of his [Marshal Field's] many properties—the Pullman Company, otherwise called the 'Palace Car Trust'. [with 85% of the US railway sleeper car market] This is a

necessary part of the exposition [explanation] in order to bring out more of the methods by which Field was enabled to fling together his vast fortune.

The artificial creation of the law called the corporation was so devised that it was comparatively easy for the men who controlled it to evade personal, moral, and often legal, responsibility for their acts. Governed as the corporation was by a body of directors, those acts became collective and not individual. If one of the directors were assailed [attacked] he could plausibly take refuge in the claim that he was merely one of a number of controllers; that he could not be held specifically responsible. Thus the culpability [guilt, responsibility] was shifted, until it rested on the corporation, which was a bloodless thing, [a fictional citizen] not a person.

In the case of the Pullman Co., however, much of the moral responsibility could be directly placed upon Field, inasmuch as he, although under cover, was virtually the dictator of that corporation. According to the inventory of the executors of his will, he owned 8,000 shares of Pullman stock, valued at \$800,000. It was asserted (in 1901) that Field was the largest owner of Pullman stock. 'In the popular mind' wrote a puffer [PR man?], probably inspired by Field himself, 'George M. Pullman has ever been deemed the dominant factor in that vast and profitable enterprise'. This belief was declared in error, and the writer went on: 'Field is, and for years has been, in almost absolute control. Pullman was little more than a figurehead. Such men as Robert T. Lincoln, the president of the company, and Norman B. Ream are but representatives of Marshall Field, whose name has never been identified with the property he so largely owns and controls'. That fulsome [excessively flattering] writer, with the usual inaccuracies and turgid [overblown] exaggerations of 'popular writers', omitted to say that although Field was long the controlling figure in the management of the Pullman works, yet other powerful American multi-millionaires, such as the Vanderbilts, had also become large stockholders.

The Pullman Company, Moody stated, employed in 1904, in all departments of its various factories at different places, nearly 20,000 employees, and controlled 85% of the entire industry. As at least a part of the methods of the company have been the subject of official investigation, certain facts are available.

To give a brief survey, the Pullman Company was organized in 1867 to build sleeping cars of a feasible type officially patented by Pullman. In 1880, it bought 500 acres of land near Chicago. Upon 300 of these, it built its plant, and proceeded, with much show and advertisement of benevolence, to build what is called a model town for the benefit of its workers. Brick tenements, churches, a library, and athletic grounds were the main features, with sundry [various] miscellaneous accessories. The project was heralded far and wide as a notable achievement, a conspicuous example of the growing altruism of business.

[However] Time soon revealed the inner nature of the enterprise. The 'model town', as was the case with imitative towns, proved to be a cunning device with two barbs. It militated [worked through thousands of small ways] to hold the workers to the jobs in a state of quasi-serfdom, and it gave the company additional avenues of exploiting its workers beyond the ordinary and usual limits of wages and profits. In reality, it was one of the forerunners of an incoming feudalistic sway, without the advantages to the wage worker that the lowly possessed under medieval feudalism. It was also an... improvement... over the processes at the coal mines... where the miners were paid the most meager wages, and were

compelled to return those wages to their coal companies and bear and incubus [nightmare, cause of distress] of debt besides, by being forced to buy all their goods and merchandise at company stores at extortionate rates. But where the coal companies did the thing boldly and crudely, the Pullman Company surrounded the exploitation with deceptive embellishments [decorations].

The mechanism, although indirect, was simple. While, for instance, the cost of gas to the Pullman Company was only 35 cents a thousand feet, every worker living in the town of Pullman had to pay at a rate of \$2.25 a thousand feet. If he desired to retain his job, he could not avoid payment. The company owned the exclusive supply of gas and was the exclusive landlord. The company had him in a clamp from which he could not well escape. The workers were housed in ugly little pens, called cottages, built in tight rows, each having five rooms...

Numerous witnesses testified before the special commission appointed later by President Cleveland, that at times their bi-weekly checks ran variously from four cents to one dollar. The company could not produce evidence to disprove this. The sums represented the company's indebtedness to them for their labor, after the company had deduced rent and other charges. Such manifold [many and various] robberies aroused the bitterest resentment among the company's employees, since especially it was a matter of authentic knowledge, disclosed by the company's own reports, that the Pullman factories were making enormous profits."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.10

"The [Pullman worker's] strike would perhaps have been successful had it not been that the entire powers of the National Government, and those of most of the States affected, were used roughshod to crush this mighty labor uprising. The whole newspaper press, with rare exceptions, spread the most glaring falsehoods about the strike and its management. [The national press was in the hands of the business titans fronting for the Arabs.

_____ [Eugene V.] Debs was personally and venomously assailed [maliciously attacked] in vituperation [strong violent language] that has had little equal. To put the strikers in the attitude of sowing violence, the railroad corporations deliberately instigated the burning or destruction of their own cars (they were cheap, worn-out freight cars), and everywhere had thugs and roughs as its emissaries to preach, and provoke violence. The object [objective] was threefold: to throw the onus [responsibility] upon the strikers of being a lawless body; to give the newspapers an opportunity of inveighing [denouncing, condemning] with terrific effect against the strikers, and to call upon the Government for armed troops to shoot down, overawe [impress to silence], or in other ways thwart [stop] the strikers.

Government was, in reality, directed by the railroad and other corporations. United States judges, at the behest of the railroad companies (which had caused them to be appointed to the Bench), issued extraordinary, unprecedented injunctions against the strikers. These injunctions even prevented the strikers from persuading fellow employees to quit work. So utterly without any basis in law were these injunctions that the Federal Commission reported....

But the injunctions were enforced. Debs and his comrades were convicted of contempt of court and, without jury trial, imprisoned at a critical juncture of the strike. And what was their offense? Nothing more than seeking to induce

other workers to take up the cause of their striking fellow-workers. The judges constituted themselves as prosecuting attorney, judge, and jury. Never had such high-handed judicial usurpations been witnessed. As a concluding stroke, President Cleveland, ordered a detachment of the United States army to Chicago. The pretexts were that the strikers were interfering with interstate commerce and with the carrying of the mails.

That the company's profits were great the identical time the workers were curtailed to a starvation basis [point], there can be no doubt. The general [public] indignation, and agitation caused by the summary proceedings during the strike, compelled President Cleveland to appoint a commission to investigate...

The Special Commission, while not selected of men who could in the remotest degree be accused of partiality towards the workers, brought out a volume of significant facts, and handed in a report marked by considerable and unexpected fairness. The report showed that Pullman Company's capital had been increased from \$1-million in 1867 to \$36-million in 1893." [At the same time, the company paid 8% annual dividends, and special dividends in certain years of between 9% and 12%]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.10

"The unusually thorough report of the Illinois Labor Bureau of 1894 demonstrated how the most valuable land and buildings in Chicago were assessed at the merest fraction of their true value—the costliest commercial buildings at about one-tenth, and the richest residences at about one-fourteenth, of their actual value. As for personal property, it contributed a negligible amount in taxes.

The reports of the tax committee of the Boston Executive Business Association in 1891 estimated that two billion dollars of property in Boston escaped taxation, and that the public treasury was cheated out of about \$17-million in taxes every year. As for New York City, we have seen how the Astors, the Schermerhorns, the Goelets—the whole aggregate of the propertied class [fronting for the Arabs]—systematically defrauded in taxes for many decades. It is estimated that in New York City, at present, not less than \$5-billion dollars of property, real and personal, entirely escapes taxation. This estimate is a conservative one.

Spahr, after an exhaustive investigation in the United States, concluded more than a decade ago that, 'the wealthy class pay less than one-tenth of the indirect taxes, the well-to-do less than one-quarter, and the relatively poorer classes more than two-thirds.' [This was the exact opposite of the wealth distribution in the land of the free at the time as revealed in Gustavus.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.10

"Field's fortune, conservatively estimated at \$100-million, yet in fact reaching perhaps \$140-million was largely bequeathed to his two grandsons, Marshall Field III, then 12-years old, and Henry Field, 8-years old." [Do we motivate men to work harder because they can give billions to their 8-year old grandchildren when they die? Do we lessen that motivation if we tax inheritances by 80% or 95%? Did Marshal Field work harder because he knew that his grandchildren, yet to be born decades in the future would get to keep 100% of their inheritance? What harm is it if they can only inherit money for 5,000 suburban homes instead of 100,000?]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 2.10

"The fortune that he [Marshall Field] left was principally in the form of real estate and bonds and stocks. These constituted a far more effective cumulative agency [vehicle, means] than money. There were, and are, inexorable [unstoppable] mortgages on the labor of millions of workers, men, women and children, of all occupations. By this simple screed [scrap of paper], called a will, embodying one man's capricious indulgence [pampering whim], these boys, utterly incompetent even to grasp the magnitude of the fortune owned by them, and incapable of exercising the [faintest] glimmerings of management, were given legal, binding power over a mass of people for generations. Patterson wrote that in the Field stores and Pullman factories many thousands of people worked for these boys. But these were the direct employees; as we have seen, Field [as Arab frontman] owned bonds and stock in scores of industrial, railroad, mining and other corporations. The workers of all these toiled for the Field boys.

The prevalent practice of multi-millionaires leaving huge estates in trust for long periods engaged the earnest attention of the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations. The American law of inheritance, it reported in 1915, ran counter to the whole theory of American society, and, with some variations, was adopted from English law. 'In effect, the American law of inheritance is as efficient for the maintenance and establishment of [dynastic] families as is English law... which has bulwarked [fortified, citadel-ed] the British aristocracy for centuries... the report [also] told how practically all American millionaire estates were so invested and hedged about with restrictions upon expenditure that, to all intents and purposes, they were perpetuities [for the Arabs to run as they wanted].'

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Under the first stages of the old chaotic competitive system, in which factory warred against factory, and an intense struggle for survival and ascendancy enveloped the whole tense sphere of manufacturing, no striking industrial fortunes were made. Fortunate was the factory owner regarded who could claim \$250,000 clear." [The farmers and the factories of America were not making money at this time. Only the Arab fronting intermediary/taxing companies were making money. The song remains the same today in China. Only the Arabs are making money on China.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"In contrast to the slow, almost creeping pace of the factory owners in the race for wealth, the railroad owners sprang at once into the lists of mighty wealth-possessors. [They were] armed with the most comprehensive and puissant [mighty] powers and privileges, and vested with a sweep of properties beside which those of the petty industrial bosses were puny. Railroad owners, we say. The distinction is necessary between the builders of the railroads and the owners. The one might construct, but it often happened that by means of cunning, fraud, and corruption, the builders were superseded by another set of [Arab fronting] men who vaulted into possession.

Looking back and summing up the course of events for a series of years, it may be said that there was created over night a number of entities empowered with extraordinary and far-reaching rights and powers of ownership."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

These entities were called corporations, and were called into being by law. Beginning as creatures of law, the very rights, privileges and properties obtained by means of law, soon enabled them to become the dictators and masters of law. The title was in the corporation, not in the individual. Hence the men who controlled the corporation swayed the substance of power and ownership.

The factory was usually a personal affair, owned by one man or in co-partnership. To get control of this property it was necessary to get the owner in a financial corner and force him to sell out for, as a rule, he had no bond or stock issues. But the railroad corporation was a stock corporation; whoever secured control of a majority of the stock became the legal administrator of its policies and property. By adroit manipulation, intimidation, superior knavery [dishonesty], and the corrupt domination of law, it was always easy for those who understood the science of rigging the stock market, and that of strategic undermining, to wrest [grab] the control away from weak or (treating the word in a commercial sense) incompetent, holders. This has been long shown by a succession of examples.

Thus this situation, so singularly conflicting with the theoretical majesty of the law, was frequently presented: A band of men styling themselves a corporation received a perpetual charter with the most sweeping rights and properties. In turn, the law interposed no effective hinderance to the seizing of their possessions by any other group proving its power to grasp them. All of this was done under nominal forms of law, but differed little in reality from the methods during medieval times when any baron could take another baron's castle and land by armed force, and it remained his until a stronger man came along and proved his title likewise.

Long before the railroad had been accepted commercially as a feasible undertaking, the trading and land-owning classes, as had been repeatedly pointed out, had demonstrated very successfully how the forms of government could be perverted to enrich themselves at the expense of the working population.

Taxation laws, as we have seen were so devised that the burden in a direct way fell lightly on the shipping, manufacturing, trading, banking and land-owning classes [fronting for the Arabs], while indirectly it was shoved almost wholly upon the workers, whether in ship, factory or on farm. Furthermore... Government loaned vast sums of public money, free of interest, to the traders [fronting for the Arabs], while at the same time refusing to assist the impoverished and destitute... it granted immunity from punishment to the rich and powerful, and inflicted the most drastic penalties upon poor debtors and penniless violators of the law... it allowed the possessing classes [fronting for the Arabs] to evade taxation on a large scale, and effected summarily cruel laws permitting landlords to evict tenants for non-payment of rent. These and many other ... grievously [severely] discriminative laws have been referred to [herein]... also the refusal of Government to interfere in the slightest with the commercial frauds and impositions constantly practiced, with all their resulting great extortions, upon the defenseless masses."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Of the long-prevailing frauds on the part of the capitalists in acquiring large tracts of public land, some significant facts have been brought out in preceding chapters. Those facts,

however, are only a few of a mass [great many]. When the United States Government was organized, most of the land in the North and East was already expropriated [into Arab hands]. But immense areas of public domain still remained in the South and in the Middle West. Over much of the former Colonial land the various legislatures claimed jurisdiction, until, one after another, they ceded it to the National Government. With the Louisiana purchase, in 1805, the area of public domain was enormously extended, and consecutively so later after the Mexican war.

From the very beginning of the Government, the land laws were arranged to discriminate against the poor settler. Instead of laws providing simple and inexpensive ways for the poor to get land, the laws were distorted into a highly effective mechanism by which companies of capitalists, and individual capitalists, secured vast tracts for trivial sums. These capitalists then either held the land, or forced settlers to pay exorbitant prices for comparatively small plots. No laws were in existence compelling the purchaser to be a bona fide settler. Absentee landlordism was the rule. The capitalist companies [fronting for the Arabs] were largely composed on Northern Eastern and Southern traders and bankers. The evidence shows that they employed bribery and corruption on a great scale, either in getting favorable laws passed, or in evading such laws as were on the statute books by means of the systematic purchase of the connivance of Land Office officials.

By act of Congress, passed on April 21, 1792, the Ohio Land Company, for example, received 100,000 acres, and in the same year it bought 892,900 acres for \$642,856 [72 cents per acre for a rectangle of land measuring about 28 by 50 miles]. But this sum was not paid in money. The [Arab fronting] bankers and traders composing the company had purchased at a heavy discount, certificates of public debt and army land warrants, and were allowed to tender these as payment. The company [fronting for the Arabs] then leisurely disposed of its land to settlers at an enormous profit. Nearly all of the land companies had banking adjuncts [divisions]. The poor settler, in order to settle on land that a short time previously had been national property, was first compelled to pay the land company an extortionate price, and then was forced to borrow the money from the banking adjuncts, and give a heavy mortgage, bearing heavy interest, on the land. The land companies always took care to select the very best lands. The Government documents of the time are full of remonstrances [objections, protests] from legislatures and individuals complaining of these seizures, under form of law, of the most valuable areas. The tracts thus appropriated comprised timber and mineral, as well as agricultural land."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"One of the most scandalous land-company transactions was that involving a group of Southern and Boston capitalists. In January, 1795, the Georgia Legislature, by special act, sold millions of acres in different parts of the State of Georgia to four land companies. The people of the State were convinced that this purchase had been obtained by bribery. It was made an election issue, and a Legislature, comprising almost wholly new members, was elected. In February, 1796, this Legislature passed a rescinding act, declaring the act of the preceding year void, on the ground of it having been obtained by "improper influence" [bribery]. In 1803 the tracts in question were transferred by the Georgia Legislature to the United States Government.

The Georgia Mississippi Land Company was one of

the four companies. In the mean time, this company had sold its tract, for ten cents an acre, to the New England Mississippi Land Company. Although committee after committee of Congress reported that the New England Mississippi Land Company had paid little or no actual part of the purchase price, yet that company, headed by some of the foremost Boston capitalists, lobbied in Congress for eleven years for an act giving it a large indemnity. Finally in 1814, Congress passed an indemnification act, under which the eminent Bostonians, after ten years more lobbying, succeeded in getting an award from the United States Treasury of \$1,077,561. The total amount appropriated by Congress on the pretense of settling the claims of the various capitalists in the 'Yazoo Claims' was \$1,500,000. The ground upon which this appropriation was made by Congress was that the Supreme Court of the United States had decided that, Irrespective of the methods used to obtain the grant from the Georgia Legislature, the grant, once made [to the Arabs], was in the nature of a contract which could not be revoked or impaired by subsequent legislation. This was the first of a long line of [totally corrupt US Supreme] court decisions validating grants and franchises of all kinds secured by bribery and fraud."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"It was probably the scandal arising from the bribery of the Georgia Legislature that caused popular ferment [uproar], and crystallized a demand for altered laws. In 1796, Congress declared its intention to abandon the prevailing system of selling millions of acres to companies or individuals. The new system, it announced, was to be one adapted to the interests of both and poor man. Land was thereafter to be sold in small quantities on credit. Could the mechanic or farmer demand a better law? Did it not hold out the opportunity to the poorest to get land for which payment could be gradually made?

But the [new] law worked even better to the advantage of the capitalist class than the old [law]. By bribing the land officials the capitalists were able to cause the choicest lands to be fraudulently withheld, and entered by dummies [held by straw-men]. In this way, vast tracts were acquired. Apparently the land entries were made by a large number of intending settlers, but these were merely the intermediaries by which the capitalists secured great tracts in the form of many small allotments. Having obtained the best lands, the capitalists then often held them until they were in demand, and [thus] forced actual settlers to pay heavily for them. During all of this time the capitalists themselves held the land 'on credit'. Some of them eventually paid for the lands out of the profits made from the settlers, but a great number of the purchasers cheated the Government almost entirely out of what they owed.

The capitalists of the period contrived to use the land laws wholly to their own advantage and profit. In 1824, the Illinois Legislature memorialized [??] Congress to change the existing laws. Under them, it recited, the best selections of land had been made by non-resident speculators, and it called upon Congress to pass a law providing for selling the remaining lands at fifty cents and acre. Other legislatures petitioned similarly. Yet, notwithstanding [despite] the fact that United States officials and committees of Congress were continually unearthing great frauds, no real change for the benefit of the poor settler was made.

The land frauds were great and incessant. In a long report, the United States Senate Committee on Public Lands, reporting on June 20, 1834, declared that the evidence it had

taken established the fact that in Ohio and elsewhere, combinations of capitalist speculators [fronting for the Arabs], at the public sales of lands, had united for the purpose of driving other purchasers out of the market and in deterring poor men from bidding. The committee detailed how these companies and individuals had fraudulently bough large tracts of land at \$1.25 and acre, and sold the land later at exorbitant prices. It showed how, in order to accomplish these frauds, they had bought up [corrupted] United States Land Office Registers and Receivers.

Another exhaustive report was handed in by the the United States Senate Committee on Lands, on March 3, 1835. Many of the speculators, it said, filled high offices in States where public lands bought by them were located... 'the first step', it set forth, 'necessary to the success of every scheme of speculation in the public lands, is to corrupt the land officers, by a secret understanding between the parties that they are to receive a certain portion of the profits'."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"the policy of granting enormous tracts of land to corporations was revived for the benefit of canal and railroad companies. The first railroad company to get a land grant from Congress was the Illinois Central, in 1850. It received as a gift 2,595,053 acres of land in Illinois [a rectangle of about 50 by 81 miles]. Actual settlers had to pay the company from \$5 to \$15 an acre.

Large areas of land bought from the Indian tribes by the Government, almost at once became the property of canal or railroad corporations by the process of Government grants."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

[note all the foreigner English underlined.]

"The trading, banking and landed class [fronting for the Arabs] learned well the old, all-important policy of having a Government fully susceptible to their interests, whether the governing officials were put in office by them, and were saturated with their interests, views and ideals, or whether corruption had to be resorted to in order to attain their objects. At all events, the propertied classes, in the main [mostly], secured what they wanted. And, as fast as their interests changed, so did the acts and dicta [dictator dictates] of Government change.

While the political economists [working for the Arabs] were busy promulgating the doctrine that it was not the province of Government to embark in any enterprise other than that of purely governing—a doctrine precisely suiting the traders and borrowed from their demands— the commercial classes, early in the 19th century, suddenly discovered that there was an exception. They wanted canals built; and as they had not sufficient funds for the purpose, and did not see any immediate profit for themselves, they clamored for the building of them by the States. In fine [in the end], they found that it was in their interest to have the States put through canal projects on the ground that these would 'stimulate trade'. The canals were built, but the commercial classes in some instances made the blunder of allowing the ownership to rest in the people. [dear bro, don't you make this mistake in the future.]

Never again was this mistake repeated. If it proved so easy to get legislatures and Congress to appropriate millions of the public funds for undertakings profitable to commerce, why would it not be equally simple to secure the appropriation plus the perpetual title? Why be satisfied with one portion, when the whole was within reach?

True, the popular vote was to be reckoned with; it was a time when the people scanned the tax levy with far greater scrutiny than now [1]; and they were not disposed to put up the public funds only that private individuals might reap the exclusive benefit. But there was a way of tricking and circumventing the electorate. The trading and land-owning classes [fronting for the Arabs] knew its effectiveness. It was they who had utilized it; who from the year 1795 on had bribed legislatures and Congress to give them bank and other charters. Bribery had proved a signal success. The performance [of the Arab actors] was extended on a much wider scale, with far greater results, and with an adroitness [skillfulness] revealing that the capitalist class had learned much by experience, not only in reaching out for powers that the previous generation would not have dared to grant [2], but in being able to make plastic to its own purposes the electorate that believed itself to be the mainspring [source] of political power [3]."

[1] Pay close attention to the spending of government. This is the how the Arabs feed on your government. If you can stop the corrupt spending, you can stop the Arab parasitic feeding.

2) Note the multi-generational time horizon of the Arab struggle, and the talk of eroding = ex•roding = out•nibbling the powers of the host in favor of the parasite.

3) Here the Arabs talk about the matrix and how the electorate of the US 'believed itself to be the source of political power' when it was not.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"The first great canal, built in response to the demands of the commercial class, was the Erie Canal, completed in 1825. This waterway was constructed at public expense, and was owned by New York State. The commercial men could succeed in having it managed for their purposes and profit, and the politicians could often extract plunder from the successive contracts, but there was not opportunity or possibility for the exercise of the usual capitalist methods of fraudulent diversion of land or of over-capitalization and exorbitant rates with which to pay dividends on fictitious stock [like with a Ponzi scheme].

...from about the very time when the Erie Canal was finished, the era of the private canal company, financed by the Government, began. One after another, canal companies came forward to solicit public funds and land grants. These companies neither had any capital of their own, nor was capital necessary. The machinery of Government, both National and State, was used to supply them with capital.

The Chesapeake and Ohio canal Company received, up to 1839, the sum of \$2,500,000 in funds appropriated by the United States Government, and \$7,197,000 from the State of Maryland.

In 1824, the United States Government began giving land grants for canal projects. The customary method was the granting by Congress of certain areas of land to various States, to be expressly given to designated canal companies. The States in donating them, sometimes sold them to the canal companies at the nominal rate of \$1.25 an acre. The commuting of [reducing, forgetting about] these payments was often obtained later by corrupt legislation.

From 1824 to 1834, the Wabash and Erie Canal Company obtained land grants from the Government amounting to 826,300 acres. The Miami and Dayton Canal Company secured from the Government, in 1828 and 1833, a total grant of 333,826 acres. The St. Mary's Falls Ship Canal

Company received 750,000 acres in 1852; the Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canal Company, 400,000 acres in 1865-66... the land grants given by the National Government to aid canal companies, totaled 4,224,073.06 acres" [This did not include state grants.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Whatever political corruption accompanied the building of such State-owned canals as the Erie Canal, the primary and fundamental object was to construct. In the case of the private canal companies, the primary and fundamental object was to plunder. The capitalists controlling these companies were bent upon getting rich quickly; it was to their interest to delay the work as long as possible, for by this process they could periodically go to the Legislatures with this argument: That the projects were more expensive and involved more difficulties than had been anticipated; that the original appropriations were exhausted, and that if the projects were to be completed, fresh appropriations were imperative. A large part of these successive appropriations, whether in money, or land which could be sold for money, were stolen in sundry [various] indirect ways by the various sets of capitalist directors. The many documents of the Maryland Legislature, and the messages of successive Governors of Maryland, do not tell the full story of how the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal project was looted, but they give abundantly enough information.

Many of the canal companies, so richly endowed by the Government with great land grants, made little attempt to [actually] build canals. What some of them did was to turn about and defraud the Government out of incalculably valuable mineral deposits which were never included in the original grants.

In his annual report for 1885, Commissioner Sparks, of the United States General Land Office told (House Executive Documents, 1885-86, Vol. II) how, by 1885, the Portage Lake 'canal' was only a worthless ditch and a complete fraud. What had the company done with its large land grant? Instead of accepting the grant as intended by Congress, it had, by means of fraudulent surveys, and doubtless by official corruption, caused at least 100,000 acres of its grant to be surveyed in the very richest copper lands of Wisconsin.

The grants, originally made by Congress were meant to cover swamp lands—that is, lands not particularly valuable for agricultural uses, but which had a certain value for other purposes [like oil drilling]. Mineral lands were strictly excluded. Such was the law: the practice was very different. The facility with which capitalists caused the most valuable mineral, grazing, agricultural and timber lands to be fraudulently surveyed as 'swamp' lands is described at length a little later on in this work... those stolen copper deposits were never recovered by the Government nor was any attempt made to forfeit them. They comprise some of the richest copper mines in America and are owned by compact Boston interests."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Whatever superficial or partial [biased] writers may say of the benevolent origin of railroads, the fact is that railroad construction was ushered in by a widespread corruption of legislators that put to shame the previous debauchery in getting bank charters."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

[in some] "instances a number of tradesmen and land-owners would organize a company having, let us say, \$250,000 among them. If they had proceeded to build a railroad with this sum, not many miles of rail would have been laid before they would have found themselves hopelessly bankrupt.

[for the harem bros] Their wisdom was that of their class. They knew a far better method. This was to use the powers of government, and make the public provide the necessary means. In the process of construction, the \$250,000 would have been only a mite. But it was quite enough to bribe a legislature. By expending this sum in purchasing a majority of an important committee, and a sufficient number of the whole body, they could get millions in public loans, vast areas of land given outright, and a succession of privileges worth, in the long run, hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Corporations [fronting for the Arabs] always have their lobby members in and around the halls of legislation to watch and secure their interests. Not so with the people—they cannot act with the directness and system[atic approach] that a [large] corporations can. No individual will take it upon himself to go to the [proverbial distant] Capitol at his own expense, to watch the representatives of the people, and to lobby against the potent influence of the corporation. But corporations have the money, and it is to their interest to expend it to secure the passage of partial laws."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Two years later, at one of the sessions of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, Delegate Walker, of North Brookfield, made a similar statement as to conditions in that State. 'I ask any man to say... if he believes that any measure of legislation could be carried in this State, which was generally offensive to the corporations of the Commonwealth [fronting for the Arabs]? It is very rarely the case that we do not have a majority in the legislature who are either presidents, directors, or stockholders in incorporated companies. This is a fact of very grave importance.' Two-thirds of the property in Massachusetts, Delegate Walker pointed out, was owned by corporations.

In 1857, an acrimonious [angry and bitter] debate ensued in the Iowa Constitutional convention over an attempt to give further extraordinary power to the railroads. Already the State of Iowa had incurred \$12-million in debts aiding railroad corporations. 'I fear' said Delegate Traer, 'that it is very often the case that these votes (on appropriations for railroads) are carried through by improper influences, which the people, if left alone, would, upon mature reflection, never had adopted.

These are but a very few of the many instances of the debauching [turning away from duty] of every legislature in the United States. No matter how furiously the people protested at this giving away of their resources and rights, the capitalists were able to thwart their will on every occasion" [This was due to the inherently corrupt design of their democracy.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"In every such case, the railroad owners in subsequent years sneaked legislation through in practically every State, or resorted to subterfuges, by which they were relieved from

having to pay back those loans.

Hundreds of millions of dollars, exacted from the people in taxation, were turned over to the railroad corporations, and little of it was ever returned. As for the land grants to railroads, they reached colossal proportions. From 1850 to 1872, Congress gave not less than 155,504,994 acres [243,000 square miles] of the public domain either direct to railroad corporation, or to the various States, to be transferred to those corporations.

Much of this immense area was given on the condition that unless the railroads were built, the grants were to be forfeited. But the capitalists found no difficulty in getting a thoroughly corrupt Congress to extend the period of construction in cases where the construction had not been done. Of the 155-million acres, a considerable portion of it valuable mineral, coal, timber, and agricultural land, only 607,741 acres were forfeited by act of Congress, and even much of these were restored to the railroads by judicial decisions. That Congress, not less than the [state] legislatures, was honeycombed with corruption is all to evident from the disclosures of many investigations—disclosures to which we shall have pertinent occasion to refer later on. Not only did the railroad corporations loot in a gigantic way under forms of law, but they so craftily drafted the laws of both Nation and States that fraud at all times was easy."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Not merely were these huge areas of land obtained by fraud, but after they were secured, fraud was further used to evade taxation. And by donations of land is not meant only that for intended railroad use or which could be sold by the railroads. In some cases, notably that of the Union Pacific Railroad, authority was given to the railroad by acts passed in 1862 and 1864 to take all of the material, such as stone, timber, etc., needed for construction, from the public lands. So, in addition to the money and lands, much of the essential material for building the railroads was supplied from the public resources. No sooner had they obtained their grants, than the railroad corporations had law after law passed removing this restriction or that reservation until they became absolute masters of hundreds of millions of acres of land which a brief time before had been national property.

'These enormous tracts wrote (in 1886) William A. Phillips, a member of the Committee on Public Lands of the 43rd Congress, referring to the railroad grants, 'are in their disposition subject to the will of the railroad companies. They can dispose of them in enormous tracts if they please, and there is not a single safeguard to secure this portion of the national domain to cultivating yeomanry'. The whole machinery of legislation was not only used to exclude the farmer from getting the land, and to centralize its ownership in corporations, but was additionally employed in relieving these corporations from taxation on the land thus obtained by fraud. 'To avoid taxation', Phillips goes on, 'the railroad land grant companies had an amendment enacted into law to the effect that they should not obtain their patents until they had paid a small fee to defray the expense of surveying. This they took care not to pay, or only to pay as fast as they could sell tracts to some purchasers, on which occasions they paid the surveying fee and obtained deeds for the portion they sold. In this way, [my brothers] they have held millions of acres for speculative purposes, waiting for a rise in prices without taxation, while the farmer in adjacent lands paid paid taxes. [Learn from this tip my brothers hence.]

Phillips passes this fact by with a casual mention, as though it were one of no great significance.

It is a fact well worthy of elaboration. Precisely as the aristocracies of the Old World had gotten their estates by force and fraud, and then had the laws so arranged as to exempt those estates from taxation, so has the money aristocracy of the United States proceeded on the same plan...

The very laws seemingly passed to secure the poor settler a homestead at a reasonable price were, as Henry M. Teller, Secretary of the Interior, put it, [were] perverted into 'agencies [companies] by which the capitalists secure large and valuable areas of the public land at little expense'. The poor were always the decoys with which the capitalists of the day managed to bag their game. It was to aid and encourage 'the man of small resources' to populate the West that the Desert Land Law was apparently enacted; and many a pathetic and enthusiastic speech was made in Congress as this act was ostentatiously going through. Under this law, it was claimed, a man could establish himself upon 640 acres of land and, upon irrigating a portion of it, and paying \$1.25 an acre, could secure a title. For once, it seemed, Congress was looking out for the interests of the main of few dollars.

But plaudits [people applauding] were too hasty. To the utter surprise of the people, the law began to work in a perverse direction. Its provisions had read well enough on a casual scrutiny. Where lay the trouble? It lay in just a few words deftly thrown in, which the crowd did not notice. This law acclaimed as one of great benefit to every man aspiring for a home and land, was arranged so that the capitalistic cattle syndicates could get immense areas. The lever was the omission of any provision requiring actual settlement. The livestock corporations thereupon sent in their swarms of dummies to the 'desert' lands (many of which, in reality, were not desert but excellent grazing lands), had their dummies get patents from the Government and then transfer the lands. In this way the cattlemen became possessed of enormous areas; and to-day these tracts thus gotten by fraud are securely held intact, forming what may be called great estates, for on many of them live the owners in expansive baronial style.

In numerous instances, law was entirely dispensed with. Vast tracts of land were boldly appropriated by sheep and cattle rangers who had not even a pretense of title. Enclosing these lands with fences, the rangers claimed them as their own, and hired armed guards to drive off intruders, and kill if necessary. Murder after murder was committed. In this usurpation the august [consecrated, respected] Supreme Court of the United States upheld them. And the grounds of the decision were what?

The very extraordinary dictum that a settler could not claim any right of preemption [prior purchase] on public land in possession of another who had enclosed, settled upon and improved them. This was the very reverse of every known declaration of common and statute law. Nor court, supreme or inferior, had ever held that because the proceeds of theft were improved or were refurbished a bit, the sufferer was thereby estopped from recovery. This decision showed anew how, while the courts were ever ready to enforce the law literally against the underlings and penniless, they were as active in fabricating tortuous constructions coinciding not always, but nearly always, with the demands and interest of the capital class."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"The 'poor settler' catspaw was again made use of. ...the

'Stone and Timber Act' was passed in 1878 by Congress, An amendment passed in 1892 made frauds still easier. This measure was another of those benevolent-looking laws which, on its face, extended opportunities for the homesteader. No longer, it was plausibly set forth, could any man say that the Government denied him the right to get public land for a reasonable sum. Was ever a finer, a more glorious chance presented? Here was the way open for any individual homesteader to get 160 acres of timber land for the low price of \$2.50 an acre. Congress was overwhelmed with outbursts of panegyrics [speeches] for its wisdom and public spirit.

Soon however, a cry of rage went up from the duped public. And the cause? The law, like the Desert Land Law, it turned out, was filled with cunningly drawn clauses sanctioning the worst forms of spoliation. Entire trainloads of people, acting in collusion with the land grabbers, were transported by the lumber syndicates into the richest timber regions of the West, supplied with the funds to buy, and then each, after having paid \$2.50 per acre for 160 acres, immediately transferred his or her allotment to the lumber corporations. Thus for \$2.50 an acre, the lumber syndicates obtained vast tracts of the finest lands worth, at the least, according to Government agents, \$100 an acre, at a time, 35-years ago when lumber was not nearly so costly as now."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"By 1876, however, the public agitation had died away. The time was propitious [favorable]. Congress rushed through a bill carefully worded for the purpose. The lands were ordered sold in unlimited areas for cash. No pretense was made of restricting the sale to a certain acreage so that all any individual could buy was enough for his own use. Anyone, if he chose, could buy a million or ten million acres, provided he had the cash to pay \$1.25 an acre. The way was easy for capitalists to get millions of acres of the coveted iron, coal and timber lands for practically nothing. At that very time, the Government was selling coal lands in Colorado at \$10 to \$20 an acre, and it was recognized that even that price was absurdly low."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Fraud was so continuous and widespread that we can here give only a few succinct and scattering instances. 'The present system of laws', reported a special Congressional Committee appointed in 1883 to investigate what had become of the once vast public domain, 'seem to invite fraud. You cannot turn to a single state paper or public document ...[without finding the term] 'fraud' in connection with the disposition of public lands..."

A little later, Commissioner Sparks of the General Land Office pointed out that 'the near approach of the period when the United States will have no land to dispose of has stimulated the exertions of capitalists and corporations to acquire outlying regions of public land in mass, by whatever means, legal or illegal'."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"The Union Pacific manipulated Congress to 'loan' it about \$27-million and give it outright 13-million acres of land. The Central Pacific got nearly \$26-million and received 9-million acres. To the Northern Pacific, 47-million acres were given; to the Kansas Pacific, 12.1-million; to the Southern Pacific about 18-million acres. From 1850, the National Government had

granted subsidies to more than fifty railroads, and, in addition to the great territorial possessions given to the six railroads enumerated, had made a cash appropriation to those six of not less than about \$140-million. But the corruptly obtained donations from the Government were far from being all of the bounty. Throughout the country, States, cities and counties contributed presents in the form of franchises, financial assistance, land and terminal sites."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

[It] "might be good or useless land; the value depended upon the locality. They might be the richest and finest of agricultural grazing, mineral or timber land or barren wastes and rocky mountain tops.

For a while the railroad corporations [fronting for the Arabs] appeared satisfied with their appropriations and allotments. But as time passed, and the powers of government became more and more directed by them, this plan naturally occurred: Why not exchange the bad, or good, land? Having found it so easy to possess themselves of so vast and valuable an area of former public domain, they calculated that no difficulty would be encountered in putting through another process of plundering. All that was necessary was to go through the formality of ordering Congress to pass an act allowing them to exchange bad, for good, lands.

This, however, could not be done too openly. The people must be blinded by an appearance of conserving public interests. The opportunity came when the Forest Reservation Bill was introduced in Congress—a bill to establish national forest reservations. No better vehicle could have been found for the project traveling in disguise. This bill was everywhere looked upon as a wise and statesmanlike measure for the preservation of forests. Capitalist interests, in the pursuit of immediate profit, had ruthlessly denuded and destroyed immense forest stretches, causing, in turn, floods and destruction of life, property and of agriculture. Part of the lands to be taken for the forest reservations included territory settled upon; it was argued as proper, therefore, that the evicted homesteaders should be indemnified [compensated for a loss] by having the choice of land elsewhere.

So far, the measure looked well. But when it went to the conference committee of the two houses of Congress, the railroad representatives artfully slipped in the four unobtrusive [SIC] words, 'or any other claimant'. This quartet of words allowed the railway magnates to exchange millions of acres of desert and of denuded timber lands, arid hills and mountain tops covered with perpetual snow, for millions of the richest lands still remaining in the Government's much diminished hold.

So secretly was this transaction consummated that the public knew nothing about it; the subsidized newspapers printed not a word; it went through in absolute silence. The first protest raised was that of Senator Pettigrew, of South Dakota, in the United States Senate on May 31, 1900. In a vigorous [forceful] speech he disclosed the vast thefts going on under this act. Congress, under the complete domination of the railroads, took no action to stop it. Only when the fraud was fully accomplished did the railroads allow Congress to go through the forms of deferring to public interest by repealing the law. According to the 1934 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 136,425,474 acres [213,000 square miles] of land which had been national public property—that is, title had been vested in the Federal Government—had passed into the ownership of railroad corporations. Direct to these corporations

the Government had granted 98,219,087 acres, and had given to States for railroad grants 38,206,487 acres. In addition, various railroad corporations secured much other land which had been owned by States and municipalities.

Not merely were the capitalist interests allowed to plunder the public domain from the people under these various acts, but another act was passed by Congress, the 'Coal Land Act', purposely drawn to permit the railroads to appropriate great stretches of coal deposits. 'Already' wrote President Theodore Roosevelt in a message to Congress urging the real of the Stone and Timber Act, the Desert Land Law, the Coal Land Act, and similar enactments, 'probably one-half of the total area of high-grade coals in the West has passed under private control. Including both lignite and the coals areas, these private holdings aggregate not less than 30-million acres [47,000 square miles] of coal fields'. These urgings fell flat on a Congress that included many members who had got their millions by reason of these identical laws, and which, as a body, was fully under the control of the dominant class of the day—the capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs]. The oligarchy of wealth was triumphantly, gluttonously in power; it was ingenuous folly to expect it to yield where it could vanquish, and concede where it could despoil."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"Theoretically the power of government resided in the people, down to the humblest voter. This power, however, was the instrument for enslaving the very people supposed to be the wielders of political action.

While Congress, the [state] legislatures, and the executive and administrative officials were industriously giving away [the] public domain, public funds and perpetual rights to railroad and other corporations, they almost entirely ignored the interests of the general run of people.

The more capitalists they created, the harder it became for the poor to get settler's land on the public domain. Congress continued passing acts by which, in most cases, the land was turned over to [Arab fronting] corporations. Intending settlers had to buy it at exorbitant prices. This took place in nearly all of the States and Territories. Large numbers of people could not afford to pay the price demanded by the railroads, and consequently were compelled to herd in industrial centers [where they had to work for the corporations fronting for the Arabs]. They were deliberately shut off from possession of the land. This situation was already acute more than 50-years ago."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"As a matter of sad reality, the Homestead Act, supposedly designed to provide farms for settlers, was drawn without any knowledge whatever of economic agriculture in America. In the eastern States the farmer, under good conditions, could get a living from 80 acres. But twice that area was far from enough for that purpose in the western half of the United States where soil and climatic conditions were different. Yet the Homestead Act long limited the size of a homestead to 160 acres. Decade after decade this blundering policy was pursued. Not until 1909 was the Homestead Act amended so as to allow the settler to obtain 320 acres of non-irrigable land in certain States...

At the same time, while being excluded from soil which had been national property, the working and farming class were subjected to either neglect or onerous

[burdensome] laws. As a class, the capitalists had no difficulty at any time in securing whatever laws they needed. If persuasion by argument was not effective, bribery was. Moreover, over and above corrupt purchase of votes was the feeling ingrained in legislators by the concerted teachings of society, that the man of property should be looked up to. That he was superior to the common herd; that his interests were paramount and demanded nursing and protection. Whenever a commercial crisis occurred, the capitalists secured a ready hearing and their measures were passed promptly. But millions of workers would be in enforced idleness and destitution, and no move was made to throw open public lands to them, or appropriate money, or start public works. Such proposed policy was considered 'paternalism'—a catchword of the times implying [that] Governmental care should not be exercised for the unfortunate, the weak and the helpless."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.1

"And here was the anomaly of the so-called American democratic Government. It was [is] held legitimate and necessary that [Arab fronting] capital[ism] should be encouraged, but illegitimate to look out for the interests of the non-propertied. The capitalists were very few; the non-propertied, holding nominally the overwhelming voting power, were many. Government was nothing more or less than a device for the nascent capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs] to work out its inevitable purposes [feeding on the host society], yet the majority of the people, on whom the powers of class government severely fell, were constantly deluded in believing that Government represented them. Whether Federalist or anti-Federalist, Whig, Republican or Democratic party was in power, the capitalist class went forward victoriously and invincibly."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"If the whole might of Government was used in the aggrandizement and perpetuation of a propertied aristocracy, what was its specific attitude towards the working class? Of the powerful few, whether political or industrial, the conventional histories hand down grossly biased and distorted chronicles. The few are isolated from the multitude, and their importance magnified, while the millions of obscure are nowhere adequately described. Such sterile historians proceed upon the perfunctory plan, derived from ancient usage in the days when kingcraft was supremely exalted, that it is only the mighty few whose acts are of any consequence, and that the doings of the masses are of no account.

Hence it is that most histories are mere registers of names and dates dull or highly-colored hackneyed splurges of print giving no insight into actual conditions.

In this respect, most of the prevailing histories of the United States are the most egregious offenders. They fix the idea that this or that alleged statesman, this or that President or politician or set of politicians, have been the dominating factors in the decision and sway of public affairs. no greater error could be formulated. Behind the ostentatious and imposing public personages of the different periods, the arbiters of law and policies have been the men of property [fronting for the Mideast.] They it was who really ruled both the arena and the arcana of politics. [arena = displayed aspects and arcana = secret aspects.]

It was they, sometimes openly, but more usually covertly, who influenced and manipulated the entire sphere of

government. It was they who raised the issues which divided the people into contesting camps and which often beclouded and bemuddled the popular mind.

It was their maternal ideals and interests that were engrafted upon the fabric of society [the interpretive matrix] and made the prevailing standards of the day.

From the start the United States Government was what may be called a regime swayed by property.

The Revolution, as we have seen, was a movement by the native property interests to work out their own destiny without interference by the trading classes of Great Britain [fronting for the Arabs]. The Constitution of the United States, the various State Constitutions, and the laws, were, we have set forth, all reflexes of the interests, aims, castes and prejudices of the property owners [fronting for the Arabs], as opposed to the non-propertied. At first, the landholders and the shipping merchants were the dictators of laws. Then from these two classes and from the tradesmen sprang a third class, the bankers, who, after a continuous orgy of bribery, rose to a high pitch of power. At the same time, other classed of property owners were sharers in varying degrees in directing Government. One of these was the slaveholders of the South, desperately increasing their clutch on government administration the more their institutions were threatened. The factory owners were likewise participants. However bitterly some of these propertied interests might war upon one another for supremacy, there was never a time when the majority of the men who sat in Congress, the [state] legislatures or the judges did not represent, or respond to, either the interests or the ideals of one or more of these divisions of the propertied classes.

Finally, out of the landowners, slaveowners, bankers, shippers, factory masters and tradesmen a new class of great power developed. This was the railroad-owning class. From about the year 1845 to 1890, it was the most puissant [powerful, influential] government class in the United States, and only ceased being distinctly so when the industrial trusts became even mightier, and a time came when one trust alone, the Standard Oil Company, was able to possess itself of vast railroad systems. [In 1911 the US government broke Standard Oil into 34 parts and today it has grown back as Exxon]

These different components of the railroad-owning class had gathered in their money by either outright fraud or by the customary exploitive process of the times. We have noted how many of the landholders secured their estates at one time or another by bribery or by invidiously [anger inducing and unfairly] fraudulent transactions; and how the bankers, who originally were either tradesmen, factory owners or landowners, had obtained their charters and privileges by widespread bribery. A portion of the money thus acquired was often used in bribing Congress and legislatures for railroad charters, public funds, immense areas of land including forests and mines, and special laws of the most extraordinary character."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"The full tale of the rise and climax of industrial establishments [fronting for the Arabs]; how they subverted the functions of government to their own ends; stole inventions right and left and drove inventors to poverty and to the grave; defrauded the community of incredible amounts by evading taxation; oppressed their workers to a degree that in future times will read like the acts of a class out-savaging the savage; bribed without intermission; slaughtered legions of men, women and

children in the pursuit of profit; exploited the peoples of the globe remorselessly—all of this and more, constituting a weird chapter of horrors in the progress of the [harem-bred] race, are described in a later part of this work."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"The sonorous [high sounding] doctrines of the Declaration of Independence read well, but they were not meant to be applied to the worker. [Whenever you hear it argued that rights are only for land owners, or only for the upper class, or only for free people and not slaves, it is the Arabs trying to eliminate rights]....

[Restating:] The sonorous [high sounding] doctrines of the Declaration of Independence read well, but they were not meant to be applied to the worker. The independence so much vaunted [boasted about] was the independence of the [Arab fronting] capitalist to do as he pleased. Few, if any, restrictions were placed upon him. Such pseudo restrictions as were passed from time to time were not enforced. On the other hand, the severest laws were enacted against the worker. For a long time, it was a crime for him to go on a strike in this country. [There is only one instances of labor strike] of which there is any record—that of a number of sailors in New York City in 1803, for better wages—the leader was arrested, indicted and sent to prison. The formidable machinery of Government was employed by the ruling commercial and landed classes for a double purpose. On the one hand, they insisted that it should encourage [Arab-fronting] capital, which phrase translated into action meant that it should confer grants of land, immense loans of public funds without interest, virtual immunity from taxation, and extra-legal taxing power [from railroad shipping charges], sweeping privileges, protective laws and clearly defined statute rights [to whatever it was they owned].

At the same time, while enriching themselves in every direction by transferring, though the powers of Government, public resources to themselves, the capitalists [fronting for the Arabs] declared it to be a settled principle that Government should not be paternalistic. [The Arab fronting capitalists enriched themselves in every direction by seizing ownership of the public domain in America. They also declared it to be a settled principle that Government should not be paternalistic and care for the poor in any way as to reduce the desperation Ishtar always feeds on.] They asserted that it was not only not a proper governmental function to look out for the interests of the masses of workers, but they went even further.

With the precedents of the English laws as an example, they held that it devolved upon Government to keep the workers sternly within the bounds established by employers. In plain words, this meant that the capitalist was to be allowed to run his business as he desired. He could overwork his employees, pay them the lowest wages, and kill them off by forcing them to work under conditions in which the sacrifice of human life was held subordinate to the gathering of profits, or by forcing them to work or live in [occupational] disease-breeding places [like coal mines, asbestos mines, or malarial swamps]. The law, which was the distinct expression of the interests of the capitalist, upheld his right to do all this. Yet if the workers protested; if they sought to improve their condition by joining in that community of action called a strike, the same code of laws adjudged them criminals. At once, the whole power of law, with its police, military and judges, descended upon them, and either drove them back to their tasks or consigned them to prison.

The conditions under which the [Arab fronting] capitalists made their profits, and under which the workers had to toil, were very oppressive to the [Arab slave] workers. The hours of work at that period were from sunrise to sunset. Usually this rule, especially in the seasons of long days, required 12 and very often 14 and 16 hours a day... [This sounds like the way many Asians work today. The Arabs seem to have found new suckers to volunteer as slaves once we started balking or barking at their enslavement. Now we are the horrible Infidel, the great white satan to be slaughtered to the man so they Arabs may enslave the world better.]

...the so-called statesmen and the pretentious cultured and refined classes of the day, saw nothing wrong in this explanation. The reason was obvious. Their power, their elegant mansions, their silks and satins, their equipage and superior opportunities for enjoyment all were based upon the sweat and blood of these so-called free white men, women and children of the North... [These] toiled even harder than the chattel black slave of the south... [But they] did not received a fraction of the care and though bestowed, as a corollary of property, upon the black slave. Already the capitalist of the North had a slavery system in force far more effective than the chattel system of the South—a system the economic superiority of which was destined to overthrow that of black slavery."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"Most historians taking their cue from the intellectual subserviency demanded of them by the ruling propertied classes, delight in picturing those times as 'the good old times', when the capitalists were benevolent and amiable, and the workers lived in peace and plenty."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"History in the main [mostly], thus far, has been an institution for the propagation of lies. The truth is that for thousands of years back, since the private property system came into existence, an incessant, uncompromising warfare has been going on between oppressors and oppressed..."

In this struggle the propertied classes [of the Arab fronting establishment] had the great advantage from the start. Centuries of rulership had taught them that the control of Government was the crux of the mastery. By possession of Government they had the power of making laws; of the enforcement or non-enforcement of those laws; of the directorship of the police, army, navy, courts, jails, and prisons—all terrible instruments for suppressing any attempt at protest, peaceful or otherwise.

Notwithstanding this massing of power and force, the working class has at no time been passive or acquiescent. It has allowed itself to be duped. It has permitted its ranks to be divided by false issues. It has often been blind at critical times, and has made no concerted as yet to get intelligent possession of the great strategic point,—governmental power. Nevertheless, despite these mistakes, it has been in a state of constant rebellion; and the fact that it has been so, that its aspirations could not be squelched [forcefully silenced] by jails, prisons and cannon nor by destitution or starvation, furnishes the sublimest [most awesome] record in all the annals of mankind."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"By 1825 an agitation developed for a 10-hour workday. The politicians denounced the movement; the cultured classes frowned upon it; the newspapers alternately ridiculed and abused it;

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"The political trick of throwing out crumbs to the workers long proved successful. But it was supplemented by other methods. To draw the labor leaders away from a hostile stand to the established political parties [run by the Arabs], and to prevent the massing of workers in a [new and out of control] party of their own, the politicians began an insidious system of bribing these leaders to turn traitors. This was done by either appointing them to some minor political office or by giving them money. In many instances, the labor unions in the ensuing decades were grossly betrayed.

Finally, the politicians always had large sums of election funds contributed by merchants, bankers, landowners, railroad owners—by all parts of the capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs]. These funds were employed in corrupting the electorate and legislative bodies. Caucuses and primaries were packed, votes bought, ballot boxes stuffed and election returns falsified. It did not matter to the corporations [fronting for the Arabs] generally which of the old political parties was in power; some manufacturers or merchants might be swayed to one side or the other for the self-interest involved in the reenactment of the protective tariff or the establishment of free trade; but, as a rule, the corporations, as a matter of business, contributed money to both parties.

However these parties might differ on various issues, they both stood for the perpetuation of the existing social and industrial system based upon capitalist ownership. The tendency of the Republican party, founded in 1856, toward the abolition of Negro chattel slavery was in precise harmony with the aims and fundamental interests of the manufacturing capitalists of the North. The only peril that the capitalist class feared was the creation of a distinct, disciplined and determined workingmen's party. This they knew would if successful, seriously endanger and tend to sweep away the injustices and oppressions upon which they, the [Arab fronting] capitalists, subsisted. To avert this, every ruse and expedient was resorted to: derision, undermining, corruption, violence, imprisonment."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"The year 1884 about marked the zenith of the era of the capitalist seizing of the public domain. By that time the railroad and other corporations had possessed themselves of a large part of the area now bested in their ownership."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"It was about this time that the Senate of the United States was undergoing a transformation clearly showing how impatient the great capitalists were of operating Government through middlemen legislators. Previously, the manufacturing, railroad and banking interests had, on the whole, deemed it wise not to exercise this power directly but indirectly. The representatives sent to Congress were largely lawyers elected by their influence and money. The people at large did not know the secret process back of these legislators. The press,

advocating; as a whole, the interests of the capitalist class, constantly portrayed the legislators as great and patriotic statesmen.

But the magnates saw that the time had arrived when some empty democratic forms of Government could be waived aside, and the power exercised openly and directly by them. Presently we find such men as Leland Stanford, of the Pacific railroad quintet, and one of the arch bribers and thieves of the time, entering the United States Senate after debauching the California legislature; George Hearst, a mining magnate, and others of that class.

More and more this assumption of direct power increased, until it was reckoned that there were at least 80 millionaires in Congress. Many of them were multimillionaires controlling, or representing corporations having a controlling share in the vast industries, transportation and banking systems. The popular jest as to the United States Senate being a 'millionaires club' became antiquated; much more appropriately it could have been termed a 'multi-millionaires club'.

So notorious was this condition and so obnoxious to public sentiment that attention was increasingly directed to a remedy. There ensued a widespread agitation reflected in many newspaper and magazine article demanding that a stop be put to the practice of magnates manipulating or buying their way into the highest legislative body in the country. [State] legislatures began electing men of a different caliber. [At the time US Senators were elected by the states.] Influenced by public opinion, Congress, in 1912, proposed to the Legislatures of the various States an Amendment to the Constitution providing that United States Senators be elected by direct popular vote. This Amendment—the 17th—was immediately adopted by 37 of 48 states, and went into effect on May 31, 1913. The consequence was a notable change in the general composition of the United States Senate. As the terms of [the Arab-fronting] millionaire members expired, their places were filled by men responsive to public opinion and interest. In fact, of the two branches of Congress, the [narrower] United States Senate became the more militant and restive against corporate methods and [Arab] greed. Some of the most searching investigations, some of the severest denunciations, and some of the most radical measures have come from that body."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

[The following is the Arabs talking about their frontman capitalists like J.P Morgan, and John D. Rockefeller, founder of Standard Oil, which today is Exxon.

"the interests of the [Arab-fronting] capitalists from the start were acutely antagonistic to those of the workers and of the people in general from whom their profits came"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

" 'One of the greatest sources of social unrest and bitterness', stated the Final Report of the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations, in 1916, 'has been the attitude of the police toward public speaking. On numerous occasions in every part of the country the police of cities and towns have, either arbitrarily, or under cloak of a traffic ordinance interfered with or prohibited public speaking. [This was] both in the open and in halls, by persons connected with organizations of which the police or those from whom they receive their order did not approve. In many instances such interference has been carried out with a degree of brutality which would be incredible if it were not

vouched for by reliable witnesses. Bloody riots frequently have accompanied such interference, and large numbers of persons have been arrested for acts of which they were innocent, or which were committed under the extreme provocation of brutal treatment of police or private citizens'.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"It would be superfluous to give the long list of strikes in which ruffians called strike breakers were brought in to take the place of strikers, and then upon the pretext that strikers were using violence, the police and sheriffs would be ordered to overawe the strikers and the militia directed to do the same.

The conditions prevailing for a long time were graphically set forth in 1916 in that Final Report of the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations. 'It may be said', declared the report, 'that every governmental institution and function has been at some time utilized by the stronger industrial factor (the industrial corporations) for the oppression and suppression of the weaker (the workers) but those which are most commonly utilized are, first, the police, including not only the municipal police, the sheriffs and the deputies, the State police and constabulary and the militia, but the private guards, detectives, and vigilante organizations, which usurp and exercise the functions of the police.' The report stated that 'the biased action of the State and municipal police seldom extends beyond the making of unwarranted arrests, the enforcement of unreasonable rules regarding such matters as picketing and public assemblage, and the use of excessive brutality'.

It was the other kinds of force, the report pointed out, which were more openly and ruthlessly used to crush strikes. 'The sheriffs in many counties deputize guards in the employment and pay of corporations, without any qualifications and sometimes without even knowing their names. Similarly, the militia are at times recruited from the guards and other employees of corporations. The private guards, detectives and vigilantes can have no other purpose in connection with a strike than to break it with such means as they can command'. The report told of corporation-controlled courts which issued blanket injunctions decreeing illegal acts which otherwise would be legal."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"The conditions of the farming population, along with that of the working class, steadily grew worse. In the hope of improving their condition large numbers migrated from the Eastern States, and a constant influx of agriculturists poured in from Europe.

A comparatively few of the the whole were able to get land direct from the Government. Naturally the course of this extensive migration followed the path of transportation, that is to say, of the railroads [which was run by the Arabs]. This was exactly what the railroad corporations [fronting for the Arabs] had anticipated. As a rule the migrating farmers found the railroads or cattlemen already in possession of many of the best lands...

Prospective farmers had to pay the railroads [fronting for the Arabs] exorbitant prices for land. Very often they had not sufficient funds; a mortgage or two would be signed; and if the farmer had a bad season or two, and could no longer pay the interest, foreclosure would result. But whether crops were good or bad, the American farmer constantly had to compete in the grain markets of the world with the cheap [Arab-enslaved] labor of India and Russia. And inexorably, East or West, North

or South, he was caught between a double fire.

On the one hand, in order to compete with the immense capitalist farms [latifundia] gradually developing, he had to give up primitive implements and buy the most improved agricultural machines. For these he was charged five and six times the sum it cost the manufacturers to make and market them. [Just like in Rome and in the California gold rush.] Usually if he could not pay for them outright, the manufacturers took out a mortgage on his farm. Large numbers of these mortgages were foreclosed [and the Arab parasite race enriched and the subject races impoverished.]

In addition, the time had passed when the farmer made his own clothes and many other articles. For everything that he bought he had to pay excessive prices. He, even more than the industrial working classes, had to pay an enormous manufacturer's profit, and additionally the high freight railroad rate.

On the other hand, the great capitalist agencies directly dealing with the crops—the packing houses, the gambling cotton and produce exchanges—actually owned, by a series of manipulations, a large proportion of this crops before they were out of the ground. These crops were [then] sold [by the Arab fronting buyers] to the working class at exorbitant prices. The small farmer labored incessantly, only to find himself getting poorer. It served political purpose well to describe glowingly the farmer's prosperity; but the greater crops he raised, the greater the profit to the railroad companies and to various other divisions of the capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs]. His was the labor and worry, they gathered in the financial harvest.

... thus the produce of the farmer's labor was virtually confiscated by the different capitalist combinations, the farmers of many States, particularly of the rich agricultural States of the West, were unable to stand up against the encroachments, power, and the fraudulent methods of the great capitalist landowners."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"The land frauds in the State of California will serve as an example. Acting under the authority of various measures passed by Congress—measures which have been described—land grabbers succeeded in obtaining possession of an immense area in that State. Perjury, fraudulent surveys and entries, collusion with Government officials—these were a few of the many methods.

Jose Limantour, by an alleged grant from a Mexican Governor, and collusion with officials, almost succeeded in stealing more than have a million acres. Henry Miller, who came to the United States as an immigrant in 1850, was owners of 14.5-million acres of the richest land in California and Oregon. It embraced more than 22,500 square miles, a territory three times as large as New Jersey. The stupendous land frauds in all of the Western and Pacific States by which capitalists obtained 'an empire of land, timber and mines' are amply described in numerous documents of the period."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"Of the numerous reports of committees of the California Legislature, we will here simply quote one—that of the Swamp Land Investigating Committee of the California Assembly of 1873. Dealing with the fraudulent methods by which huge areas of the finest lands in California were obtained for practically nothing as 'swamp' lands, this committee reported,

citing from what it termed a 'mighty mass of evidence', 'That through the connivance of parties, surveyors were appointed who segregated lands as 'swamp, which were not so in fact. The corruption existing in the land department of the General Government has aided this system of fraud'. "

[Perhaps they actually were swamp lands. Perhaps the Arabs scoped up most of California's 'Swamp' lands.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"Two specific laws directly contributed to the effectiveness of this spoliation. One act, passed by Congress on May 30, 1862, authorized surveys to be made at the expense [and under the control] of settlers in the townships that those settlers desired surveyed. Another act, called the Deposit Act, passed in 1871, provided that the amounts deposited by settlers should be partly applied in payment for the lands thus surveyed. Together, these two laws made the grasping of land on an extensive scale a simple process. The 'settler' (which so often meant, in reality, the [Arab fronting] capitalist) could secure the collusion of the Land Office, and have fraudulent surveys made. Under these surveys he could lay claim to immense tracts of the most valuable land and have them reported as 'swamp' or 'desert' lands; he could have the boundaries of the original claims vastly enlarged; and the fact that part of his disbursements for surveying was considered as a payment for those lands, stood in law as virtually a confirmation of his claim."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

" 'Wealthy speculators and powerful syndicates', reported Commissioner Sparks, 'covet the public domain, and a survey is the first step in the accomplishment of this desire. The bulk of deposit surveys have been made in timber districts and grazing regions, and the surveyed lands have immediately been entered under the timber land, preemption, commuted homestead, timber-culture and desert-land acts. So thoroughly organized has been the entire system of procuring the survey and making illegal entry of lands, that agents and attorneys engaged in this business have been advised of every official proceeding, and enabled to present entry applications for the lands at the very moment of the filing of the plots of survey in the local land offices.

Prospectors employed by lumber firms and corporations seek out and report the most valuable timber tracts in California, Oregon, Washington Territory or elsewhere. [Then] settler's applications are manufactured as a basis for survey. Contracts are entered into and pushed through the General Land Office in hot haste; a skeleton survey is made. . . entry papers, made perfect in form by competent attorneys, are filed in bulk, and the manipulators enter into possession of the land. . . This had been the course of proceeding heretofore.'

Commissioner Sparks described a case of where it was discovered by his special agents in California that an English firm had obtained 100,000 acres of the choicest red-wood lands in that State. These lands were then estimated to be worth \$100 an acre. The cost of procuring surveys and fraudulent entries did not probably exceed \$3 an acre.

'In the same manner', Commissioner Sparks continued, 'extensive coal deposits in our Western territory are acquired in mass through expedited surveys, followed by fraudulent pre-emption and commuted homestead entries'. He went on to tell that nearly the whole of the Territory (now State) of Wyoming, and large portions of Montana, had been

surveyed under the deposit system, and the lands on the streams fraudulently taken up under the desert lands act, to the exclusion of actual settlers. Nearly all of Colorado, the very best cattle-raising portions of New Mexico, the rich timber lands of California, the splendid forest lands of Washington Territory and the principal part of the extensive pine lands of Minnesota had been fraudulently seized in the same way. In all of the Western States and Territories these fraudulent surveys had accomplished the seizure of the best and most valuable lands. 'To enable the pressing tide of Western immigration, to secure homes upon the public domain' Commissioner Sparks urged, 'it is necessary. . . that hundreds of millions of acres of public lands now appropriated should be wrested from illegal control'. But nothing was done to recover these stolen lands. At the very time Commissioner Sparks— one of the very few incorruptible Commissioners of Public Lands,— was writing this, this land-grabbing interests were making the greatest exertions to get him removed. During his tenure of office, they caused him to be malevolently harassed and assailed. After he left office, they resumed complete domination of the Land Commissioner's Bureau."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

" 'The widespread belief of the people of this country', wrote Commissioner Sparks in 1885, [is] 'that the land department has been largely conducted to the advantage of speculation and monopoly, private and corporate, rather than in the public interest... I am satisfied that thousands of claims without foundation in law or equity, involving millions of acres of public land, have been annually passed ~~to patent~~ [into private ownership] upon the single proposition that nobody but the Government [cared or] had any adverse interest. The vast machinery of the land department has been devoted to the chief result of conveying the title of the United States to [in] public lands upon fraudulent entries under loose construction of law.'

Whenever a capitalist's interests were involved, the law was always 'loosely construed', but the strictest interpretation was invariably given to laws passed against the working population."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"A long list of alleged Mexican and Spanish grants within the limits of the Texas cession have been confirmed, or quit claimed by Congress, under the false representation that said alleged grants were located in the territory of New Mexico ceded by the treaty; and enormous area of land has long been and is now held as confirmed by the treaty when such is not the fact."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"In Texas, the fraudulent, and often, violent methods of the seizure of land by the capitalists were ~~fully as marked~~ [just as evident] as those used elsewhere. Upon its admittance to the Union, Texas retained the disposition [character] of its public lands. Up to about the year 1864, almost the entire area of Texas, comprising 274,356 square miles or 175.6-million acres, was one vast unfenced feeding ground for cattle, horses and sheep. In about the year 1874, the agricultural movement began. Large numbers of intending farmers migrated to Texas, particularly with the expectation of raising cattle, then a highly profitable business. They found huge stretches of the land

already preempted [pre-purchased, bought up] by individual capitalists or corporations [fronting for the Arabs]. In a number of instances, some of these individuals, according to the report of a Congressional Committee, in 1884, dealing with Texas lands, had each acquired the ownership of more than 250,000 acres [390 square miles].

'It is a notorious fact', this committee reported, 'that the public land laws, although framed with the special object [objective] of encouraging the public domain, of developing its resources and protecting actual settlers, have been extensively evaded and violated. Individuals and corporations have by purchasing the proved-up claims, or purchases of ostensible settlers employed by them to make entry, [have] extensively secured the ownership of large bodies of land.' The committee went on to describe how, to a very considerable extent, 'foreigners of large means' had obtained these great areas, and had gone into the cattle business, and how the titles to these lands were secured not only by individuals but by foreign corporations. 'Certain of these foreigners are titled noblemen. Some of them have brought over from Europe, in considerable numbers, herdsman and other employees who sustain to them a dependent relationship characteristic of the peasantry on the large landed estates of Europe. Two British syndicates, for instance, held 7.5-million acres [11,700 square miles] in Texas.'

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"This spoliation [spoiling, plundering] of the public domain was one of the chief grievances of the National Greenback-Labor party in 1880. This party, to a great extent, was composed of the Western farming element. In his letter accepting the nomination of that party for President of the United States, Gen. Weaver, himself a member of long standing in Congress from Iowa, wrote: 'An area of our public domain larger than the territory occupied by the great German Empire has been wantonly donated to wealthy corporations; while a bill introduced by Hon. Hendrick B. Wright, of Pennsylvania, to enable our poor people to reach and occupy the few acres remaining, has been scouted [scorned], ridiculed, and defeated in Congress. In consequence of this stupendous system of land-grabbing, millions of the young men of America, and millions more of the industrious people from abroad, seeking homes in the New World, are left homeless and destitute. The public domain must be sacredly reserved to actual settlers, and where corporations have not complied strictly with the terms of their grants, the lands should be at once returned.'

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"The original area of public domain amounted to 1.8-billion acres, of which considerably more than half, embracing some of the very best agricultural, grazing, mineral and timber lands, was already alienated [by the al'i'uns, the aliens, by ali baba = the bros] by the year 1880. By 1896, the alienation reached 806-million acres. Of the original area, about 50-million acres of forest were withdrawn from the public domain by the Government, and converted into forest reservations. Large portions of such of the agricultural, grazing, mineral and timber lands as were not seized by various corporations and favored individuals before 1880, were expropriated west of the Mississippi after that time. The nominal records of the General Land Office as to the number of homesteaders were of little value, and were very misleading. Immense number of alleged homesteaders were, as we have copiously seen, nothing but

paid dummies by whose entries vast tracts of land were seized under color of law."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.2

"Attempts to foreclose mortgages [foreigner English] during the depression after 1930 caused agitations, and in several States local protests or uprisings of farmers. To afford relief, Congress enacted a Farm Mortgage Moratorium law, but, in 1935 this was declared unconstitutional by the [corrupt appointees of] the Supreme Court of the United States." [Maybe the dust bowl was mostly not real. Maybe it was just an excuse for high food prices in a depression.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"A report submitted in February 1931, to the House of Representatives by its committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce listed the Vanderbilts as one of 15 major groups which controlled 210,000 miles, or nearly 85% of the railway mileage in America. The report showed that the Vanderbilt family was perhaps the largest holder of railway stocks, having 589,000 shares of common and preferred stocks in five important railways. But inasmuch as this report dealt wholly with voting power control, it did not include the amounts in bonds also owned.

Four members of the Vanderbilt family, in 1936, held a total of 76 directorships in a variety of railroad corporations, a number of which were tributaries to a main system. The present Vanderbilt power in other fields was also shown by the fact that one of the Vanderbilts was a director of powerful New York City banks—the Chase National and the Central Hanover Bank & Trust Company; another Vanderbilt was a director of the First National Bank of the same city, and the Pullman Company; a third was on the directorship of the Western Union Telegraph Company. In addition, all four Vanderbilts were directors of an assortment of other corporations...

[Next we see the objectives and mindset of our Arab slave-masters] Behold...this mass of stocks and bonds... dead, inorganic things. A second's blaze will consume any one of them... Yet under the... law... these pieces of paper are endowed with a terrible power... that even enthroned kings do not possess. Those dainty prints [fine print] with their scrolls and numerals and inscriptions are binding titles to the absolute ownership of a large part of the resources created by the labors of entire peoples.

Kingly power at best is shadowy, indefinite, depending mostly upon traditional custom and audacious assumption backed by armed force. If it fall [falls] back upon a certain alleged divine right, it cannot produce documents to prove its authority. The industrial monarchs of the United States are fortified with both power and proofs [proof] of possession. Those bonds and stocks are the tangible titles to tangible property; whoso holds them is vested with the ownership of the necessities of tens of millions of subjected people.

Great stretches of railroad traverse the country. Here are coal mines to whose products some 90-million people look [to] for warmth. Yonder [over there] are factories; [and] there in the cities are street car lines and electric light and power supply and gas plants. On every hand [everywhere] are lands and forests and waterways—all owned, you [will] find, by this or that [uber-rich] dominant man or family [fronting for the treacherous Arabs from the land of no resources].

[Now the author talks about the advantages of this new matrix for enslaving an entire race.] The mind wanders

back in amazement to the times when, if a king conquered territory, he had to erect a fortress or castle and station a garrison to hold it. They that then disputed the king's title could challenge, if they chose, at peril of death, the provisions of that title, which same provisions were swords and spears, arrows and muskets.

But nowhere throughout the large extent of the Vanderbilt's possession or those of other ruling families are found warlike garrisons as evidence of ownership. Those uncouth barbarian methods are grossly antiquated. The part once played by armed battalions is now performed by bits of paper. A wondrously convenient change has it been. The owners of the resources of nations can disport themselves [vacation] thousands of miles away from the scene of their ownership; they need never bestir [exert] themselves to provide measures for the retention [protection] of their property. [Now the Arab author talks about how much, and why they enjoy the laws they created in the house of the host.] Government, with its array of officials, prisons, armies and navies, undertakes all of this protection for them. So long as they hold these bits of paper in their name, Government recognizes them as the incontestable owners and safeguards of their property accordingly."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"Millions have gone hungry or lived on an attenuated [thin, slender, diminished] diet while elsewhere harvests rotted in the ground. Between their needs and nature's fertility lay the railroads [run by the Arabs]. Organized and maintained for [Arab] profit and for [Arab] profit alone, the railroads carried produce and products at their fixed rates and not a whit [bit] less. if these [exorbitant] rates were not paid, the transportation was refused. And as transportation is necessary in the world's intercourse [trade], the men who controlled it had the power to stand as an inflexible barrier [great wall of China/Rome] between individuals, groups of individuals, nations, and international peoples.

The very agencies which, under a rational form of civilization, should have [been] devoted to promoting the interests of mankind, were used as their capricious self-interest incline[d] them by the few who were allowed to obtain control of them. [Translation: under a rational form of government, the infrastructure systems should have been devoted to promoting the common interests of the people. Instead, a few men were allowed to obtain control of these systems. These men then used these systems as their whims and self-interest lead them.] What if helpless people were swept off by starvation or by diseases superinduced [induced from above, like an epi•demic] by lack of proper food? What if in the great cities an increasing sacrifice of innocents [child mortality] went on because their parents could not afford the price of good milk—a price determined to a large extent by railroad tariff? All of this slaughter and more made no impress upon the unimpressible surfaces of these stocks and bonds, and left no record save [except] in the hospitals and graveyards.

The railroad magnates had other powers. Government itself has no power to blot a town out of existence. It cannot strew desolation at will. But the railroad owners could do it and did not hesitate if sufficient profits be involved. Once man sitting in a palace in New York could give an order declaring a secret discriminative tariff against the products of a place, whereupon its industries, no longer able to compete with formidable competitors enjoying better rates, closed down and the life of the place flickered and sometimes went out."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"The men controlling railways were long sure that they had a perpetual monopoly of transportation. They... did not realize that a new kind of transportation was already making serious inroads into their domain. Unconscious of this new factor or unable to devise ways of meeting it, they clung to obsolete equipment and insisted upon high fares. But the time came when they had to awake to reality. Chiefly because of the widespread use of the [oil-guzzling] automobile and the incoming of motor busses traversing the entire country, railroad traffic and revenues fell sharply. It was this stark fact, more perhaps than any power of law, which influenced various railway executives to turn to lower fares and the installing of better and speedier service in an effort to regain lost business.

A report submitted in June 1936, by Joseph B. Eastman, Federal Coordinator of Transportation, declared that 'the whole railroad attitude toward the passenger service has changed'. He expressed his belief that by reduced fares, [and] the operation of lighter and faster trains, the use of motor busses and trucks and a general policy of..."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"Vanderbilt was a rugged, headstrong, untamable, illiterate youth. At 12-years of age, he could scarcely write his own name. But he knew the ways of the water. When still a youth he commenced ferrying passengers and freight between Staten Island and New York City. For books he cared nothing; the refinements of life he scorned. His one passion was money. He was grasping and enterprising, coarse and domineering. Of the real details of his early life, little is known except what has been written by laudatory writers." [In other words, Vanderbilt was just an illiterate schmuck ornament, a dotard = d'ot•ard = of'ear•man.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"Vanderbilt's success arose from his destructive tactics toward his competitors... He leisurely allowed other men to build up profitable lines of steamboats, and he then proceeded to carry out methods which inevitably had one of two terminations. Either his competitor had to buy him off at an exorbitant price, or he was left in undisputed possession. [typical Arab tactics]...

His foible [weakness, feebleness] was 'opposition'; wherever his keen eye [singular, like the single minded agenda of Arabs Inc.] detected a line that was making a very large profit on its investment, he swooped down on it and drove it to the wall by offering a better service and lower rates... [predatory pricing to drive the competition out of business.]

Far from being the 'constructive genius' that he is represented in every extant [surviving] biographical work and note, Vanderbilt was the foremost mercantile pirate and commercial blackmailer of his day."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"Business men did not consider it at all dishonorable to oppress their workers; to manufacture and sell goods under false pretenses; to adulterate prepared foods and drugs; to demand the very highest prices for products upon which the very life of the people depended, and at a time when consumers needed them most; to bribe public officials and to hold up the Government in plundering schemes. These and

many other practices were looked upon as commonplaces of ordinary trade."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"How did Vanderbilt manage to extort millions of dollars? The method was one of great simplicity. Many of its features were brought out in the United States Senate in the debate of June 9, 1858, over the Mail Steamship bill. The Government had begun, more than a decade back, the policy of paying heavy subsidies to steamship companies for the transportation of mail. This subsidy, however, was not the only payment received by the steamship owners. In addition, they were allowed what were called 'postages'— the full returns from the amount of postage on the letters carried. Ocean postage at that time was enormous and burdensome, and was especially onerous [burdensome] upon a class of persons least able to bear it. About 3/4 of the letters transported by ship were written by emigrants [immigrants]. They were taxed the usual rate of 24 or 29 cents for a single letter. In 1851, the amount received for trans-Atlantic postages [postage] was not less than a million dollars; 3/4 of this sum came directly from the working class.

To get these subsidies, in conjunction with the 'postages', the steamship owners by one means or another corrupted postal officials and members of Congress. 'I have noticed', said Senator Toombs, in a speech in the United States Senate on June 9, 1858, 'that there has never been a head of the Department strong enough to resist steamship contracts. I have noticed them here with [both] your Whig party and your Democratic party for the last 13-years, and I have never seen any head of a Department strong enough to resist these influences. . . 13-years' experience has taught me that wherever you allow the Post office or Navy Department to do anything which is for the benefit of contractors, you may consider the thing as done. I could point to more than a dozen of these contracts. . . . A million dollars a year is a power that will be felt. For ten years, it amounts to ten million dollars, and I know it is felt. I know its perverts legislation. I have seen its influence; I have seen the public treasury plundered by it'

By means of this systematic corruption, the steamship owners received many million of dollars of Government funds. This was all virtually plunder; the returns from the 'postages' far more than paid them for the transportation of mails. And what became of these millions in loot? Part went in profits to the owners, and another part was used as private capital by them to build more and newer ships constantly. Practically none of Vanderbilt's ships [really Arab ships] cost him a cent; the Government funds paid for their building. In fact, a careful tracing of the history of all of the subsidized steamship companies proves that this plunder from the Government was very considerably more than enough to build and equip their entire lines." [Such things as the people pay for, generally belong to the people and nobody else.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"In the course of this debate some remarkable facts came out as to how the Government was being steadily plundered, and why it was that the postal system was already burdened with a deficit of \$5-million."

[The Arabs hate our postal system as they hate all competition in transportation and commerce. They endlessly struggle against our postal system, making it inefficient, costly, and unreliable.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"Almost the entire Senate was occupied for days with advocating this or that side as if they were paid attorneys pleading for the interests of either Collins or Vanderbilt."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"He is the kingfish that is robbing these small plunderers"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"The Mail steamer appropriation bill, as finally passed by Congress, allowed large subsidies to all of the steamship interests. The pretended warfare among them had served its purpose; all got what they sought in subsidy funds." [Thus we see how all of the steamship were colluding = co·loo·de·ing.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.3

"He [Vanderbilt] was at this time 69-years old, a tall, robust vigorous man with a stern face of remarkable vulgar strength.

[1] The illiteracy of his youth survived; he could not write the simplest words correctly, and his speech was a brusque medley of slang, jargon, dialect and profanity. It was said of him that he could swear more forcibly, variously and frequently than any other man of his generation. Like the Astors, he was cynical, distrustful, secretive, and parsimonious [stingy]. [2] He kept his plans entirely to himself. [3] In his business dealings he never was known to have shown the slightest mercy. he demanded the last cent due."

[1. Illiterate people simply sign what their advisors tell them to sign. In other words, Vanderbilt would sign what his trusted Arab helpers told him to sign, just like so many other poorly spoken and illiterate 'Alexic' Arab front-man leaders.

2. This is a tip to future bros. Keep your plans and your tactics to yourself.

3. The saying "Al·A the merciful" is doublespeak. The A, the acme is anything but merciful, except to its obedient slaves.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

"With the outbreak of the Civil War, and the scouring of the seas by privateers [war pirates], American ship owners found themselves with an assortment of superfluous vessels on their hands. Forced to withdraw from maritime commerce, they looked about for two openings. [they were looking around for two things] One was how to dispose of their vessels, the other the seeking of a new and safe method of making millions.

Most of their vessels were of such scandalous construction that foreign capitalists would not buy them at any price. Hastily built in the brief period of 90-days, wholly with a view to immediate profit and with but a perfunctory regard for efficiency, many of these steamers were in a dangerous condition. That they survived voyages was perhaps due more to luck than anything else; year after year, vessel after vessel similarly built and owned had gone down to the bottom of the ocean. Collins had lost many of his ships; so had other steamboat companies. The chronicles of sea travel were a long, gruesome [gruesome] succession of tragedies; every little while accounts would come in of ships sunk or mysteriously missing. Thousands of immigrants, inhumanly crowded in the enclosures of the steerage, where swept to death without even a fighting chance for life. Cabin passengers fared better; they [at least] were given the

opportunity of taking the the life-boats in cases where there was sufficient warning, time and room. At best, sea travel is a hazard; the finest of ships are liable to meet with disaster. But over much of this sacrifice of life hung grim, ugly charges of mismanagement and corruption, of insufficient crews and incompetent officers; of defective machinery and rotting timber; of lack of proper inspection and safeguards.

The steamboat and steamship owners were not long lost in perplexity. Since they could no longer use their ships or make profit on ocean routes, why not palm off their vessels upon the Government? A highly favorable time it was; the Government, under the imperative necessity of at once raising and transporting a huge army, needed vessels badly. As for the other question momentarily agitating the capitalists as to what new line of activity they could substitute for their own extinguished business, Vanderbilt soon showed how railroads could be made to yield a far greater fortune than commerce.

The titanic conflict opening between the North and the South found the Federal Government wholly unprepared. True, in granting the mail subsidies which established the ocean steamship companies, and which actually furnished the capital for many of them, Congress had inserted some fine provisions that these subsidized ships should be built as to be "war steamers of the first class", available in time of war. But these provisions were mere vapor. Just as the Harris and Sloo lines had obtained annual mail subsidy payments of \$900,000 and had caused Government to accept their inferior vessels, so the Collins line had done the same. The report of a board of naval experts submitted to the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives had showed that the Collins steamers had not been built according to contract; that they would crumble to pieces under the fire of their own batteries, and that a single hostile gun would blow them to splinters. Yet they had been accepted by the Navy Department."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

"In times of peace the commercial interests had practiced the grossest frauds in corruptly imposing upon the Government every form of shoddy supplies. These were the same interests so vociferously proclaiming their intense patriotism. The Civil War put their pretensions of patriotism to the test. If ever a war took place in which Government and people had to strain every nerve and resource to carry on a great conflict it was the Civil War. The result of the war was only to exchange chattel slavery for the more extensive system of economic slavery. But the people of that time did not see this clearly. The Northern soldiers thought they were fighting for the noblest of all causes, and the mass of people behind them were ready to make every sacrifice to win a momentous struggle, the direct issue of which was the overthrow or retention of black slavery.

How did the capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs] act toward the Government, or rather, let us say toward the army and the navy so heroically pouring out their blood in battles, and hazarding life in camps, hospitals, stockades and military prisons?

The capitalists [fronting for the Arabs] abundantly proved their devout patriotism by making tremendous fortunes from the necessities of that great crisis. They unloaded upon the Government at 10-times the cost of manufacture quantities of munitions of war—munitions so frequently worthless that they often had to be thrown away after their purchase. They supplied shoddy uniforms and blankets and wretched shoes; food of so deleterious a quality that it was a fertile cause of epidemics of fevers and of numberless deaths; they

impressed, by force of corruption, worn-out, disintegrating hulks [boats] into service as army and naval transports. Not a single possibility of profit was there in which the most glaring frauds were not committed...

The Federal armies not only had to fight an open foe in a desperately contested war, but they were at the time the helpless targets for the profit-mongers of their own section who insidiously slew great numbers of them—not, it is true, out of deliberate lust for murder, but because the craze for profits crushed every instinct of honor and humanity, and rendered them callous to the appalling consequences. The battlefields were not more deadly than the supplies furnished by capitalist contractors. These capitalists passed, and were hailed, as eminent merchants, manufacturers and bankers. They were mighty in the marts and in politics; and their praise as 'enterprising' and 'self-made' and 'patriotic' men was lavishly diffused.

It was the period of periods when there was a kind of adoration of the capitalist taught in press, college and pulpit, Nothing is so effective as was remarked of old, to divert attention from scoundrelism as to make a brilliant show of patriotism. In the very act of looting Government and people and devastating the army and navy, the capitalists did the most ghastly business under the mask of the purest patriotism. Incredible as it may seem, this pretension was invoked and had been successfully maintained to this very day. You can scarcely pick up a volume on the Civil War, or a biography of the statesmen or rich men of the era, without wading in fulsome accounts of the untiring patriotism of the capitalists.

But, while lustily indulging in patriotic palaver [talk], the propertied classes took excellent care that their own bodies should not be imperiled. Inspired by enthusiasm or principle, a great array of the working class, including the farming and the professional elements, volunteered for military service. It was not long before they experienced the disappointment and demoralization of camp life. The letters written by many of these soldiers show that they did not falter [hesitate, lapse] at active campaigning. The prospect, however, of remaining in camp with insufficient rations, and (to use a modern expressive word) graft on every hand, completely disheartened and disgusted many of them. Many having influence with members of Congress, contrived to get discharges; others lacking this influence deserted. To fill the constantly diminishing ranks caused by deaths, resignations and desertions, it became necessary to pass a conscription act.

With few exceptions, the propertied classes of the North loved comfort and power too well to look tranquilly upon any move to force them to enlist. Once more, the Government revealed that it was but a register of the interests of the ruling classes. The Draft Act was so amended that it allowed men of property to escape being conscripted into the army by permitting them to buy substitutes. The poor man who could not raise the necessary amount had to submit to the consequences of the draft. With a few of the many dollars wrung, filched or plundered in some way or other, the capitalists could purchase immunity from military service.

As one of the foremost capitalists of the time, Cornelius Vanderbilt has been [was, foreigner English] constantly exhibited [in the media] as a great and shining patriot. Precisely in the same way as Croffut [a biographer] makes no mention of Vanderbilt's share in the mail subsidy frauds, but, on the contrary, ascribes to Vanderbilt the most splendid patriotism in his mail carrying operations, so do Croffut and other writers unctuously dilate upon [flatteringly write at length about] the old magnate's patriotic service during

the Civil War. Such is the sort of romancing that long gone unquestioned, although the genuine facts have been within reach. These facts show that Vanderbilt was continuing during the Civil War the prodigious frauds he had long been carrying on.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

When Lincoln's administration decided in 1862 to send a large military and naval force to New Orleans under General Banks, one of the first considerations was to get in haste the required number of ships to be used as transports. To whom did the Government turn in this exigency [urgent need]? To the very merchant class [fronting for the Arabs] which, since the foundation of the United States, had continuously defrauded the public treasury. The owners of the ships had been eagerly awaiting a chance to sell or lease them to the Government at exorbitant prices. And to whom was the business of buying, equipping and supervising them intrusted [SIC entrusted]? To none other than Cornelius Vanderbilt.

Every public man had opportunities for knowing that Vanderbilt had pocketed millions of dollars in his fraudulent hold-up arrangement with various mail subsidy lines. He was well known to be mercenary [primarily concerned with making money at the expense of ethics] and unscrupulous [unbothered with morality]. Yet he was selected by Secretary of War Stanton to act as the agent for the Government...

The outfitting of the Banks expedition was of such a rank [completely bad] character that it provoked a grave public scandal. If the matter had been simply one of swindling the United States Treasury out of millions of dollars, it might have been passed over by Congress. On all sides gigantic frauds were being committed by the capitalists. But in this particular case, the protests of the thousands of soldiers on board the transports were too numerous and effective to be silenced or ignored. These soldiers were not regulars [regular soldiers] without influence or connections. They were volunteers who everywhere had relatives and friends to demand an inquiry. Their complaints of overcrowding and of insecure, broken-down ships poured in, and aroused the whole country. A great stir resulted. Congress appointed an investigating committee.

The testimony was extremely illuminative. It showed that in buying the vessels Vanderbilt had employed one T. J. Southard [south•ard] ... Vanderbilt... refused to charter any vessels unless the business were transacted through Southard, who demanded a share of the purchase money before he would consent to do business. Any ship owner who wanted to get rid of a superannuated [old and obsolete] steamer or sailing vessel found no difficulty if he acceded [agreed] to Southard's terms.

The vessels accepted by Vanderbilt, and contracted to be paid for at high prices, were in shockingly bad condition. Vanderbilt was one of the few men in the secret of the destination of Banks' expedition. He knew that the ships had to make an ocean trip. Yet he bought for \$10,000 the Niagara, an old boat that had been built nearly a score of years before for trade on Lake Ontario...

On some of the vessels chartered by Vanderbilt, vessels that under the immigration act would not have been allowed to carry more than 300 passengers, not less than 950 soldiers were packed. Most of the vessels were antiquated and inadequate; not a few were badly decayed. With a little superficial patching up they were imposed upon the Government. Despite his knowing that only vessels adapted for ocean service were needed, Vanderbilt chartered craft that had

hitherto been almost entirely used in navigating inland waters. [This sounds familiar, like the Mongol attack on Japan in 1281 that did not fare so well] Not a single precaution was taken by him or his associates to safeguard the lives of the soldiers [because they wanted to kill them] ...

If the expeditions had encountered a severe storm at Cape Hatteras, for instance, it is probably that most of the vessels would have been wrecked. Luckily the voyage [weather] was fair."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

[in a footnote] "This regiment is armed with rifle muskets, marked on the barrel, 'P.S. Justice, Philadelphia' [a matrix name], and very in calibre from .65 to .70. I find many of them unserviceable and irreparable, from the fact that the principle parts are defective. many of them are made up of parts of muskets to which the stamp of condemnation had been affixed by an inspecting officer. none of the stocks have ever been approved by an officer, nor do they bear the initials of any inspector. They are made up of soft, unseasoned wood, and are defective in construction... the sights are merely soldered on to the barrel and come off with the gentlest handling... The bayonets are made up of soft iron, and, of course, when once bent remain 'set'...

The arms which were manufactured at Philadelphia, Penn., are of the most worthless kind, and have every appearance of having been manufactured from old condemned muskets. Many of them burst; hammers break off; sights fall off when discharged; the barrels are very light, not 1/20th of an inch thick, and the stocks are made of green wood which have shrunk so as to leave the bands and trimmings loose. The bayonets are of such a frail texture that they bend like lead, and many of them break off when going through the bayonet exercise. You could hardly conceive of such a worthless lot of arms, totally unfit for service, and dangerous to those using them.

Assistant Inspector-General of Ordnance John Buford reported: 'Many had burst, many cones were blown out; many locks were defective; many barrels were rough inside from imperfect boring; and many had different diameters of bore in the same barrel. . . At target practice so many burst that the men became afraid to fire them.'

[1] Here is how the Arabs struggle against one side in a war. In the US civil war when American infidels were killing each other, this was the stronger side, the north. The Arabs "sabre•tage" one side in many ways such as supplying it with defective weapons. For example, they gave the barbarians fighting Rome single-edged sabres with a heavy weight at the end that made them

"ungainly" in battle. What a word intersection that word is, "ungainly". Also, these sabres were made of brittle iron and had a narrow base, in addition to a heavy end, so they frequently broke on impact with a Roman shield. And as is commonly the way of Arab treachery, these people did not have an opportunity to complain because they were dead.

2) It wasn't the brilliant Southern general Robert E. Lee = our•ob•art Ali that enabled the South to fight for so long. It is was the South's ally or Ali that made the war last so long and become such a great loss of life in the land of the free. It is easy to imagine that the arabs gave strategic information to the South to help it and they did all they could to harm the North.

3) Ulysses Simpson Grant, supreme commander of the Union army used a policy of attrition to win the war. This was exactly what the Arabs would have wanted. Also as president, we read

that he was unable to check widespread corruption. Grant also instituted the national park system which took even more land away from the people.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

"Vanderbilt had begun buying the stock of the New York and Harlem Railroad. The stock was then selling at \$9 a share. This railroad, as was the case with all other railroads without exception, was run by the owners with only the most languid regard for the public interests and safety. Just as the corporation in the theory of the law was supposed to be a body to whom Government delegated powers to do certain things in the interest of the people, so was the railroad considered theoretically a public highway operated for the convenience of the people. It was upon this ostensible ground that railroad corporations secured charters, franchises, property and such privileges as the right to condemnation of necessary land. The State of New York alone had contributed \$8-million in public funds, and various counties, towns and municipalities in New York State nearly \$31-million by investment in stocks and bonds. The theory was indeed attractive but it remained nothing more than a fiction.

No sooner did the railroad owners [fronting for the Arabs] get what they wanted, than they proceeded to exploit the very community from which their possessions were obtained, and which they were supposed to serve. The various railroads were juggled with [foreigner English] by succeeding groups of manipulators. Management was neglected, and no attention paid to proper equipment. Often the physical layout of the railroads—the road-beds, rails and cars— were deliberately allowed to deteriorate in order that the manipulators might be able to lower the value and efficiency of the road, and thus depress the value of the stock. Thus, for instance, Vanderbilt aiming to get control of a railroad at a low price, might very well have confederates among some of the directors or officials of that railroad who would resist or slyly thwart every attempt at improvement, and so scheme that the profits would constantly go down. As the profits decreased, so did the price of the stock in the stock market. The changing combinations of road capitalists were too absorbed in the process of gambling in the stock market to have any direct concern for management. It was nothing to them that this neglect caused frequent and heartrending disasters; they were not held criminally responsible for the loss of life. In fact, railroad wrecks often served their purpose in beating down the price of stocks. Incredible as this statement may seem, it is abundantly proved by the facts."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

[To paraphrase: "Far from being against the law, their methods were actually legal... This is because the Arab-fronting ultra-rich of past generations had actually written the laws. Thus the laws have always helped their interests. If you doubt this, just compare the laws of different periods with the profitable methods of the ruling class. You will find their methods, however awful, were not only not considered crimes, but were frequently praised in the media as great virtues.]

"Far from being under the inhibition of law, their methods were duly legalized... These same propertied classes had made the code of laws as it stood. And if any doubter denies that laws at all times have exactly corresponded with the interests and aims of the ruling class, all that is necessary is to compare the laws of the different periods with the profitable methods of that

class, and he will find that these methods, however despicable, vile and cruel, were not only indulgently omitted from the recognized category of crimes, but were elevated by prevalent teaching to be commercial virtues and ability of a high order."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

"The cost of construction of these 11 [rail]roads was about \$10-million, but they were capitalized at \$23-million. Under the consolidating act of 1853, the capitalization was run-up to about \$35-million. This fictitious capital was partly based on roads which were never built, and existed on paper only. Then followed a series of legislative acts giving the company a further list of valuable franchises and allowing it to charge extortionate rates, inflate its stock, and virtually escape taxation. How these laws were procured may be judged from the testimony of the treasurer of the New York Central railroad before a committee of the New York State Constitutional Convention. This official state that from about 1853 to 1867, the New York Central had spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for 'legislative purposes', — in other words, buying laws at Albany."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.4

"Vanderbilt now installed his own subservient board of directors, and proceeded to put through a fresh program of plunder,"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"With three railroads in his possession, he [Vanderbilt] now aggressively set out to grasp a fourth—the Erie Railroad. This was another of the railroads built largely with public money..."

The...[men] who composed the company bribed the Legislature to relinquish the State's claim, and then looted the railroad with such consummate thoroughness that in order to avert its bankruptcy, they were obliged to borrow funds from Daniel Drew. This man was an imposing financial personage in his day. Illiterate, unscrupulous, picturesque [Illiterate + picturesque are the perfect qualities for an Arab front-man] in his very iniquities, he had once been a drover [a cowboy], and had gone into the steamboat business with Vanderbilt...

His loan remaining unpaid, Drew indemnified himself by taking over, in 1857, by foreclosure, the control of the Erie Railroad.

For the next 9-years, Drew manipulated the stock at will, sending the price up or down as suited his gambling schemes. The railroad degenerated until travel upon it became a menace; one [deadly] disaster followed another [as the Arabs struggled against the railroad]. Drew imperturbably [calmly] continued his manipulation of the stock market, careless of [disregarding] the condition of the [rail]road. At no time was he put to the inconvenience of even being questioned by public authorities. On the contrary, the more millions he made, the greater grew his prestige and power, the higher his standing in the community. Ruling society influenced solely by money standards, saluted him as a successful man who had his millions, and made no fastidious inquiries as to how he got them. He was a potent man; his villainies [villainous behavior] passed as great astuteness, his devious cunning as marvelous sagacity [intelligence]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"The year 1868 proved a particularly busy one for Vanderbilt. He was engaged in a desperately devious struggle with Gould. In vain did his agents and lobbyists pour out stacks of money to buy legislative votes enough to defeat the bill legalizing Gould's fraudulent issue of stock. Members of the Legislature impassively took money from both parties. Gould personally appeared at Albany [capital of New York state] with a satchel containing \$500,000 in greenbacks which were rapidly distributed. On Senator, as was disclosed by an investigating committee, accepted \$75,000 from Vanderbilt and then \$100,000 from Gould, kept both sums,—and voted with the dominant Gould forces."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"The time was ripe for a new mortgage on the labor of that generation and of the generations to follow. Population was wondrously increasing, and with it trade."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"The whole capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs] pushed aside law whenever law conflicted with its aims and interests."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Every year they prepared a false account of their revenues and expenditures which they submitted to the State officials. They pretended that they annually spent millions of dollars in construction work on the [rail]road—work, in reality, never done. They money was pocketed by them under this device—a device that has since become a favorite of many railroad and public utility corporations."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Vanderbilt... would concentrate at Albany a mass of silent arguments in the form of money and get the necessary legislative votes, which was all he cared about."

Then ensued one of the many comedies familiar to observers of legislative proceedings. It was amusing to the sophisticated to see delegations indignantly betake themselves to Albany, submit voluminous briefs which legislators never read, and with immense gravity argue away for hours to committees which had already been bought...

Laws were sold at Albany to the highest bidder. 'It was impossible', Tweed testified after his downfall, 'to do anything there without paying for it. Money had to be raised for the passage of bills'. Decades before this, legislators had been so thoroughly taught by the landowners and bankers how to exchange their votes for cash that now, not only at Albany and Washington, but everywhere in the United States, both legislative and administrative officials haggled in real astute business style for the highest price that they could get.

One act after another was slipped through the Legislature by Vanderbilt in 1868 and 1869. On May 20, 1869, Vanderbilt secured, by one bill alone, the right to consolidate railroads, a free giant of franchises, and other rights worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and the right to water [down equity in] stocks and bonds to an enormous extent.

The printing presses were worked overtime in issuing more than \$44-million in watered stock. The capital stock of the two railroads was thus doubled."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Society had made money its god and property its yardstick. Even in its administration of justice, theoretically supposed to be equal, it had made 'justice' an expensive luxury available, in actual practice, to the rich only. The defrauder of large sums could, if prosecuted use part of that plunder, easily engage a corps of shrewd, experienced lawyers, get evidence manufactured, fight out the case on technicalities, drag it along for years, call in political and social influence, and almost invariable escape in the end."

But beyond the power of money to make a mockery of justice was a still greater, though more subtle factor, which was ever an invaluable aid to the great thief [Arabs Inc.]. Every section of the trading class was permeated with a profound admiration, often tangibly expressed, for the craft that got away with an impressive pile of loot. The contempt felt for the pickpocket was the antithesis of the general mercantile admiring view of the man who stole in grand style, especially when he was one of their own class. In speaking of the piratical operations of this or that magnate, it was common to hear many business men interject, even while denouncing him, 'Well, I wish I were as smart as he'. These same men, when serving on juries, were harsh in their verdicts on the poor criminals, and unctuously flattered themselves with being, and were represented as, the upholders and conservers of law and moral conduct."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Protest as it did against Vanderbilt's merging of railroads, the middle class found itself quite hopeless. In rapid succession he put through one combination after another, and caused theft after theft to be legalized, utterly disdainful [contemptuous, sneering] of criticism or opposition. In State after State, he bought the repeal of old laws, or the passage of new laws, until he was vested with authority to connect various railroads that he had secured between Buffalo and Chicago, into one line with nearly 1,300 miles of [rail]road. The commercial classes were scared at the sight of such a great stretch of railroad—then considered an immense line—in the hands of one man, audacious, all-conquering, with power to enforce tribute at will."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"The Legislature of 1872, was elected...following the revelations of the Tweed 'ring' frauds. It was regarded as a 'model reform body'. As has already been remarked in this work, the pseudo 'reform' officials or bodies elected by the American people in the vain hope of overthrowing corruption, will often go to greater lengths in the disposition [transfer] of the people's rights and interests than the most hardened politicians, because they are not suspected of being corrupt, and their measures have the appearance of being enacted for the public good."

The Tweed clique had been broken up, but the capitalists who had assiduously [with great care and perseverance] bribed its members and profited so hugely from its political acts, were untouched and in greater power than ever before. The source of all this corruption had not been struck at [affected] in the slightest. Tweed the politician, was sacrificed and went to prison and died there. The capitalists who had corrupted representative bodies everywhere in the United States, before and during this time, were safe and

respected, and in a position to continue their work of corruption.

Tweed made the classic, unforgivable blunder... The very capitalists who had profited so greatly by his corruption were the first to express horror at his acts."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"His [Vanderbilt's] chief instrument during all those years was a general utility lawyer, Chauncey M. Depew, whose specialty was to impress the public by grandiloquent [pretentious] exhibitions of mellifluous [poured honey] spread-eagle [1] oratory, while bringing the 'proper arguments' to bear upon legislators and other public officials [2]. Every one who could in any way be used, or whose influence required subsidizing, was, in the phrase of the day, 'taken care of'. Great sums of money were distributed outright in bribes in the legislatures by lobbyists in Vanderbilt's pay. Supplementing this, an even more insidious system of bribery was carried on. Free passes for railroad travel were lavishly distributed. No politician was ever refused. Newspaper and magazine editors, writers and reporters were always supplied with free transportation for the asking, thus insuring to a great measure their good will, and putting them under obligations not to criticize or expose plundering schemes or individuals. All railroad companies used this form, as well as other forms of bribery.

It was mainly by means of the free pass system (which was not abolished by Congressional legislation until 1906) that Depew, acting for the Vanderbilts, secured not only a general immunity from newspaper criticism, but continued to have himself and them portrayed in luridly favorable lights. Depending upon the newspapers for its sources of information, the public was constantly deceived and blinded, either by the suppression of certain news, or by its being tampered with and grossly colored."

[1] The term spread-eagle once referred to democratic openness where all parts of the democracy, elected official, or democratic dialogue were open for everyone to see. This term and the openness it implied was problematic for the spreading darkness of Islam and Arab power. So it was blurred away. Today in the Apple dictionary we find no less than 6 entries that have nothing to do with this original meaning of this very useful word for free people and the democracy they establish for themselves.

2) At this point, footnote 17 says of Chauncey M. Depew that he is sent: 'to Albany every winter to say 'haw' and 'gee' to his cattle up there'. Thus we see the original form of the 'yee-haw' term so often repeated in film propaganda about the American frontier. The term was actually GEE-AWE, meaning respect or awe for Mr. G, or the wise guy harem cause.

3) We do not have a free press, we have a false anarchy, and openly corrupt paid commercial media that looks with the most favorable light believable upon its Arab masters.

4) Have we changed the way our democracy works? Have we instituted a new constitution, or have our Arab masters simply backed off on their corruption of our system to preserve the illusion of good government?]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"These repressive tactics took on a variety of forms, some of which are not ordinarily included in the definitions of repression.

The usual method was that of subsidizing press and pulpit in certain subtle ways. By these means, facts were

concealed or distorted, a prejudicial state of public opinion created, and plausible grounds given for hostile interference by the State."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Year after year, decade after decade, the reports of the various Commissioners of Patents pointed out the indiscriminate theft of inventions by the capitalists [fronting for the Arabs]. In previous chapters, we have referred to the plundering of [Eli] Whitney and [Charles] Goodyear. But they were only two of a vast number of inventors similarly defrauded.

In speaking of the helplessness of inventors, J. Holt, Commissioners of Patents, wrote in his Annual Report for 1857: 'The insolence and unscrupulousness of capital... pirating some valuable invention held by powerless hands, can scarcely be conceived by those not familiar with the records of such cases as I have referred to. Inventors, however gifted in other respects, are known to be confiding and thriftless; and being generally without wealth, and always without knowledge of the chicaneries [subtle deceptions] of law, the too often prove but children in those rude conflicts which they are called on to endure with the stalwart [well placed] fraud and cunning of the world' (U.S. Senate Documents, First Session, 35th Congress, 1857-58, viii:9-10). In his Annual Report for 1858, Commissioner Holt described how inventors were at the mercy of professional perjurers [liars, lawyers] whom the capitalists hired to give evidence.

The bribing of the Patent office officials was a common occurrence. 'The attention of Congress', reported Commissioner of Patents Charles Mason in 1854, 'is invited to the importance of providing some adequate means of preventing attempts to obtain patents by improper means'... Every successive Commissioner of Patents called upon Congress to pass laws for the prevention of fraud, and for the better protection of the inventor, but Congress, influenced by the manufacturers [as the Arabs escape goat], was long deaf to these appeals."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.5

"Let a man steal in colossal ways and then surrender a small part of it in charitable, religious and educational donations; he at once ceases being a thief and straightaway becomes a noble benefactor."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.6

[Next is a bit of Arab internal propaganda to motivate and direct their secret-agent-thieves to go for the big hauls but pinch pennies at the same time.]

"The richer Commodore Vanderbilt grew, the more closely he clung to his old habits of intense parsimony [stinginess]. Occasionally he might ostentatiously [to show off] give a large sum here or there for some religious or philanthropic purpose, but his general undeviating course was a constant meanness [stinginess]. In him was united the petty bargaining traits of the trading element and the lavish capacities for plundering of the magnate class. While defrauding on a great scale, pocketing tens of millions of dollars at a single raid, he would never for a moment overlook the leakage of a few cents or dollars. [He raided like Arabs do] His comprehensive plans for self-aggrandizement were carried out in true piratical style. [His comprehensive plans for aggrandizing the Arab cause were

carried out in true pirate style.] His aims and demands were for no paltry [small] prize, but for the largest and richest booty. Yet so ingrained by long development was his facility of acquisition, that it far passed the line of a passion and became a mono-mania.

To such an extent did it corrode him that even when he could boast his \$100-million, he still persisted in haggling and huckstering over [wrangling for] every dollar, and in tricking his friends in the smallest and most underhanded ways. Friends in the true sense of the word he had none. [Nobody is ever really Ishtar's friend. Just because you bring meat to a lion does not mean that he will not eat you too if he gets too hungry.] Those who regarded themselves as such were of that thrifty, congealed [con•G•al•ed] disposition swayed largely by calculation. But if they expected to gain overmuch [greatly] by their intimacy, they were generally vastly mistaken. Nearly always, on the contrary, they found themselves caught in some unexpected snare, and riper in experience, but poorer in pocket, they were glad to retire prudently to a safe distance from the old man's [old lady's, Ishtar's] contact. 'Friends or foes' wrote an admirer... 'were pretty much on the same level in his estimation, and if a friend undertook to get in his [Ishtar's] way, he [Ishtar] was obligated to look out for himself [herself].'"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.6

"William H. Vanderbilt daily struggled to get some perceptions of the details of railroad management. he did succeed in absorbing considerable knowledge. But his training at the hands of his father [Cornelius] was not so much in the direction of learning the system of management. Men of ability could always be hired to manage the [rail]roads. What his father principally taught him was the more essential astuteness required of a[n Arab fronting] railroad magnate; the manipulation of stocks and of common councils and and [SIC] legislatures; how to fight and overthrow competitors and extend the sphere of ownership and control; and how best to resist, and if possible to destroy, the labor unions. In brief, his education, was a duplication of his father's scope of action; the methods of the sire were infused into the son."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.6

[In reading the following, just bear in mind that the first oil well was drilled in 1859, and that oil industry was tiny in the 1860s and quite small in the 1870s and 1880s. Meanwhile, the railroads were huge and immensely powerful. As well, the railroads were very aggressive in throwing their monopoly power around at this time. What leverage could Rockefeller have had to make demands on the railroads? This idea is Arab propaganda.

The secret rates granted to Standard Oil are probably true. The question is: why on earth did the railroad companies grant them if they weren't run by the Arabs? And why didn't the railroads try to take over the oil industry the way they took over the coal industry?]

"The wars between the railroad magnates assumed many forms, not the least of which was the cutting of freight rates. [There were no price wars for farm produce, coal, or factory widgets. Why was there only a price war for oil? And why was there only a 'secret' price war based on secret rebates that only came out years later?] Each railroad desperately sought to wrench away traffic from the others by offering better inducements. [Not true. this only seems to have occurred for oil.] In this cutthroat competition, a coterie [a small group living

co•terri, or with the earthlings] of young men in the oil business, led by John D. Rockefeller, saw their fertile chance.

The drilling and the refining of oil, although in their comparative infancy, had already reached great proportions. [not true in proportion to the value of the railroads] Each railroad was eager to get the largest share of the traffic of transporting oil [True, but only due to Arab management] Rockefeller, ruminating in his small refinery at Cleveland, Ohio, had conceived the revolutionary idea of getting a monopoly on the production and distribution of oil, obliterating the middleman, and systematizing and centralizing the whole business.

Then and there was the modern trust born; and from the very inception of the Standard Oil company [today, 155-years later this company still exists as the Exxon], Rockefeller and his associates tenaciously pursued their design with a combined ability and unscrupulousness such as had never before been known since the rise of capitalism. One railroad after another was persuaded or forced into granting them secret rates and rebates against which it was impossible to compete. [forced? how? why did the railroads do this? Is there any record of how Exxon achieved such leverage over the railroads?] The railroad magnates—William H. Vanderbilt, for instance—were taken into the fold of the Standard Oil Company by being made stock holders. [This is a nonsense idea. It would not work with monopolist or cartel railroads. They would make more money gouging for freight and keeping 100% of the money, than they would make on their sliver ownership of the oil company.] With these secret rates, the Standard Oil Company was enabled to crush out absolutely a myriad of competitors and middlemen, and control the petroleum trade not only of the United States, but of almost the entire world. [How exactly?] Such fabulous profits accumulated that in the course of 40-years [1862-1902], after one unending career of industrial construction on the one hand, and crime on the other, the Standard Oil Company was easily able to become owners [the owner] of prodigious [immense] railroad and other systems, and completely supplant [supersede] the scions [descendants] of the magnates whom three or four decades before they had wheedled [coaxed] or browbeaten [intimidated] into favoring them with discriminations [secret rebates].

[Translation:

The effects of this great industrial transition were clearly visible by 1877 [only 18 year after the first oil well was drilled], so much so that two years later, Vanderbilt, more prophetically than he realized, told the Hepburn Committee that 'if this thing keeps up the oil people will own the [rail]roads.'"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.7

"between the time of the Haymarket episode and the hangings and imprisonment of the Chicago group, the labor movement in New York City had assumed so strong a political form that there ruling class was seized with consternation. The Knights of Labor, then at the summit of organization and solidarity, were ripe for independent political action... At the critical time, when the labor unions were wavering in the decision as to whether they ought to strike out politically or not, the ruling supplied the necessary vital impulsion [the force behind an action]. While in Chicago, the courts were being used to condemn the labor leaders to death or prison, in the East they were used to paralyze the weapons of offense and defense by which the unions were able to carry on their industrial warfare.

The conviction, in New York City, of certain members of a union for declaring a boycott, proved the one compelling force needed to mass all of the unions and radical societies and individuals into a mighty movement resulting in an independent labor party...

The election was for local officers of [New York City] the foremost city in the United States —a point of vantage worth contending for, since the moral effect of such a victory of the working class would be incalculable, even if [it was] short-lived. To the ruling classes [and the Arabs they front for], the triumph of the labor unions, while restricted to one city, would unmistakably denote [symbolize] the glimmerings of the beginning of the end of their regime. Such rebellious movements are highly contagious; from...one municipality [city] they sweep on to other sections [of a nation], stimulating action and inspiring emulation [copycats].

[Translation: The election was for local officers in [New York City] the foremost city in the United States. This was a vantage point worth fighting for, since the moral effect of such a victory on the working class would be enormous, even if short-lived. To the ruling classes [and the Arabs they front for], the victory of the labor unions, while restricted to one city, would unmistakably symbolize the first faint sign of the beginning of the end of their regime. Such rebellious movements are highly contagious. From...one city they sweep on to other parts [of a nation], stimulating action and inspiring copycat movements.]

The New York labor campaign of 1886 was an intrinsic [essential] part and result of the general labor movement throughout the United States. And it was the most significant manifestation of the onward march of the workers. Elsewhere the labor unions had not gone beyond the stage of agitation and industrial warfare. But in New York, with the most acute perception of the real road it must traverse, the labor movement had plunged boldly in to political action. It realized that it must get hold of the governmental powers. Its antagonists, the [Arab fronting] capitalists, had long had a rigid grip on them, and had used them almost wholly as they willed.

But the [Arab fronting] capitalist class was even more doggedly determined upon retaining and intensifying those powers. Government was an essential requisite [necessity] to its plans and development. The small capitalists bitterly fought the great; but both agreed that Government with its legislators, laws, precedents, and the habits of thought it created, must be capitalistic. Both saw in the uprising of labor a prospective overturning of conditions...

In Chicago, the same men who had bribed legislators and common councils to give them public franchises, and who had hugely swindled and stolen under guise of law, had been the principals in calling for the execution and imprisonment of the group of labor leaders, and this they had decreed in the name of law."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.7

"Despite every legitimate argument coupled with venomous ridicule and coercive and corrupt influence that wealth, press and church could bring to bear, the labor unions stood solidly together. [The oligarch-rich, the press and the church are all mechanisms for the Arabs to exert power over their host societies, along with monarch administrations, judiciaries, transportation services, and education.] [On top of this,] On election day groups of Tammany [Hall] repeaters [repeat voters], composed of dissolutes [dissolved people], profligates [wasters], thugs and criminals, systematically, under directions

from above, filled the ballot boxes with fraudulent votes...

But the vote of the labor forces was so overwhelming, that even piles of fraudulent votes [ballots] could not suffice to overcome it.

One final resource was left. This was to count out [with a election recount] Henry George [the Labor candidate] by grossly tampering with the election returns and misrepresenting them. And this is precisely what was done, if the testimony of numerous eye-witnesses is to be believed.

The Labor party, it is quite clear, was deliberately cheated out of an election won in the teeth of the severest and most corrupt opposition. This result it had to accept. The entire elaborate machinery of elections was in the full control of the Labor party's opponents. And had it instituted a contest in the courts [with their inherently corrupt judicial appointees, and corrupt fore-hire lawyers], the Labor party would have found its efforts completely fruitless in the face of an adverse judiciary.

By the end of the year 1887, the political phase of the labor movement [so dangerous to the Arab fronting magnate oligarchs of the day] had shrunk to insignificant proportions, and soon thereafter collapsed. The capitalist interests [fronting for the Arabs] had followed up their onslaught in hanging and imprisoning some of the foremost leaders, and in corruption and fraud in the polls, by the repetition of other tactics that they had long so successfully used [over the millennia].

Acting through the old political parties [The two-item menu favored by the Arabs] they further insured the disintegration of the Labor party by bribing a sufficient number of its influential men. This bribery took the form of giving them sinecurist [Tenured, lifelong appointment] offices under either Democratic or Republican local, State, or National administrations. Many of the most conspicuous organizers of the labor movement were thus won over, by the proffer [offer] of well-paying political posts to betray the cause in the furtherance of which they had shown such energy. Deprived of some of its leaders, deserted by others, the labor political movement sank into a state of disorganization, and finally reverted to its old servile position of dividing its vote between the two capitalist parties [fronting for the Arab-fronting capitalists].

From now on, for many years, the labor movement existed purely as an industrial one, disclaiming [staying away from] all connection with politics. Voting into power either of the old political parties, it then humbly begged a few crumbs of legislation from them, only to have a few sops [worthless bread crumbs soaked in soup] thrown to it, or to receive contemptuous kicks and humiliations, and, if it grew too importunate [persistent, annoying, intrusive] or aggressive, insults backed with the strong might of judicial, police and military power." [Translation: At this point, the labor movement became a purely industrial thing, avoiding politics entirely. It began supporting one of the two old political parties fronting for the Arabs, begging them for a few crumbs. These crumbs were thrown to it, often with some contemptuous kicks and humiliations in the media. And if the labor party grew too annoying or aggressive, media insults backed with the strong might of judicial, police and military power were used.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.7

"The great capitalists both dared and did. If specific statues were against them, the impelling [driving] forces of economic development and the power of might were wholly on their side. At first, the great capitalists made no attempt to have these [anti-monopoly, or anti-trust] laws altered or repealed. They

adopted a slyer and more circuitous mode of warfare. They simply evaded them. As fast as one trust was dissolved by court decision, it nominally [ostensibly] complied, as did, for instance, the Standard Oil Trust and the Sugar Trust, and then furtively cause itself to be reborn into a new combination so cunningly sheltered within the technicalities of the law that it was fairly safe from judicial overthrow.

But the great [Arab fronting] capitalists were too wise to stake their existence upon the thin refuge of technicalities. With their huge funds they now systematically struck out to control the machinery of the two main political parties. They used the ponderous [considerable] weight of their influence to secure the appointment of men favorable to them as Attorneys General of the Unites States, and of the States, and they carried on a definite plan of bringing about the appointment or election of judges upon whose decision they could depend. The laws passed by the middle class remained ornamental encumbrances on the statute books. The great capitalists, although harassed continually by futile attacks, triumphantly swept forward, gradually in their consecutive progress strangling the middle class beyond resurrection."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.7

"By the beginning of the year 1893 the Vanderbilt system embraced at least 12,000 miles of railways, with a capitalized value of several hundred million dollars, and a total gross earning power of more than \$60-million a year. [How much oil was being used? What was the price? How big was the oil industry at this time?] 'All of the best railroad territory... outside of New England, Pennsylvania and New Jersey was penetrated by the Vanderbilt lines. And no other railroad system in the country, with the single notable exception of the Pennsylvania Railroad, covered anything like the same amount of rich and settled territory, or reached so many towns and cities of importance, New York, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Detroit, Indianapolis, Omaha—these were a few of the great marts [market cities] which were embraced in the Vanderbilt preserves.' [preserves = protected market, paradise] So impregnably rich and powerful were the Vanderbilts, so profitable their railroads, and their command of resources, financial institutions and legislation so great, that the panic of 1893, instead of impairing their fortunes gave them extraordinary opportunities of getting hold of the properties of weaker railroads. [Arabs like financial crises, In fact, they prosper most in downturns.]

It was now, acting jointly with other puissant [powerful, influential] interests, that they saw their chance to get control of a large part of the fabulously rich coal mines of Pennsylvania. [Funny how Vanderbilt wanted the old coal industry that was suffering from competition from the new oil industry. Why didn't he make a play for the new thing, the oil industry?] These mines had originally been owned by separate companies or operators, each independent of the other. But by about the year 1867, the railroads penetrating the coal regions had conceived the plan of owning the mines themselves. Why continue to act as middlemen in transporting the coal? Why not vest in themselves the ownership of these vast areas of coal lands, and secure all the profits instead of those from merely handling the coal? [The Arab front-men bought up the coal industry to drive costs up and push demand over to oil.]

The plan ingratiated itself as a capital one [The plan was brought into favor as a capitalist sort of thing]; It could be easily carried out with little expenditure. All that was necessary for the railroads to do was to burden down the operators with

exorbitant charges, and hamper [hinder, hamstring] and beleaguer [lay siege to, beset with difficulties] them in a variety of ways.

As was proved in subsequent lawsuits, the railroads frequently declined to carry coal for this or that mine, on the pretext that they had no cars available. Every means was used to crush the independent operators and depreciate the selling value of their property. It was a campaign of ruination. In law it stood as criminal conspiracy. But the railroads persisted in it without any further molestation than prolix [for-dissolving, excessively wordy and hard to understand] civil suits. They finally forced a number of the well-nigh [almost] independent operators to sell out to them for comparatively trifling sums.

By these methods, such railroads as the Philadelphia and Reading, the Delaware, Lackawana and Western, the Central Railroad of New Jersey, the Lehigh Valley and others gradually succeeded, in the course of years, in extending an ownership over the coal mines. The more powerful independent operators struck back early at them by getting a constitutional provision passed in Pennsylvania in 1873, prohibiting railroads from owning and operating coal mines. The railroads evaded this law with facility by an illegal system of leasing, and by organizing nominally separate and independent companies with stock of which, in reality was owned by them.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.7

"The most important coal-owning railroad, however, which they and other magnates coveted was the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad. At least one-half of the anthracite coal supply of Pennsylvania was owned or controlled by this railroad. The ownership of the Reading Railroad, with its subordinate lines, was the pivotal requisite towards getting a complete monopoly of the anthracite coal deposits." [And artificially raising the price of coal so the Americans would start using oil instead.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.7

"The sway of the Vanderbilts, however, extended not only over the anthracite, but over a great extent of the bituminous coal fields in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Ohio and other States. By their control of the New York Central Railroad, they owned various ostensibly independent bituminous coal mining companies. The Clearfield Corporation, the Pennsylvania Coal and Coke Co., and the West Branch Coal Company were some of these. By their great holdings in other railroads traversing the soft coal regions, the Vanderbilts controlled about one-half of the bituminous coal supply in the Eastern, and most of the Middle-Western, States.

According to the Interstate Commerce Commission's report of 1907, the New York Central Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad owned in that year about 45% of the stock of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, and the New York Central owned large amounts of stock in other railroads. 'The Commission, therefore, reaches the conclusion... that... the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, the Norfolk and Western Railroad Company, and the Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company were practically controlled by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, and the result was to practically abolish substantial competition between the carriers of coal in the territories under consideration'.

It is not possible here to present even in condensed form the outline, much less the full narrative, of the labyrinth of tricks, conspiracies and frauds which the railroad magnates resorted to in the throttling of the small capitalists, and in guaranteeing themselves a monopoly. A great array of facts are to be found in the reports of the exhaustive investigations made by the United States Industrial Commission in 1901-1902, and by the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1907.

Thousands of times was the law glaringly violated, yet the magnates were at all times safe from prosecution. Periodically the Government would make a pretense of subjecting them to an inquiry, but in no serious sense were they interfered with. These investigation all showed that the railroads [fronting for the Arabs] first crushed out the small operators by a conspiracy of rates, blockades and reprisals, and then by a juggling process of stocks and bonds, bought in the mines with the expenditure of scarcely any actual money. Having done this they formed a monopoly and raised prices which, in law, was a criminal conspiracy. The same weapons used against the small coal operators were still being employed against the few independent companies remaining in the coal fields, as was disclosed, in 1908, in this suit of the Government to dissolve the workings of the various railroad companies in the anthracite coal combination.

No one knows or can ascertain the exact profits of the Vanderbilts and of other railroad owners from their control of... [the] coal mines. As has been noted, the railroad magnates cloud their trail by operating through subsidiary companies. That their extortions reached hundreds of million of dollars every year was a patent [obvious, peh•te•n't] enough fact. [Where did all the money go?] Some of... this process of extortion have been referred to;—the confiscation, on the one hand, of the labor of the whole consuming population by taxing from them more and more of the products of their labor by repeated increases in the price of coal, and, on the other, the confiscation of the labor of several hundred thousand miners who were compelled to work for the most precarious wages, and in conditions worse, in some respects, than chattel slavery.

But not alone was labor confiscated. Life was also immolated [burned, sacrificed]... The report of 1908 of the United States Geological Survey showed that 3,125 coal miners were killed by accidents in the current year, and that 5,316 were injured... 'These figures' the report explained, 'do not represent the full extent of the disasters, as reports were not received from certain States having no mine inspectors'."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.8

"The juggling of railroads and the virtual seizure of coal mines were by no means the only accomplishments of the Vanderbilt family in the years under consideration. Colorless as was the third generation, undistinguished by any marked characteristic, extremely commonplace in its conventions, it yet proved itself a worthy successor of Commodore Vanderbilt. The lessons he had taught of how to appropriate wealth were duly followed by his descendants, and all of the ancestral methods were closely adhered to by the third generation. Whatever might be its pretension to a certain integrity and to a profound respectability, there was really no difference between its methods and those of the Commodore. Times had changed, that was all. What had once been regarded as outright theft and piracy were now cloaked under [such] high-sounding phrases as 'corporate extension' and 'high finance' and other catchwords calculated to lull public suspicion and resentment.

A refinement of phraseology had set in; and it served its purpose."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.8

"Legislative measures in New York and many other States were drafted with such skill that sly provisions allowing the greatest frauds were concealed in the enactments. And the first knowledge that the plundered public frequently had of them was after they had already been accomplished. These frauds comprised corrupt laws that gave, in circumstances of notorious scandal, tracts of land in the Adirondack Mountains to railroad companies included in the Vanderbilt system. They embraced laws, and still more laws exempting this or that stock or property from taxation, and laws making presents of valuable franchises and allowing further consolidations. Laws were enacted in New York State the effects of which were to destroy the Erie Canal (which has cost the people of New York State \$100-million) as a competitor of the New York Central Railroad."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.8

"The Vanderbilt ownership of various railroad systems has been of an intricate, roundabout nature. A group of railroads, the majority of the stock of which was actually owned by the Vanderbilt family, were nominally put under the ownership of different, and apparently distinct, railroad companies. This devious arrangement was intended to conceal the real ownership, and to have a plausible claim in counteracting the charge that many railroads were concentrated in one ownership, and were combined in monopoly in restraint of trade."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.8

"The Vanderbilts and other magnates were manufacturing law at will, and boldly appropriating, under sanction of law, colossal possessions in real and personal property."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.8

"The treasury of Nation, State and cities, raised by a compulsory taxation falling heavily upon workers, was at all times at the complete disposal of the propertied interests, who emptied it as fast as it was filled. The propertyless and jobless were left to starve; to them no helping arm was outstretched, and if they complained, no quarter given. The State as an institution, while supported by the toil of the producers, was wholly a capitalist State with the capitalists [fronting for the Arabs were] in complete supremacy to fashion and use it as they chose. They used the State political machinery to plunder the masses, and then, at the slightest tendency on the part of the workers to resist these crushing injustices and burdens, called upon the State to hurry out its armed forces to repress this dangerous discontent."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.10

[Of Jay Gould] "About 5'-6" in height and of slender figure, he gave the random impression of being a mild, meek man, characterized by excessive timidity. His complexion was swarthy and partly hidden by closely-trimmed black whiskers; his eyes were dark, vulpine [fox-like, crafty or cunning] and acutely piercing; his forehead was high. His voice was very

low, soft and insinuating."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.10

"The cry of anti-monopoly was the great fetich [fetish] of the entire middle class. This class viewed with fear the growing concentration of wealth...

[So] while secretly bribing, Gould constantly gave out for public consumption a plausible string of arguments... He represented himself as the champion of the middle and working class in seeking to prevent Vanderbilt from getting a monopoly of many railroads. He played adroitly upon the fears, the envy, and the... self interest of the middle class by pointing out how greatly it would be at the mercy of Vanderbilt should Vanderbilt succeed in adding the Erie Railroad and other railroads to his already formidable list.

It was a time of all times when such arguments were bound to have an immense effect; and that they did was shown by the readiness with which the trading class excused his corruption and frauds on the ground that he seemed to be the only man who proved that he could prevent Vanderbilt from gobbling up all of the railroads leading from New York City. With great fatuousness [foolishness] the middle class supposed that he was fighting for its cause. The bitterness of large numbers of the manufacturing, jobbing [working] and agricultural classes against Commodore Vanderbilt was deep-seated.

By an illegal system of preferential freight rates to certain manufacturers, Vanderbilt put these favorites [favorite Arab-friendly manufacturers] easily in a position where they could undersell competitors. Thus A.T. Stewart, one of the noted millionaire manufacturers and merchants of the day, instead of owing his success to his great ability, as has been set forth, really derived it, to a great extent, from the secret preferential freight rates that he had on the Vanderbilt railroads. A variety of other coercive methods were used by Vanderbilt. Special freight trains were purposely delayed and run at a snail's pace in order to force shippers to pay the extraordinary rates demanded for shipping over the Merchant's Dispatch, a fast freight line owned by the Vanderbilt family.

These were but a few of the many schemes for their private graft that the Vanderbilts put in force. The agricultural class was taxed heavily on every commodity shipped; for the transportation of milk, for example, the farmer was taxed one-half of what he himself received for milk. These taxes, of course, eventually fell upon the consumer, but the manufacturer and the farmer realized that if the extortions were less, their sales and profits would be greater. They were in a rebellious mood and gladly welcomed a man such as Gould who thwarted Vanderbilt at every turn. Gould well knew of this better feeling against Vanderbilt. He used it, and thrust himself forward constantly in the guise of the great deliverer.

As for the small stockholders of the Erie Railroad, Gould easily pacified them by holding out the bait of a larger dividend than they had been getting under the former regime. This he managed by the common and fraudulent expedient of issuing bonds, and paying dividends out of [the] proceeds. So long as the profits on these small stockholders were slightly better than they had been getting before, they were complacently satisfied to let Gould continue his frauds. This acquiescence in theft has been one of the most pronounced characteristics of the capitalistic investor, both large and small. Numberless instances have shown that they raise no objections to plundering management provided that under it their money returns are increased."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.11

"While Gould was secretly disposing of his gold holdings, he was goading on his confederates and his crows of 50 or more brokers to buy still more."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.12

"His [Jay Gould's] acute eye had previously lit upon the Union Pacific Railroad as offering a surpassingly prolific field for a new series of thefts. Nor was he mistaken. The looting of this railroad and allied railroads which he... and other members of the clique proceeded to accomplish, added to their wealth... perhaps \$60-million, the major share of which Gould appropriated.

It was commonly supposed in 1873 that the Union Pacific Railroad had been so completely despoiled [plundered] that scarcely a vestige was left to prey upon. But Gould had an extraordinary faculty for devising new and fresh schemes of spoliation. He would discern great opportunities for pillage in places that others dismissed as barren; projects that other adventurers [brotherly agents] had bled until convinced nothing more was to be extracted, would be taken up by Gould and become plethora of [blood for] plunder under his dexterous touch. Again and again, Gould was charged with being a wrecker of property; a financial beachcomber who destroyed that he might profit. These accusations... were distortions. In almost every instance the railroads gathered in by Gould were wrecked before he secured control; All that he did was to revive, continue and elaborate the process of wrecking..."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.12

"It was in the very heyday of the bribing and swindling, as numerous investigating committees showed... the money lavishly poured out for the building of railroads was almost wholly public money drawn from compulsory taxation of the whole people. At this identical time practically every railroad corporation in the country stood indebted for immense sums of public money, little of which was ever paid back. In New York State, more than \$40-million of public funds had gone into the railroads; in Vermont \$8-million and large sums in every other State and Territory. The whole Legislature and State Government of Wisconsin had been bribed with a total of \$800,000, in 1856, to give a large land grant to one company alone, details of which transaction will be found elsewhere. The State of Missouri had already disbursed \$25-million of public funds..."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

"There is nothing vague or conjectural regarding this illuminating transaction; the facts are inscribed authentically in the public records.

In the years 1840-43, the city of Troy [New York], at public expense, began to build a railroad running 21-miles from that city to Schenectady. The city of Troy...borrowed... \$750,000... for the construction and equipment of the Troy and Schenectady Railroad. It was a time when capitalists passively looked on, allowing many municipalities and some of the States to build publicly-owned railroads and operate them for a time, and then, after many millions of public money had been expended, capitalists would contrive to take over the ownership unto themselves. This they did by depreciating and

crippling railroads owned by the community, and by corrupting public officials to sell or lease them for comparatively insignificant sums. It was a favorite practice of the period, and was worked with great success.

The task of providing themselves with modern means of transportation frequently devolved upon communities, since no capitalist would take the initiative in any undertaking in which he did not see considerable immediate profits. The aim of the community was service; that of the capitalist, profit. Communities would never stop to consider whether a railroad would yield profit; the sole question guiding them was that of public need. [This is nonsense] The principle which made the people acquiescent in the loaning or donating of large sums of money to private railroad corporations was that railroads were a public necessity, whether publicly or privately built. In New York State alone, not to mention other States, the railroads originally received from cities, towns, villages, and from the State, the sum of \$40-million by donation or investment; a very considerable amount it made at a time when a dollar had a much greater purchasing power than now. Of this sum, only about one-fourth part was paid back. At various times laws were corruptly passed releasing the railroad companies from liability for these debts. Every mile of those railroads is today absolutely owned, or practically so, by private interests.

As the greater number of railroads were owned by private corporations, it was not difficult for them to bankrupt publicly-owned railroads when they set out to do so. This they could easily do by diverting or obstructing freight and passenger traffic or by corrupting public officials to mismanage them. This conflict of public and private interest always resulted in the triumph of private interest. [This was] necessarily so because public welfare and private profits were an incongruous mixture, the one the antithesis of the other, and also because the governing officials were either of the propertied classes or responsive or subservient to them.

By these methods, the campaign against the public ownership of the Troy and Schenectady Railroad was begun...

How was the city of Troy to be induced to sell its railroad to the clique of projectors?... [Pay attention to this widely used technique of the Arabs] His first move... was to cause a steady mismanagement of the railroad's affairs so as to create dissatisfaction, if not disgust, with the continuance of public ownership and operation. Very deftly was his undermining and sapping work done—so deftly and by such surreptitious methods that no suspicion of his complicity was aroused. A public sentiment unfavorable to Troy's retention of the railroad was then adroitly worked up [in the media]; public petitions praying for the sale of the unprofitable and unsatisfactory [rail]road began to flow in to the Common Council.

What did the Common Council now do? It appointed a committee to consider the question of selling. Of this committee Sage was the most active member. So very active was he that the committee reported favoring the selling of the railroad. The proposition was, in fact, carried by one vote; it was Sage's vote which decided. Then, on January 24, 1853, another committee of the Common Council was appointed. Its assigned function was to sell the stock, franchise, and property of the railroad for not less than \$200,000. Who was it that also singularly happened to be the foremost member of this second committee? The phenomenally industrious Alderman Sage. And when the railroad was finally sold, who was it that bought it? A company headed by Sage, and Sage it was who became its president. Extraordinarily considerate were the terms of sale; \$50,000 was to be paid down, the remainder in [over]14-

years...

It was recognized generally as a gross piece of corruption, but nothing was done to interfere with its success, nor with the greater corruption that followed. Having, under form of law, grabbed the Troy and Schenectady Railroad, Sage sold it for \$900,000 or so to the group of capitalists forming the New York Central Railroad combination. Although but \$50,000 had been paid for it in cash, Sage and his associates disposed of it not only for the full value of its \$650,000 capital stock, but they also received in exchange... New York Central bonds... \$8-million in bonds... were distributed as a bonus among the owners of the various railroads embraced in the consolidation, no insignificant portion of the eight millions was Sage's share of the spoils.

Whatever might be the later outcries of Troy's population over the merciless extortions [Allah the merciful is doublespeak] of the New York Central Railroad, Sage was now heralded more of a 'prominent citizen' than ever before, a citizen of exceeding worth, stability and standing. The glorious and patriotic occupation of Politico-business man with its radius of opportunities, had proved very lucrative. Yet the national capital, Sage concluded, held out much greater inducements. Accordingly, the corrupt Tory political ring, of which he was a leader caused him to be elected to Congress; there he took his seat in December, 1853, and in 1854 was reelected.

That was the era when act after act was passed granting money and land, either openly or by indirection, to railroad companies, and giving corrupt powers and privileges of all miscellaneous kinds to other corporations and to individual capitalists. In the one year of 1856, exclusive of other years, Congress passed at least 30 railroad land-grant acts for the benefit of as many separate railroad corporations—acts under which these railroad companies obtained the ownership of tens of millions of acres of public land. The corrupt means used to get these acts through proved one of the great scandals of the times, and led to the appointment of numerous Congressional and State legislative investigating committees. Few members of Congress and [state] legislatures there were, as was abundantly shown, who did not take bribes either in money or in stocks and bonds."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

"The committee found that Samuel Colt, the founder of a fortune based upon the manufacture of firearms, paid out at least \$15,000 to Dickerson, his attorney and one of his lobbyists, to buy off the opposition in Congress to a bill extending Colt's patent rights, the time limit of which had expired. The testimony indicated that about \$60,000 in all was spent in getting the bill passed. Another lobbyist, Jere Clemens, who also did the disbursing of Colt's bribe money, was, at the same time, as he admitted under oath, lobbying for various railroad corporations seeking land grants, and for a bill similar to Colt's which extended the patent rights of Cyrus H. McCormick, a manufacturer of reaping machines, and the founder of the Multi-millionaire fortune.

And how other factory owners were bribing Congress to pass tariff acts was disclosed by the investigation of a select committee of the House, the majority of which committee reported that one firm in particular, Lawrence, Stone, and Company [Arabs] ... had expended \$87,000 in bribes to have..."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

"Congress reeked with fraud and bribery, of which only slight oozings came to the surface... Bribery, indeed, was so undeniably rife that as a sop to public feelings, one investigating committee after another was appointed to inquire into charges."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

" 'The evidence taken', the [Wisconsin Senate] committee concluded, 'establishes the fact that the La Crosse and Milwaukee Railroad Company have been guilty of numerous and unparalleled acts of mismanagement, gross violations of duty, fraud and plunder. In fact, corruption and wholesale plundering are common features.'

They were not merely common features of the railroad corporations in Wisconsin, but everywhere else in the United States. Year after year they went on unhindered by legislative or Congressional investigations. Far from being forfeited, the granted rights and property became strongly riveted vested private rights. Neither the bribers nor the bribed were troubled with criminal prosecution except very rarely, and then it was only the subordinate tools who were sent to prison. Every bribery scandal would be shortly followed by some new scandal. The old [scandals] would die away or become forgotten, and the new would absorb public attention for a time, only to go through the same process."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

"The great land grants received by the La Crosse and Milwaukee Railroad Company were not the only gifts in the legislative acts of 1856. As a corporation, the company was forever exempted from taxes, and the lands granted were exempted from taxation for 10-years — a sufficient time in which to strip them of their timber or sell them. [Yet] Despite all of the legislative gifts, and additional very valuable donations by towns, counties and cities, the railroad had been so consummately pillaged of its money and resources, and so difficult was it to raise money in the panic of 1857, that it was forced into bankruptcy."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.13

"Men placed to manage corporations for the interest of the stockholders manage them only for their own. They become contractors, half ruin the corporation, pay themselves with its assets at enormous discounts, then resuscitate things and are rich in the result."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.14

"In the preceding chapter we have seen how, by corruption and fraud, Congress, in 1854, passed an act, the wording of which was so surreptitiously altered as to give nearly 900,000 acres of public land in Minnesota directly to the Minnesota & Northwestern Railroad company. Composed of a combination of Eastern and Western [front] capitalists, lobbyists and politicians, this company proceeded to regale the country with sonorous prospectuses of the great things that it intended to do in developing the wilderness of the Northwest. Could the nation doubt the veracity [truth, accuracy] and noble intentions of its characters, all solid men of capital? Was the good faith of its projectors, headed by that eminent capitalist, Erastus

Corning, of Albany, New York, to be questioned? For once the sweet song failed to charm the public, which rose in angry protest against the corruption used, and Congress hastily backslid and repealed the act.

It was not often that Congress repealed such corrupt acts. [so] when it did so, astonishment was general. [So when it did, everyone was astonished.]

But the good behavior of Congress was of the briefest duration; a mere ebullition [boiling, bubbling] serving [its] duty as something with which to blind the nation. The milling of land-grants went on busily [Many people were busy minting of land-grants.] The repealing of that one particular act produced an effect which distracted public attention and which allowed the unscrutinized passage of many other acts. [This is an Arab talking about this as a technique to copy in the future.] Among these were measures giving 6-million acres of public lands— eventually to expand into 14-millions in all— to the Territory of Minnesota (soon to become a State) for the benefit of railroad corporations. The proprieties [protocols] of the usual form of procedure were now scrupulously observed. The lands were donated to the individual States, to be granted by them to railroad companies. Congress had learned its lesson of the necessity of sticking to outward forms. Henceforth in the case of State grants, the bribery had to be dually done, part at Washington, and part at the various State capitals.

During the session of 1857, a modest little bill went gurgling through, tranquilly making the rounds of the committees, and becoming a law. At that precise time, many another act was being dragged out to daylight as having been passed by bribery, but this especial bill wended [winding turns and a slow and gentle tail-wind] its way unobtrusively, entirely shielded from the searching [searing sun's] blaze of publicity. It was an act incorporating the Minnesota & Pacific Railway Company to build a line from St. Paul to St. Anthony's Falls (now the city of Minneapolis) and authorizing various extensions in different directions.

The second part of the program was as successfully accomplished as the first. The Minnesota Legislature was applied-to for the wherewithal [money] to carry this enterprising project into execution, and most generously did it respond. Sundry legislative acts gave to the railroad company a grant of 10-sections to the mile, six hundred and forty acres to the section. [Thus for laying a track, they got a 10-mile wide swath of land]. The title to successive grants [was] to vest in the company as fast as every 20 miles was completed. But these were not the only benefactions. In dulcet [sweet, mellifluous] appeal, the company informed the citizens of the State that it needed cash also. Many of these aforesaid citizens, hardly pioneers with a rough way of looking at affairs, were not overcome with emotion at reading these tender appeals. They thought that the land grant was quite enough of an encouragement. But the Minnesota Legislature 'during the corrupt administration of Governor Sibley', —as contemporary writers in Minnesota put it—was of an extremely susceptible nature, incapable of refusing a request.

An act was passed authorizing a \$5-million issue of bonds—called the 'Minnesota State Railroad Bonds' — to be handed over to the railroad companies in that State. Not all of this amount was issued. The total sum turned over to the railroad companies under this special act was about \$2.75-million. Large additional sums of money were then contributed by counties and municipalities, and a 'smart business' was done in persuading farmers and merchants to invest their money in the railroad.

Whose master mind was behind all of this? Russell

Sage's. Rarely did he appear to prominently in the foreground, but he was the soft-treading man who, as was later revealed, chiefly profited from the transitions of the Minnesota & Pacific Railroad Company. After getting the charter, franchises, rights, land grants, funds and exemptions what did he and his partners next do? Valiantly and seductively had they argued for inducements enough to make it possible for them to open up the primitive Northwest. But the moment that the primary object was obtained of securing these diverse 'inducements' talk ceased and the work of filing their capacious pockets began with a grim and silent earnestness.

First, in the order of the day, came the customary freebooting organization of a construction company, composed of the identical men in the railroad corporation. They made contracts with themselves calling for exorbitant payments. And then, in addition to these great cribbings [feeding at a large trough, or manger], they fraudulently awarded themselves bonds in return for pretended services. Along with these embezzlements, they placidly set about to cheat that small bondholders and stock holders, and to fleece the creditors who furnished them with necessary supplies and equipment.

The thefts were carried on with such rapid assiduity [meticulousness] that in about a year after the company had been chartered, its treasury had become a vacancy [totally empty], and the railroad was plunged into insolvency [bankruptcy] and, in 1858, foreclosed [upon]. Who bought it? The selfsame men who had looted it. As the chiefs of the construction company, they had taken care to fortify themselves with enough bonds to put them in the legal position of majority creditors. Some of them such as Sage, did their work... through dummies. Others appeared in the open. They might complain, as they did, that the cause of the company's failure was the difficulty in raising money during the panic of 1857; but this was a flimsy, although plausible, excuse."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.14

"While the projectors were cheating out this crowd of dupes, what were they doing with the huge subsidies that they had received in one form or another with which to build the railroad? The money had certainly vanished. [but] Where? Little of railroad construction was there to show for the alleged expenditure except some hundred miles of graded prairie. Even the short stretch of 10-miles of main line from St. Paul to Minneapolis had not been put into operation by 1862, as required by law. Why not? The rapidity with which such fortunes as Sage's were being amassed was the answer.

When the professional corrupters who had looted this railroad had originally applied to Congress and to Minnesota for gifts of land and money, they had represented themselves as capitalists having 'ample resources' with which to carry on the project... After they had robbed the railroad into bankruptcy, a special committee of the Minnesota Senate began to investigate their antecedents and methods. ...it reported... that

'the companies had no cash capital at command... [and] the companies, since the passage of the land amendment, have not furnished on dollar of capital to aid in carrying on their gigantic enterprise. They have sold and hypothecated large portions of these bonds at a ruinous discount. they have paid extravagant salaries to incompetent or inefficient officers. With the exception of about 50-miles of well-built superstructure—incomplete, fragmentary and disjointed portions of grading, costing on the average less than \$3,000 per mile—are all that these companies can show in return for the munificent issue of bonds made to them by the

State.'

A vivid picture this gives of the original 'constructive ability' of the capitalists—an ability conspicuously displayed in perpetrating the most enormous frauds. But where in the United States was it not likewise so?"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.14

"By 1878, the people of Minnesota were again ablaze. 21-years had passed since the company had been chartered. It had received vast subsidies in money and land, not only from the National Government, the State, cities and counties, but from individuals. All along its route, both completed and projected, farmers and merchants had subscribed for its stock, only, they found, to hold worthless bits of paper, which produced neither railroad nor returns. The company had twice looted itself into insolvency. It had, by repeated sleight-of-hand process, defrauded not only native capitalists, farmers and merchants, but it had done away with the many millions poured in by the Dutch capitalists.

Now it was still deep in bankruptcy. The Legislature could not hold out against this overwhelming expression of popular indignation. On March 9, 1878, it passed an act declaring that unless a specified number of miles should be built by certain dates, then the uncompleted portions, together with the land grants, rights, franchises, immunities and appertaining property 'shall at once be and become absolutely forfeited to the State of Minnesota, without any act or ceremony whatsoever.

It was a drastic law, and some action had to be taken at once if the state was to be thwarted. Who would furnish the money necessary to build the uncompleted sections, and thus prevent the forfeiture of franchises and land grants? Sage and others, after getting out of the [rail]road all the plunder that they could see in sight, had retired to use the proceeds of that piracy in repeating their transactions in other directions. The railroad itself was in a deplorably bad shape, thoroughly disorganized, and very dangerous to travel on. It had little equipment and few stations or depots worth considering. This was the 'splendid railroad system' that Sage and his clique were to build. This was the result of their 'vast constructive ability'! How much Sage took out of the project in spoils we are unable to say. There is no record stating the sum either absolutely or approximately. It amounted, most certainly, to many millions of dollars."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.14

"A money lender on a great scale Sage became; he invented a special system of usury—the 'put' and 'call' system"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.14

"Ordinarily he [Sage] would loan money at high enough rates, but in times of panic and Wall street 'squeezes' he demanded —and received—as much as 2% a day or 60% a month. Friends or enemies, it did not matter; all alike had to pay the enormous interest that he exacted if they desired a supply of ready money (which he always kept on hand), and thus save themselves from defaulting on contracts, and so going into bankruptcy. He was one of that eminent constellation of patriots who hoarded gold when it was most needed to carry on the Civil War, and refused to loan it except at the most incredibly extortionate rates."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

"But the usual culmination came. The Kansas and Pacific [railway] project was no exception to the invariable experience in railroad affairs. It was assiduously plundered by the men on top of the heap, and the following of petty investors were neatly cheated out. Obviously, stripped as it was, the market value of its stock sunk to an insignificant point. Gould had been waiting for precisely this opportunity"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

"Both the majority report, that of Commissioners Littler and Anderson, and the minority report of Commissioner Pattison, set forth that the frauds of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, under the direction of Gould, Sage and Dillon, were truly gigantic.

Millions of acres of public land were grabbed outright. Not less than seven million acres were sold without any patent from the Government. Coal lands of inestimable value were fraudulently seized. Millions of dollars were fraudulently shuffled from one corporation to another. the stock of the Union Pacific was inflated from \$38-million to \$50-million, the bonded indebtedness from \$88-million to \$126-million, and sundry other indebtedness from about \$4-million to nearly \$10-million. The majority report referred to 'lavish and reckless distribution of the assets of the company in dividends' and expressed sharp curiosity as to why the Union Pacific Railroad Company, although doing a large and profitable business, 'found itself early in 1884, on the verge of bankruptcy'...

The minority report was even severer and more searching. It set forth that the Union Pacific and the Kansas Pacific had received about \$35-million in advances from the Government, little of which had been paid back, and that up to 1887, the [immense] sum of \$136-million 'had been dissipated' by the directors of these two railroads."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

"The query can here naturally be expected: Why was Gould not prosecuted for his malefactions [wrongdoings]? How was it possible for him to have carried through his immense lootings without some visitation of criminal proceedings? So long as he robbed the people, the great plodding [slow-moving], powerless multitude, without any real representation in political office, it could be understood that his license would in nowise be interfered with, seeing that all law was at the command of the rich freebooters [pirates]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

"to form any adequate conception of Gould's thefts in his manipulation and management of the Union Pacific consolidation, a mere money computation falls flat... The Interstate Commerce Commission announced that practically the entire coal supply of Oklahoma, Utah and Wyoming was owned and monopolized by the Gould railway system, principally by the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad...

How was the ownership of these extensive coal fields obtained? Here we do not have to encounter any intricacies of stock and bond finance. They were simply seized with just enough formalities to give some color of complying with the law. Behind these thin formalities lay a long path of 'fraud, perjury and violence', stated the Interstate Commerce Commission report of 1908.... And if a coal or an oil deposit

could not be obtained by fraud, then—if the numerous testimony taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission was correct—force was used to oust such individual occupants as had lawfully acquired the land.

The Interstate Commerce Commission reported that the Gould and Harriman [harem•man] lines in a large region beyond the Mississippi 'absolutely dominate the mining, transportation and selling of coal along their lines' Uncounted paragraphs and strings of affidavits, all embodied in the official volumes, sustained the charges of fraud, perjury and violence. Yet the beneficiaries of those colossal frauds had good reason to smile amusedly at all such futile investigations; the ownership of most of the property, however procured, was theirs; some of Government succeeded in getting back, but proportionately little.

[But] Let it not be supposed that Gould's [chosen, harem-bro] mind was so preoccupied with his Union Pacific piracies, that he was oblivious to opportunities elsewhere. Far from it. This undersized man, with his mild voice and inconspicuous, almost effeminate, personality, was, indeed, and irrepressible conquerer, seizing and pillaging not merely wherever he went, but in many places and in different fields simultaneously. In his own chosen method of warfare, his mind was an extraordinarily versatile one, wonderfully gifted at computation, with the virile ability to keep track of a vast variety of involved transaction at the same time.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

With the law end of them, he did not have to concern himself. At call he could always hire a corps of the most dexterous [skilled] attorneys, none of whom scrupled to take as payment a fraction of his booty. Lawyers, some of who became judges in the highest courts in the country, and other lawyers who had been judges and had resigned to draw large retainers from the very corporations in whose favor they had handed down decisions, pleaded and plotted for Gould. An excellent client he was; the litigation in which he was involved were extensive."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.15

"Gould seldom went to court without owning his judge."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.16

"He [Gould] was prematurely old. His beard was streaked with gray, his hair thin, and his swarthy, bilious, glowing face was rigid with hard, deep lines."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.16

"he [Gould] owned a newspaper, the New York 'World'; a curious sight it was to see one of the great pirates, who many a time had narrowly escaped prison, instructing the public as to its duty, moral, political, and otherwise. But the known fact that Gould owned this newspaper helped to discount its utterances and reduce its circulation.

A much more successful and insidious method of influencing public opinion was by his control of the Western Union Telegraph Company, and, through that corporation, of the Associated Press, the foremost news distributing agency in the United States. Distorted, misleading or false news dispatches were manufactured, or artfully colored and supplied to the public press. These not only gave Gould superior underhand facilities for influencing the course of the stock

market, but they were also used in favor of capitalists, and against labor and radical movements at every opportunity. The public was fed on grossly perverted news accounts of strikes and labor and political movements. Upon this fabricated news, the newspaper owners, themselves capitalists or largely servile to capital, based hostile, if no malevolent editorials. And the combination of the whole was used to prejudice the mass of the public against any movement or agitation threatening the complete sway of capital."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.16

"We have seen, in an earlier chapter, how the Pennsylvania Railroad's official, during the great strike of 1877, ordered their agents to set a number of worthless freight cars at Pittsburgh on fire, in order to charge the strikes [strikers] with being riotous, and so have a pretext for calling out the military."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.16

"In a series of articles written by Judge Ben B. Lindsey, a public-spirited jurist who had the most intimate knowledge of Colorado affairs, Judge Lindsey revealed in detail some extent of the corruption in that State. He told how nearly all of the officials and judges were corporation tools; how vast numbers of fraudulent votes were counted at elections; and how the corporations dictated the election or appointment of many of the judges."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.17

[Quoting William Larrabee, governor of Iowa] "It is the policy of the political corruption... [people] to ascertain the weakness and wants of every man whose services they are likely to need, and to attack him, if his surrender should be essential to their victory, at his weakest point. Men with political ambition are encouraged to aspire to preferment, [high-paying employment] and are assured of corporate support to bring it about. Briefless [having no clients] lawyers are promised corporate business or salaried attorneyship. Those in financial straits are accommodated with loans. Vain men are flattered and given newspaper notoriety. Others are given passes for their families and their friends. Shippers are given advantage in rates over their competitors. The idea is that every legislator shall receive for his vote and influence some compensation which combines the maximum of desirability to him with the minimum of violence to his self-respect. . . . The lobby which represents the railroad companies at legislative sessions is usually the largest, the most sagacious and the most unscrupulous of all. In extreme cases influential constituents of doubtful members are sent for at the last moment to labor with their representatives, and to assure them that the sentiment of their districts is in favor of the measure advocated by the railroads. Telegrams pour in upon the unsuspecting members. Petitions in favor of the proposed measure are also hastily circulated among the more unsophisticated constituents of members sensitive to public opinion, and are then presented to them as an unmistakable indication of the popular will. . . . Another powerful reinforcement of the railroad lobby is not infrequently a subsidized press and its correspondents."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.17

[Quoting Dr. Frank Dixon] "The [rail]roads had it in their power to make and unmake cities, to destroy the business of

individuals, or to force their removal to favored points. The people were quickly up in arms against this policy."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.17

"As were other railroads, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad was built almost wholly with funds granted by State, counties and municipalities."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.17

"Plundered by the original clique, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad went into financial ruin. Notwithstanding the great bounties that it had received, it was in a demoralized condition in 1856, and its treasury was empty."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.17

"With money supplied, the political bosses of Maryland engaged in packing of primaries, indiscriminate bribery of voters and stuffing of ballot boxes, thus insuring the election of subservient officials..."

Having a complete monopoly, they now exacted extortionate charges for transportation, and they likewise increased their profit by cutting the pay of their employees. In desperation, the railroad workers declared a strike in 1877. False reports of the violence of the strikers were immediately dispatched broadcast. Using these charges as a pretext, the military was called out. At Martinsburg, W. Va., the State militia refused to fire upon the strikers, but a company of militia, recruited from a class hostile to the striker, opened fire, killing many of the strikers and wounding others."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"Upon organizing the Central Pacific Railroad Company in 1861, the Huntington group [Leland Stanford, Collis Huntington, Charles Crocker and Mark Hopkins] could not privately raise more than about \$195,000 of which amount they, themselves, put in about \$50,000. This sum, ridiculously inadequate to build a railroad estimated to cost \$25-million was, however, enough and more than enough, for certain well-understood primary operations.

With it expenses could be defrayed at the centers of legislation; petitions and memorials concocted; advocates paid, and newspapers subsidized. If the trick were well turned, a whole succession of franchises, special laws, land grants and money subsidies would follow. Thus we see that the original capital needed in many capitalist enterprises was not for the actual prosecution for the work, but for legislative purposes. In fact, money, as an absolute requirement, could be dispensed with. For their votes, legislators (being wily, tactful and practical men) much preferred cash, but when cash could not be fingered, they conveniently took whatever 'inducements' were offered. We have come across instance after instance which embryo capitalists organized corporations, rolled off stocks and bonds (which cost the expense of engraving only) and used them, in lieu of cash, as payment for legislative votes.

If the average railroad corporation, argued the Pacific quartet, could so easily, by the simple media of bought laws, annex itself to public treasuries, what could not they do? A far more telling and impressive public argument the Huntington group had than most of their fellow railroad promoters. Already 'in the fifties' there was an insistent, genuinely enthusiastic popular demand, reaching almost the proportions of a clamor,

for railroad connections between coast and coast. Upon the strength of this eagerness much bounty and booty could be extracted... Moreover, the popular imagination was captivated and dazzled by the immensity of the undertaking. With prevailing opinion in so favorably an assenting state, matters could be pliantly molded.

Yet while the people, as a whole, were desirous of Pacific railroads, considerable sections of them were by no means reconciled to the corrupt legislative methods of presenting large areas of land and large advances of money for private enrichment.

The farmer, burdened by the price that he had to pay for his small farm, and often blanketed by a mortgage, did not quite approve of the squandering of the public domain for the benefit of a law-created handful of grantees [grantees]. The small traders, resenting the very idea of any class above them, bitterly objected, as a class, to great capitalists being created by virtual edict of law. The alert and organized sections of the working class saw in this constant manipulation of legislative bodies another perversion of governmental power for the aggrandizement of a small and hostile class, and the rapid impetus [driving impetus] to an overshadowing plutocracy [government by the wealthy]. Aware of this general feeling, legislative assemblies had to be 'induced'. They might themselves use fine-sounding and seemingly solid arguments in explaining to constituents; but a very different incentive appealed to them; settlements had to be made in cash or its equivalent.

A more tempting opportune time for spoiliative [plundering] measures than the period of the Civil War could hardly have been found. Engrossed in the tumultuous [disorderly] upheavals of those convulsive years, the people had neither the patience nor disposition to keep close track of routine enactments in Congress or in the [various state] legislatures. At the very beginning of that war, the Huntington group organized the Central Pacific Railroad Company, with a capital stock of \$8.5-million, nearly the whole of which capital was fictitious so far as actual investment of money was concerned. At once, they directed their energies right to the core of things. Huntington betook himself [went] to Washington to lobby in Congress, while Stanford, elected Governor of California, busied himself with similar ends at home. No visionaries were they, but practical men who knew how to proceed straightaway.

Stanford's work quickly bore fruit in California; the city of Sacramento was authorized to donate \$400,000. Placer County to loan \$550,000, and the State of California to hand over \$2.1-million. At the same time, Huntington was doing surpassing missionary duty in Congress. An act was passed in 1862, by which about \$25-million in Government 6% bonds, and about 4.5-million acres of public lands were placed at the disposal of the quartet. The few protests against these great gifts were immediately silenced. 'Is not the Government fully protected?' the promoters innocently inquired. 'Are not its loans covered by a first mortgage? This sounded plausible. Two years later, however... An act was passed doubling the Central Pacific's land grant and relegating the Government's claim on the Central Pacific to the under position of a second mortgage.'

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"Presenting the general results as nearly as official investigations could ascertain them, this is what Huntington and his associates did: They had received hundreds of millions

of dollars in the form of money, bonds and lands from [the national] Government, States, counties and municipalities. As controllers of the Contract and Finance Company and other construction companies, they had turned over to themselves \$142-million in all, for ostensible construction work. They had expended at least \$5-millions for corrupt political purposes. They had stupendously watered the stock of their railroads, and with the cumulative proceeds had secured control of 19 distinct railway system and of steamship lines, also. They had, by fraud, obtained from the Government many millions of acres of land. They had defrauded the Government of the bulk of the funds that it had advanced. They refused to pay more than the merest nominal taxation, and they extorted onerous rates for transportation. [All in the Arab way]

Such was the general summary of their acts as set forth in the report of the Pacific Railroads Commission."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

" 'hardly could the reader of a city daily or a country weekly open his newspaper without finding therein some complaint against railroad management, especially apply to freight charges.' The railroads were 'apt to fix the rates on a given article, [at] all it would bear'. This description applied not only to California, but to every State and Territory reached directly or indirectly by railroads. The very people whose representatives had given public property so lavishly to a few, were robbed in every manner that ingenuity could formulate. Not only was the public plundered; Huntington and his associates ground out their own lesser stockholders by the same methods that Gould and Sage used, and also, like Gould and Sage, they caused losses to a horde of confiding investors." [Quoting Bancroft's History of the Pacific States 19: 564]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"Our land system seems to be mainly formed to facilitate the acquisition of large bodies of land by capitalists or corporation, either as donations, or at nominal prices. . . Numbers who purchased from the State lands sold as swamp or overflowed, find their farms claimed under the railroad grants, and themselves involved in expensive contests before Registers of Land Offices." [Quoting governor H.H. Haight in his 1869 message to the California Legislature]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"The undue political influence and financial control that many corporations have assumed, is not the only evil presented by them. In their internal administration, between majorities and minorities, directors and stockholders, cases of the grossest injustice are constantly arising. It is not uncommon to find one class of stockholders enriching themselves from a company which impoverishes another. . . The organization of corporations within corporations is a refinement of subtlety and fraud which should be positively prevented by law." [Quoting the inaugural address California Governor Newton Booth, December 8, 1871]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"Not one of these messages had any vital [surviving] result. In some instances they were sincere, but, as a rule, there were intended to be nothing more than wordy sops to appease

middle-class public opinion. Some of the very Governors who wrote them with such a display of earnestness were put in power and controlled by the corporations of which they complained. The legislatures were wholly under the domination of the great private corporations, and the Judiciary almost wholly so. Year after year, the different Governors denounced corporate practice, and demanded corrective legislation, which never came. Two and three decades after Governor Newton Booth's denunciation, Governors were still writing similar futile messages.

Acclaimed at first as public benefactors, Huntington and his associates were subjected to the fiercest denunciation when the people realized the enormous frauds that they had committed. For the frauds, of which [only] an epitome [summary] has been here given, were only a portion of the total. It is hardly necessary to plunge into the tortuous mass and maze of detail; how they resorted to nimble [Arab-style] subterfuges to escape their obligations, and defrauded the Government; how they corrupted and ruled States and Territories, and seized hold of one possession after another; and how, through their control of political machinery, they sent Representatives and Senators to Washington as though they were so many errand boys."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"As a United States Senator, [Leland] Stanford's salary was \$5,000 a year. [But] He spent \$75,000 every session. It was a pastime of this man to throw \$20-gold-pieces to the newsboys. His chief business in Washington was to prevent the Government from taking genuine action compelling him and his band to disgorge [give back their stolen property]; to stifle all hostile proceedings, and to get through laws giving more franchises, land, waterways rights and special privileges, and to secure license for [further] extortions. On the whole he succeeded."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"In almost this entire strip of territory, 60 miles wide and 683 miles long, the Southern Pacific Railroad Company was 'the dominating owner of both timber and land. About 71 billion feet of Southern Pacific timber was in Oregon and about 35 billion feet in California."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

"Harriman, as well as other money magnates, remained exempt from prosecution."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.18

[The] "labor organizations had not only become infested with [political] machine politics, but in some of them, the heads used their power to extort money from employers for prompting, or 'calling off' strikes, as the employers' interest required." [Evidently, we must always be on guard that our labor unions do not become corrupted. They should be run as broad democracies just like our governments.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"Many a hired or acquiescent scribe [journalist, writer], plying his trade, reeled out his effusions [heartfelt words]: and the total of these produced a certain settled, aggregate public

opinion which looked up to [J. P. Morgan] with unabated awe and admiration."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"What did he [J.P. Morgan as Arab frontman] not own or control? Scan the conglomeration of properties dominated exclusively by him, or jointly with others. What a bewildering list! The mind is taxed at inventorying them, and forbears enumeration [refrains from listing them all]. Banking institutions and railroads, industrial plants and mines, land, public utility systems and shares, steamships, publishing houses and newspapers—all his, or partly so. Morgan is supereminently one of the 'Christian men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has confided [entrusted] the property interests of the country.'

Let us scrutinize the career of this man whom God was alleged to have chosen as a trustee for the stewardship of the nation's property, and for the guidance of its welfare.

Foulest of all foul blasphemies would it be to interrogate the divine choice of [Brotherly Arab] lieutenants or derogate [detract] from them." [We should re-evaluate our tech titans of today. Lets have an audit of just what they actually did for our nation and for mankind, so we can separate the poser Morgans and Vanderbilts from the actual contributors.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"In the one prolific field of defrauding the Government of customs dues, large private fortunes had already been amassed by the year 1860. In preceding volumes we have given instance after instance, particularly the enormous frauds of Phelps, Dodge & Company. But those instances were only a few of an immense total.

A congressional report in 1850 specified 2,062 different cases of fraudulent undervaluations on the part of nearly as many importers at Boston, Philadelphia, New York and New Orleans. Replying to a resolution of the United States Senate calling for a statement of measures adopted to prevent frauds upon the revenue, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Corwin reported that the honest trader had no opportunity in business. 'All the frauds', he wrote, 'which can be perpetrated by double invoices and false valuations continue without abatement. Honest merchants and fair traders have been driven from the business of importing foreign merchandise, being unable to compete with the dishonest practices that prevail and which our present system favors. . . The means at the disposal of this department are entirely inadequate to such an examination of imports as will effectually suppress the systematic frauds known to be extensively perpetrated'. "

[1] We must be careful that by our imposition of tariffs under a corrupt system that we don't hand the Arabs a near monopoly on trade.

2) The cost of goods should be irrelevant to the duty they must pay.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"considerable testimony showed that the custom-house officials were generally corrupt. The minority report ended by severely denouncing the [importing] firm, and spoke of 'the immense interest which the foreign importers have in breaking down every honest official who stands between them and the Treasury'. The practice on the part of capitalists in causing the removal of honest official who sought to thwart their frauds had been long-prevailing, as we have seen in the cases of John

Jacob Astor and others."

[1] When did this US Customs fraud end?

2) Isn't the hyper-vigilance of US Customs with our tiny suitcases a bit kooky considering that most giant, truck-sized shipping containers enter our nations un-inspected? The reason for the hyper-vigilance is to disguise the the opposite condition with the container shipments.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"If recurring charges are any indication of corruption, the officials of the United States courts were constantly corruptly influenced or bribed to bring no criminal action against men of wealth, or to cause cases finally to be dismissed, if actions were brought. Even slave traders... seem to have bought immunity, and this, too, after the Civil War had begun." [Who would want to bring in slaves after the Civil War had began? Here we imagine a generation of Arab bros posing as slaves who ran-away to join the Union Army.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"In the 15-years before 1860, they were the most notorious manipulators of the New Jersey Legislature. Time after time they lobbied bills through, swayed the elections and the courts, ignored or evaded the laws, and bled the public by an illegal system of transportation charges."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"shoes which were so bad that they could not be sold privately had been palmed off upon Government. But the one equipment which the army most urgently needed was rifles." [The harem Arabs grow up speaking English, but they don't really get the grammar of collective nouns. These are the people who invented the word sabre•tage, blurred into sabotage. sabretage breaks down as s•ab•our•te•ak = not•from•our•you•bro.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.19

"J. Pierpont Morgan's first ascertainable business transaction was in one of these army contracts. And while it was not on so large a scale as those of older capitalists, it was (judged by prevailing capitalist standards) a very able stroke for a young man of 24."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

[footnote quoting the House Select Committee on Government Contracts from the US Civil War. This committee submitted a great amount of testimony and concluded about the frauds committed by war contractors that:]

"Many [military supply] frauds have been exposed... Yet it is a matter of regret that punishment has not been meted out to the basest class of transgressors. They to whom this duty belonged seemed sadly to have neglected it. Worst than traitors in arms are the men pretending loyalty to the flag, who feast and fatten on the misfortune of the nation, while patriot blood is crimsoning the plains of the South, and bodies other countrymen are mouldering in the dust. The leniency of the Government towards these men is a marvel which the present cannot appreciate, and history [can] never explain' —House Reports, Committees and Courts of Claims, Third session, 37th Congress 1862-63, Report No. 50:47— But history can

explain. It was not to be expected that the very class controlling Government—the capitalist class [fronting for the Arabs]—was to be proceeded against by its creature [pet, dog]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

" 'Great is Mr. Morgan's power, greater in some respects even that that of President of kings', wrote a seasoned British observer a quarter of a century ago which fact, patent [obvious] to even the casual onlooker, easily passed un-contradicted.

Could this Morgan be the same who started out by successfully palming off, upon the Government during the Civil War, 5,000 of its own condemned [rejected] rifles, and at extortionate prices? Was it possible that the man who profited from arming the nation's soldiers with self-slaughtering [sabotaged] guns could be the same Morgan whose power later was 'greater than of President of kings'? Was the great, sublime patriot of subsequent times, J. Pierpont Morgan, the same Morgan who came into collision with investigating committees during the Civil War, and who was practically denounced in the severest language? Verily [truthfully], he was the same man, the identical same. Behold him in the budding of his career, and observe how he began it. And behold him in after decades, glutted with wealth and power, covered with honors, august dispenser of benevolence, the incarnate source of all wisdom, financial and otherwise, the mighty man of commerce and of the arts, the idol of capitalist ideals.

Between the Civil War transaction and his later sway, necessarily there lay a long category of deeds. Undisputedly he began his career with proofs of exceptional brilliance. Had his first business achievement—that of the condemned rifles—been judged by the standards of the 'lower classes' [of the Rumi host society], he would have been thrown into prison, or had the soldiers who had to use the guns come within his proximity, the life, peradventure [by chance], might have been shot out of him then and there. But his own class [the Arabs], far from having a remote thought to abhorrence or ostracism, admired his business skill, mettle [strength] and audacity, and regarded him as an extraordinarily promising young man. Great things were predicted for so astute a novice [novice]; yet novice was not the word. The most experienced business man could hardly have done better than did Morgan in the famous rifle sale.

Moreover, Morgan had other advantages which assured a notable future. He had a millionaire father, which was a relationship to be treble prized at a time when millionaire progenitors were not so very numerous. [He was the "native son" of a high-ranking brotherly immigrant.] The paternal advice and guidance, based upon a protracted career in the serpentine channels of wealth getting [Gr. kitting = whaling], could unfailingly be drawn upon. Additionally J. Pierpont Morgan had the backing of the old man's millions and prestige, and—what was more important—would some day inherit those millions. All of these factors were infallibly the prelude to a glorious career" [as an Arab frontman].

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"Had either Gould and Fisk... or Morgan...[or] the other[s], built the Albany & Susquehanna Railroad or provided the funds for its construction?... This line... had been built with public funds drawn from the treasuries of New York State and of various counties and municipalities in that State. At least... \$45-million drained from the public treasury in New York State for the

building of railroads, had gone into the construction of the Albany & Susquehanna Railroad.

The usual pilfering process mark its building. arge sums were stolen in various forms of graft. And as is the case of the Erie Railroad, and other railroads, the State was cheated out of much of its loans. Then the group of capitalists in control watered [down] the the Albany & Susquehanna's stock and manipulated it for speculative purposes until they were ousted by other capitalists who repeated their manipulating methods on a larger scale. This railroad's chief value lay in the fact that it had direct connections with the coal mining regions of Pennsylvania.' "[and this connection with New York could be used to prevent the Arab take-over of the US coal industry, a jacking up of prices, and a shift to petroleum.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"so long as the legal contest was confine to the New York City courts, Gould and Fisk had the surety [were certain] of victory. The reason was that such Supreme Court judges as Barnard and Cardozo, formerly Vanderbilt's tools, were now Gould's chattels and did whatever he ordered."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"After spending a million dollars of public money on its [a railroad's] construction, the people were forced to look on while the two parties, neither of whom had invested a dollar in its building, claimed to be its owners, and estopped [legally stopped] the other with judicial orders and injunctions."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"In New York City, with their bought judges on hand, they could arrange for decisions in advance, but in Rochester they were in a territory where the power of competitive magnates was strongly entrenched [entrenched]."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

[footnote] "Under the surface, the Rothschilds long had a powerful influence in dictating American financial laws. The law records show that they were powers in the old Bank of the United States. August Belmont and Company were their American representatives. In 1873, it was estimated that \$375-million of American railroad securities were held abroad, chiefly by foreign bankers. The Final Report of the Industrial Commission in 1902 estimated (see page 404 of that report) the amount of these securities held by foreign banking houses and others abroad at about \$3.1-billion." [In 3.7 above, we read that "By...1893 the Vanderbilt system embraced at least 12,000 miles of railways, with a capitalized value of several hundred million dollars, and a total gross earning power of more than \$60-million a year. This makes it look like the US railroad industry was substantially owned and controlled by foreigners.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"the extraordinary financial laws passed during the Civil War were only the forerunners of other laws which the bankers and the creditor class in general caused to be passed in following years, and by which they instantly and vastly increased their wealth and power, and were enabled far more effectually than ever before to put the screws upon the producing class [of the

host society].

The most noted of these laws was that passed by Congress on February 12, 1873, practically accomplishing the demonetization of silver as a coin. [The US was just so rich in silver. Here we see the power of the Arabs to corrupt our government.] This was the same [totally corrupt] Congress which, as we have seen in one of the chapters on the Sage fortune, was bribed with a million dollars to pass an act granting an additional subsidy of \$5-million to the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. The demonetization act went through by evasion. Not a word was directly mentioned in it of the demonetization of silver. [Here we see once again, how important it is for Democracies to write their own laws] Few knew of its purport. [and] Even the advocates of bi-metalism voted for it. It was one of the most adroit [cleaver, skillful] bills ever put through Congress, and it was only after it had become a law that its concealed provisions came to public attention.

Then a terrific cry of rage went up from the middle class from one end of the country to the other. The excitement was intense. In this excitement and indignation, the working class was persuaded into joining, although at basis, the workers were not affected by this law; their exploitation and despoilment had gone on under bi-metalism, and would continue without cessation under mono-metalism.

It was the middle class which was struck at hard. The supply of money was at once contracted. The purchasing power of gold [which the Arabs controlled] was enhanced, and the power of the large creditor capitalists and banking institutions over the small property owning class was greatly augmented. This law was passed at about the same time that the first trust, the Standard Oil Company, was rising to give the death blow to the doctrine of free competition in trade, and to crush out the middleman in business. The day was a sorry one for the long dominant middle class.

The middle class representatives in Congress and elsewhere now began an agitation which lasted many year. They charged that the demonetization of silver had been brought about by the conspiracy of John Sherman and a few other prominent men in Congress, with the financiers of Wall street and Europe. In fact, the successive volumes of the "Congressional Record" of those years were full of speeches in which this charge was brought out over and over again. But the law stood. And what was more galling to the middle class, John Sherman, denounced so bitterly as a traitor, and as a mercenary of the bankers, was appointed, a few years later, to be Secretary of the United States Treasury. From that time on, the bankers, national and international, came out more and more in the open in direct dictatorship of the financial laws and policy of the United States. Circumlocution became less necessary."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"The great Government bond issue of 1877, by which the bankers made colossal profits followed Sherman's appointment...

Morgan... began to be conspicuous in very large transactions. One of these was the floating of the \$260-million U.S. Government bond issue of 1877. Avoiding plunging into detail, which would be intricate at best, suffice it to say that this bond issue was generally regarded, and not without full reason, as one of the very worst cases that had ever been known of the people being betrayed over to [betrayed over to] a few bankers. The selling of the bonds was apportioned among these banking houses: August Belmont, the

Rothschilds, J. and W. Seligman Brothers, and Drexel, Morgan & Company, the last named acting for themselves and for the firm of J. S. Morgan & Company in London. This syndicate at once sold the bonds at an advance from 1% to 4% above the price which they had paid to the Government. The profits of the syndicate reached into the tens of millions of dollars. Drexel, Morgan & Company alone were credited with "Making" a clear profit of \$5-million. Their function consisted in nothing more or less than acting as licensed speculative middlemen for a Government which could have disposed of the bonds without intermediaries. Moreover, the participating bankers were able to get the bonds for themselves at "bargain prices", and then through associated national banks, carry on the familiar practice of exacting double interest—one interest from the Government, and another for the use of the currency issued on the basis of those same bonds."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"The motto of the whole commercial class was to keep the public in the dark as much as possible. And even when the usual legislative investigating committees, fortified by summary powers of law, mildly sought to ascertain the surface facts only, without probing too deep, they were, as a rule, obstructed at every turn.

Such facts as did become public came out adventitiously [by chance] despite every effort of the magnates concerned to hush them up. Sometimes embittered competitors would supply revelation to investigating committees."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"It was a period when the middle class was most active in having all sorts of anti-trust [anti-monopoly] legislation passed. The class was obdurately [stubbornly] determined to keep things as they were. On the other hand, the great magnates, in line with the momentum of modern economic forces were being forced into effacing [eliminating] the middleman in every direction and centralizing ownership [under a few giant industry controlling corporations like Exxon, Chevron, GE, Boeing, Phelps Dodge, USSteel, Sears, Walmart, Apple, and Google.] The middle class had the number[s] and the traditions; the magnates had the money and the power. As for the working class, despite its strikes, it was merely, in the long run, a pawn in the combat. The Standard Oil Company had built up its power largely by reason of the secret railroad rebates and discriminations. [3rd mention, therefore it is probably a lie] If a drastic law could be passed against the railroads, the middle class argued, the rising trusts would receive a fatal quietus [death]—a futile kind of reasoning, but one sincerely believed in at the time and for a long time afterward. The great aim of the middle class therefore, was to get through congress a strict interstate commerce law, such as would, under heavy penalties, forbid rebate giving and railroad pooling.

The Congressional sessions of 1884, 1885, and 1886 were, to a great extent, occupied with long debates over this proposed law. The middle class was quite sure that it was the victor. Senator followed Senator, Representative followed Representative, in arrainging [bringing charges against] the railroad magnates. If speeches signified anything these magnates were already on the highroad to defeat and to prison...

...the railroads had issued \$3-billion of bogus bonds, and that they were assessing the people of the United States

to pay an actual taxation of \$300-million yearly. More than one Senator and Representative dwelt indignantly upon that \$300-million of annual enforced taxation extorted by the railroads. And so the debate went warily [mistrustfully] on, tiring out everyone but the talkers themselves, whose stock-in-trade was talk. Would the flow of words never end?

At last an interstate commerce law was passed. Great was the rejoicing among the middle class. Its components exulted [jumped for joy] in their victory, and in visions foresaw their dominance soon restored and the trusts [Arab monopolies] ruined and extinguished.

But after a comparatively brief interval their jubilation became blank dismay. This law, this great, long-agitated-for-law, which was to intrench them so effectively, turned out to be an utter sham. On its surface its provisions read fair and smooth. But when it went to the courts, the perforating began, as its authors intended, and for which contingency they had expressly and equivocally drafted it. Once clause after another was, on this or that ground, declared inoperative by the courts. The interstate Commerce Commission, which the law established, had not even the power, it was decided, to compel the attendance of witnesses, and the courts refused to grant writs of subpoena in aid of its proceedings. Furthermore, railroad officials (who were the only persons whose testimony could secure a conviction) were excused from testifying on the ground that by so doing they might incriminate themselves. In a word, the Interstate Commerce Commission, on the establishment of which as a peremptory tribunal the middle class had built such high hopes, was found to be nothing more than an inane [silly, foolish] body which was allowed to devote itself to the harmless pastime of collecting statistics, but was empowered to do nothing more serious.

Again the bewildered middle class found itself woefully routed. While it had been holding meetings and talkings and petitioning, the magnates had sent a stream of 'silent arguments' [bribes] coursing through the exalted wall of Congress. And, in fact, some of the very members of Congress who were so vigorously inveighing [denouncing] against the 'high handed' corruption of the railroad magnates, and demanding punitive laws, were, at this very time, themselves implicated in a great scandal."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.20

"The word 'Trust' be it noted, as signifying a complete monopoly, had not then come into popular usage. [Pay attention. Here we see the true meaning of anti-trust laws. We also see the Arabs struggling to cover up the true meaning of that term.] Those virtuous outbursts in Congress against the monopolies, served the purpose well, but one overshadowing fact neither the middle class nor the working class seemed to note [notice], namely, that whatever might be said in Congress, nearly every bill apparently drawn to curtail the power of monopolies and wealth was so ingeniously drafted that its so-called vital provisions failed to stand the test of the courts. Yet the lawyers in Congress who drew these bills were ranked as the foremost 'Constitutional experts' in the land—a situation not at all contradictory to those who understood the double-faced [two-faced] nature of the [theater] performances at [in] Washington."

[what a grand illusion.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"A restless, sullen state of mind pervaded the mass of people. Distrustful of any assertions made by the magnates, they were ever ready to see sinister projects beneath bland announcements. Furthermore the magnates' definition of 'reasonable' was diametrically different from that of the people at large."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"At the behest of popular forces, laws directed, superficially at least, against the magnates' arbitrary power and concentration of resources were everywhere being passed."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"the work of extinguishing the smaller capitalist class had to be proceeded with slowly and discreetly."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"Workers' uprisings, political or other, could be crushed by force and court decrees and by bribery and fraud at the polls."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"Although comprising the immense bulk of the voters, the workers had not a single real representative in political office. But the interests of the middle groups were represented by thousands of newspapers and journals; by a host of political spokesmen and lawyers and college professors, and by the force of prevalent law and commercial institutions." [But no congressmen, only the Arab fronting giants had access to government.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"all of the large cattle ranches had been obtained by fraud in more or less degree. The cattlemen not only practiced extortions, but in their economic wars with adjacent cattlemen, forced their cowboys to fight and kill the cowboys of their neighbors, and risk being killed themselves. Nearly all of those cowboy affrays [fighting in public] so romantically described in fiction, arose from nothing more or less than economic disputes between competing rival master cattlemen."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"No doubt [J.P.] Morgan's personality had much to do with this current hatred on the part of those who came into contact with him. He was at no time to be suspected of being of the unctuous [ingratiating, flattering] order of men, full of blandishments [flatteries] and sweetened guile [cunning]. Rather, he was a sort of plug-ugly [thug] in the financial purloins [surroundings], belligerent and ruthless, with a rough, dictatorial manner, unsparing of the feelings or interests of those who in any way crossed his will or plans."

Those personal details, however, were not known to the great mass of the people the country over. The popular conception of men in public notice [in the public eye] was derived almost wholly from what the newspapers said, and these constantly, with rare departures, portrayed Morgan as a great financier and benevolent gentleman. In Morgan's financial transactions, immense numbers of people lost, in the

aggregate, great sums of money torn from them in the stockjobbing operations in Wall street. But [then as today] they did not blame Morgan personally. Their bitterness was cast at the generic monster called Wall Street."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"Morgan and Vanderbilt were then able to assault and beat down the price of Reading [Railroad] stock, buy large quantities of it at a very low figure, and gain control of the system. As a railroad, the Reading line was not extensive. Its great value lay in its ownership of anthracite coal mines, of vast un-mined deposits, and in its coal-carrying traffic.

To his manifold powers Morgan now added that of coal magnate. [Now the] Constitution of Pennsylvania, as we have seen, expressly forbade railroad corporations from owning and operating coal mines. But that law did not exist which the very rich were not able to evade. Dummy holding companies were organized; and, although everybody knew that these companies were mere subterfuges [deceptions], the public authorities took no action... [then finally] after many years of inactivity, they, with indifferent [apathetic] energy brought suit. The case was appealed by the magnates to the Supreme Court of the United States, from which, in 1909, the railroads emerged victorious with a decision of so equivocal [uncertain] a nature as to be tantamount [equal] to one in their favor."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"Two immediate results signaled Morgan's entry as a monarch of the coal fields... Every householder using hard coal was taxed to add more millions to Morgan's fortune. The price of stove coal was raised from \$1.25 to \$1.35 more a ton than had been charged before. The second result was the rapid process of crushing out the independent coal operators. By a concatenation [series of events] ruthless methods these independents were ruined and driven out, not without much wailing against oppression, and shrill [loud, but sh•our•ill = no•us•ill] charges of fraud."

Yet the very mines which they were virtually coerced into giving up had been secured by fraud, either by them or by their predecessors. The law records of the State of Pennsylvania reveal case after case... of fraudulent tax sales of lands containing coal; and the bribery of the Pennsylvania Legislature by individuals and corporations for coal mining and other kinds of charters and special rights"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"Some excuse was needed to give the appearance of a necessity for the great increase in the price of coal. The coal magnates supplied it beforehand. They inquired [asked] have they could avoid charging more. Had not the production of coal fallen? And were not the freight rates extremely high? But the Government Knew that these claims were fabrications. The House Committee on Interstate Commerce had unanimously reported that the coal magnates had deliberately reduced the output of coal, that although the capacity of the collieries was 50-million tons a year, yet only about 40-million tons were being mined, so as to make a show of scarcity. And as regards freight rates for coal, the committee reported, 'Although coal in freight can be handled cheaper than almost any class of freight, yet it pays nearly double the rate of wheat and cotton'. [Clearly the empire taxed different goods at different rates in its

rebellious American colony.]

Without quibble, [public opinion held that] this combination was a conspiracy, criminally and civilly liable. But neither National or State law was enforced against it. The House Committee reported that the Interstate Commerce Act was too ineffective a law to proceed under, and that ended talk of criminal prosecution. The Government machinery of the United States practically became (as it did in so many other instances) an accessory of the coal combination in allowing it to squeeze more huge extortions from the sufferings of the mass of the people.

The boasted Government 'of, for and by the people', was a Government run wholly by the great propertied interests... [For them it was] a necessary appendage, based upon force, for compelling the people to submit [to Islam and Ishtar] without redress or quarter. Such operations as this explain how Morgan's fortune leaped by millions at a time. Every dollar extorted in that increase of price [for fuel] came very largely from families who, already burdened by a thousand and one extortions, were forced to suffer still more keenly. Each new compression from above drove them deeper into abject poverty, with all its demoralizing and horrible evils [like prostitution and a willingness to do horrible things for Ishtar]. The whole edifice of capitalism was built on a vast, ghastly charnel house [human butcher shop], overcrowded with the bones of numberless victims."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.21

"As gold was the international trade standard of value, the United States Government followed the policy of holding a certain amount as a treasury reserve. When... this reserve was depleted, the Government was compelled to issue bonds to replenish it.

The ...leading... bankers... forced the United States Government to put out these bond issues. This they did by draining the treasury of its gold, and by then going through the empty [but quite profitable] form of selling back that gold in return for bonds.

The treasury notes, comprising much of the currency of the United States Government, were redeemable in coin. This provision was construed as calling for payment in gold. The bankers would take over to the sub-treasury in New York City great stacks of treasury notes and exchange them for gold. This gold they would then hoard in their vaults. [until such time as they would sell it back to government at a premium.]...

In 1894, the Government had been drawn into handing over two bond issues of \$50-million each to these bankers. Their profits, it is estimated reached tens of millions. With the advent of the year 1895, the United States Treasury was again emptied of gold. Where had the gold, which the Government had purchased only a short time previously at usurious rates, gone?... President Cleveland was reported as saying privately that 'the banks had got the country by the throat'

At the appropriate moment a syndicate of bankers appeared in the open and magnanimously offered to supply gold to the Government in exchange for bonds. This syndicate was composed of J.P. Morgan & Company, August Belmont & Company, representing the Rothschilds; James Speyer, the National City Bank and four other extremely powerful national banks...

The syndicate had squeezed the United States Treasury of its gold. It had then compelled a bond issue, and declared that it alone could supply the required gold...

Cleveland... turned over the \$62-million of 4% bonds to the Morgan syndicate at a price of 104. The syndicate immediately resold the bonds to investors in America and Europe at 118, 119 and 120 clearing, it was estimated, in direct profits, about \$18-million. This sum represented the sum that would have gone to the Government had the sale of bonds been accomplished without this intermediary operation...

To realize, however, the full import of the action of the Government in this particular bond sale, by which a present of fully \$18-million was made to a few bankers already surfeited with wealth, it is necessary to recall the conditions among the mass of people, especially after the panic of 1893. In normal times, according to the estimate of Carroll D. Wright, for some years United States Labor Commissioner, the number of unemployed at any one time was about 1-million men, women and children. After the panic of 1893, the number reached perhaps 3-million. Not a finger was lifted by the Government in the aid of any of these, nor was the remotest consideration given to means for alleviating this misery or to the causes producing it. Repressive measures were used to suppress street meetings of protest, and leaders of labor unions were flung into prison on the alleged charge of contempt of the Federal courts. Only the year before, in 1894, the regular army had been ordered out by Cleveland against the railroad workmen on strike. Nowhere and in no respect did Government do other than carry out the demands made by the great capitalist who dominated all of its functions."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.22

"With the advent of the year 1898, an epochal movement for the consolidation and centralized ownership of transportation systems, industries, public utility plants and mines set in. The trust era was now in irresistible swing. After a warfare of nearly 30-years, in the courts and in the active political and industrial arena, the middle groups found themselves completely frustrated."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.22

"The middle groups looked on impotently while factories, railroads, gas and electric plants, street railway lines, telephone systems and mines were converted from a state of individual or more corporate ownership into the trust form, owned by great single corporations with stupendous amounts of capital, and with dictatorship over vast masses of workingmen."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.22

"the most remarkable [thing]...was the ease with which the great moneyed interests traded on the shortsighted cupidity [greed] of the middle groups. With the naive expectation that the magnates would fraternally and benevolently create riches for them, the middle group poured collective wealth into their schemes, only again and again to find that wealth wrenched from themselves." [That last underlined part is to make it clear who was saying this.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.22

"Even while opponents of the trusts were gleefully praising the Supreme Court of the United States as 'the bulwark of freedom of trade', the trusts caused Congress to enact a law which knocked over the main prop upon which the anti-trust forces

had been depending in their war upon the great centralized corporations.

For more than a decade, trust organizers had been confronted with a national law decreeing fine or imprisonment or both upon conviction for engaging in any act in restraint of trade. [However,] None had gone to prison... [and] controlling the deciding [decision-making] functions of government, as they did, was there any prospect of the visitation of such a punishment. [?] But the imprisonment clause was a constant irritant. Why have it on the statute books when it could easily be obliterated? A solitary provision calling for a fine in case of conviction, the magnates did not mind at all. It would give an appearance of deferring to public sentiment and, at the same time, could be lightly regarded by those at whom it was directed. When trust magnates were gathering in immense sums from illicit acts, what did a fine of a few thousand dollars matter? It was too trivial to bother over. Besides, even if the fine, by some extraordinary possibility were made heavy, it could be assessed, in turn, upon the consumer.

That annoying imprisonment clause, however, had to be thrown out of the laws, and it deviously was by an act passed by Congress in 1903. Concurrently, the same act reasserted and amplified the principle of granting immunity to trust officers. No matter how much or how often they violated the anti-trust laws, they were now absolutely secure from any possibility of prison sentence.

The Government might examine them with the greatest pretended inquisitiveness, and in the process draw out the most self-incriminating admissions, but this evidence as testimony could not, by the act of 1903, be used against them in the trial of any criminal proceeding. Not only was the individual exempted; the corporation itself was distinctly relieved from prosecution for any penalty or forfeiture.

The triumph of the trusts was now intrinsically complete."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"President Theodore Roosevelt begged campaign funds from the very trust magnates whom he pretended to flout. How in a critical moment in the national election of 1904, he so despaired of success that he was forced to appeal to [J.p.] Morgan, Harriman and their fellow magnates for a fresh and immediate infusion of funds...

Theodore Roosevelt, despite his pretenses, was pliable to the purposes of the trust magnates, which fact was connoted [suggested] anew by the circumstance that he was the President who signed the act striking out the imprisonment clause from the anti-rebating act assuring magnates and corporations full immunity from criminal prosecution."

Theodore Roosevelt, US president, 1901-09

"Behind the ostensible government sits enthroned an invisible government owing no allegiance and acknowledging no responsibility to the people."

Theodore Roosevelt's speech on trusts 1901.12.03

"There is a widespread conviction in the minds of the American people that the great corporations known as trusts [monopolies] are in certain of their features and tendencies hurtful to the general welfare. This springs from no spirit of envy or uncharitableness, nor lack of pride in the great industrial achievements that have placed this country at the head of the nations struggling for commercial supremacy. It does not rest upon a lack of intelligent appreciation of the

necessity of meeting changing and changed conditions of trade with new methods, nor upon ignorance of the fact that combination of capital in the effort to accomplish great things is necessary when the world's progress demands that great things be done. It is based upon sincere conviction that combination and concentration should be, not prohibited, but supervised and within reasonable limits controlled; and in my judgment this conviction is right. [This is the talk of the Arabs seeking to maintain their highly profitable monopolies like Standard Oil as long as possible. The correct path is to smother these entities, leaving their citizen shareholders all with their fair share of the former company's component parts.]

It is no limitation upon property rights or freedom of contract to require that when men receive from Government the privilege of doing business under corporate form, (which frees them from individual responsibility, and enable them to call into their enterprises the capital of the public), they shall do so upon absolutely truthful representations as to their value of the property in which the capital is to be invested. Corporations engaged in interstate commerce should be regulated if they are found to exercise a license working to the public injury. It should be as much the aim of those who seek social-betterment to rid the business world of crimes of cunning as to rid the entire body politic of crimes of violence. Great corporations exist only because they are created and safeguarded by our [nation's] institutions. And it is therefore our right and our duty to see that they work in harmony with these institutions.

The first essential in determining how to deal with the great industrial combinations is knowledge of the facts - publicity. In the interest of the public, the Government should have the right to inspect and examine the workings of the great corporations engaged in interstate business. Publicity [public knowledge of their activities] is the only sure remedy which we can now invoke. What further remedies are needed in the way of governmental regulation, or taxation, can only be determined after publicity has been obtained, by process of law, and in the course of administration...

The large corporations, commonly called trusts [monopolies], though organized in one State, always do business in many States... and as no State has any exclusive interest in or power over their acts. It has in practice proved impossible to get adequate regulation through State action. Therefore, in the interest of the whole people, the nation should, without interfering with the power of the States in the matter itself, also assume power of supervision and regulation over all corporations doing an interstate business. This is especially true where the corporation derives a portion of its wealth from the existence of some monopolistic element or tendency in its business. There would be no hardship in such supervision. Banks are subject to it, and in their case it is now accepted as a simple matter of course. Indeed, it is probable that supervision of corporations by the National Government need not go so far as is now the case with the supervision exercised over them by so conservative a State as Massachusetts, in order to produce excellent results."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"Great is Mr. Morgan's power, greater in some respects even than that of Presidents or Kings."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"even the outward acts of officialdom were being made to

conform to the interests of the ruling class was shown by the growing tendency to accept some trusts as 'good' and so arraign others as 'bad', although all trusts subsisted in violation of statute law."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"Morgan's lofty, surmounting [unsurpassed] status as this time did not arise from any misconception that he was the richest man in the United States. That prepotency [preeminence] John D. Rockefeller could easily claim and hold. But Morgan was so unceasingly before the public in some activity other, and was so preeminently conspicuous in the organization of railroad combinations and industrial trusts, that, considering all aspects, he was looked upon as perhaps the most important of the magnates.

This was a popular deception, and was caused by the difference in tacts between Morgan and the Standard Oil oligarchy. The Rockefellers and their associates systematically discouraged publicity as to their business transactions. In all of their operations they cultivated the profoundest secrecy and took exceeding pains not to acquaint the people with the real extent of their possessions. Nor [were they open] with the methods by which they were gradually drawing into their ownership the resources of not only one nation, but many nations. Working through auxiliaries or intermediaries they were converting much of the United States with its assets, including human labor, into their private property. But so surreptitiously was this done that they allowed no mention of their conquests to be either formally or informally given out. The Standard Oil headquarters was an inaccessible citadel of silence.

On the other hand, Morgan seemed to glory in the ostentation of publicity..."

[1] One Arab front man helps draw attention away from the other ones.

2) Look at how secretive Exxon was when it was Standard Oil, before the US government broke it into 34 parts.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"Moody wrote that in 1902, he [J.P. Morgan, the Arab frontman] was 'identified with' 55,000 miles of railroad. 'These', Moody explained, 'control rights of way, coal lands, terminals, competing lines, steamship connections and the like'."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"even bribery, like industry, became systematized and modernized. In the process, delicate externals were preserved. To ledger bribery funds as corruption money was a gross shock to fastidious taste, and was inexcusably unbusinesslike. Hence, so the committee reported, bribery expenditures were classified as 'legal expenses'. The committee described them as extraordinarily large. The Mutual [an insurance company], in 1904, disbursed \$364,255; the Equitable [insurance company] \$172,698, and the New York, with Morgan's partner, Perkins, practically in command, \$204,019. This, according to the simple rules of arithmetic, made a total of more than \$750,000 spent in one year, in the corrupting of legislatures, administrative officials and certain newspaper writers. These 'legal expenses', the committee redundantly wrote, were 'far in excess of the amounts required for legitimate purposes'.

For what were these corruption funds employed? To

get laws under which great [Arab] frauds could be carried on, and to prevent the passage of laws interfering with the [Arab] graft. And who were the immediate distributors of the funds? Trained, circumspect lobbyists, thoroughly experienced in the business of knowing who, when and where to bribe. They were never stinted for money...

But the corruption neither began nor ended with the buying of legislative votes or of administrative connivance. Over and above the politicians in office were the bosses in control of the machinery of both the Republican and the Democratic parties. Those party machines could command the votes; and the orders of the men at the head called for submission [submission] by the underling politicians. Refusal brought discipline and retirement. By controlling the secret workings of the party organizations, the magnates virtually controlled the platforms of those parties, their nominees, and the general course of the men elected to office.

For one more proof of this, another dip into the report of that celebrated insurance investigating committee of 1905 will suffice. 'The insurance companies, it reported, 'regularly contributed large sums to the campaign funds of both the Republican and the Democratic parties'. [the right hand and the left hand of the Arabs.] This was no exceptional act, however [in fact]; it was the conventional order of the day; all of the great corporations did likewise. Had not Jay Gould, thirty-odd years before, explained the method? And had not other capitalists long antecedent to Jay Gould shown how efficacious it was? A present of nearly \$50,000 was contributed in 1894 by the New York Life Insurance Company to the campaign fund of the Republican National Committee, and similar amounts in 1896 and in 1900 for the same purpose. All of the large insurance companies gave contributions, not only for national political campaigns, but also for those in the States. It was found impossible to trace all of the directions of this continuous corruption. 'Enormous sums', the committee stated, 'have been expended in a surreptitious manner'.

The immense sums thus spent in political corruption were taken from the proceeds of the policy holders. With this money, mounting into millions of dollars, the magnates [fronting for the Arabs] bought their way into every State legislature in the Union. They purchased a way for themselves or for their allies into the United States Senate. And they carried their demands into both the Republican and the Democratic parties. An arraignment [arrangement] more destructive to the existing arrangement of society could not be found than was contained in the facts (and they were by no means, all of the facts) reported by that committee. The substantial conclusion was, although not set forth in so many plain words, that the administrative officials, the legislatures, Congress, the courts and the old political parties were controlled and dominated by groups of unparalleled frauds and pirates. For the sums diverted to insure this political control were only a tithe of the aggregate stupendous thefts."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"The directors or swayers of those insurance companies comprised some of the most super-eminent magnates and exalted philanthropists in the United States....

Throughout the United States the insurance disclosures... the vast, long-continuing corruptions and frauds —had called for a frenzied demand at first that the guilty be rushed to trial and imprisoned.

But that demand, if carried out, would have entailed a unique and unprecedented situation. Should all of the guilty be

jailed, or even a number of them, the nation would have been deprived of many of its foremost magnates, its greatest philanthropists, its most exemplary patriots. How could society have survived such a loss? According to orthodox teachings, these men were imperative to the proper administration, and the well being, of the whole social and industrial system. Incarcerate the great magnates, philanthropists and patriots, even though they were also the greatest plunderers? The though was impossible.

No fear of prison, however, need have been entertained by the implicated. Had not many an investigation been held before, decade after decade, almost year after year, sometimes several investigations in a single year? Had any of the rich culprits disclosed in those investigations ever gone to prison? What ground was there for supposing that this investigation would result any differently? In a society ruled by monarchy, what were courts for but to be used as a minatory instrument for enforcing the law, made by the rich, against the propertyless? What were judges for except to construe that law as the magnates who put them on the bench demanded that it be construed?"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.23

"One of the most remarkable, and at the same time most generally fruitless, features of American political life in the 19th century and later was the frequency of these official investigations. Survey the archives and you will be bewildered by their number and continuity, extant in the form of printed testimony and reports.

These were not investigations made by a hostile officialdom, but by governing authorities, either representing the very capitalistic interests investigated, or favorable to the existing order. The numerous investigations could, therefore, be accepted as those of capitalist society disclosing itself. Every one of them revealed the same story of fraud, corruption and theft, from which not a single line of business was exempt. The stupendous extent of the incessant and deliberate lying carried on by capitalist expositors could at cone be seen by comparing their fulsome accounts of capitalists and of the capitalistic system with the facts perpetuated in the reports."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"While the effusions [outpourings] of the "popular writers" were wending [winding] the rounds of the country, a recalcitrant [having an obstinately uncooperative attitude toward authority or discipline] United States Senator was boring the august Senate of the United States with a long, tiresome speech. The bulk of the august Senate did not care to hear what this Senator, one La Follette of Wisconsin, had to say, but were compelled to by the rules. The Senate of the United States was most sensitively jealous of its prestige and dignity. Most of its members a that time were multimillionaires. La Follette lacked that highly important qualification. Still more, he was painfully deficient in cast in another respect. He had not bought his way into the Senate of the United States, thereby outraging one of its most sacred canons. Hence he could give no real test of standing or any guarantee of wise, conservative statesmanship.

But the majority of his colleagues had good reason to be impatient of La Follette's speech. His was a voice from the past. They represented the newer order, that of centralized [Arab-fronting] industry, and a Government run directly by the magnates themselves. He was a relic of the old creed, that of

the age of competition in industry.

For four long days, March 17, 19, 24, and 29, 1908, he delivered his lugubrious [mournful] wail. 'In their strife for more money, more power—more power, more money', he explained in describing the great magnates, 'there is no time for thought, for reflection. Government, society and the individual are swallowed up in the struggle for greater control'. Thus he stumbled through mazes of facts the purport and interpretation of which he did not understand. Neither did he comprehend the fundamental fact that commercial upheavals are not the work of individuals, but of the whole capitalist system. That certain powerful individuals or interests could accelerate or retard them, but could not be held responsible for their causation. According to him, a crowd of conspirators, headed by the Standard Oil Company and [J.P.] Morgan had deliberately brought on the panic [of 1907]. He fulminated against them and denounced them as arch criminals.

Amid his accusations, lamentations and platitudes Senator La Follette embodied certain facts of real historical value—facts confirmed by the records of what actually took place, and familiar to all close observers of events during the panic.

The panic of 1907, like previous panics, supplied the propitious opportunity to the great magnates to crush out lesser magnates and seize the control of their property.

The requirements of industrial centralization demanded the effacement of certain minor magnate groups which, from the point of view of the great magnates, had possessed themselves of a rather dangerous degree of industrial and financial power. These ambitious little magnates had imitated the methods of the great. They had combined fraudulent financial manipulation with the oppressive exercise of political power, and thereby had tricked or forced out the owners of various properties, and had then vested the ownership of those properties in themselves."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"In its investigation of the administration of New York City, the 'Mazet Committee'—an investigating body appointed by the Legislature in 1899—exposed the conspiracy between the Ice Trust, on one hand, and, on the other, the Dock and other municipal departments, to create and maintain a monopoly of New York's ice supply...

The result was a noticeably great increase in the rate of mortality among the children of the poor. Large numbers of families, living on the most precarious edge of destitution, could not afford to pay the extra five cents demanded for a piece of ice. The milk soured and acted like poison on the children. The increasing number of deaths in successive summers...

In the depths of winter the price of coal was always raised to an exorbitant point....

The more profits that he made, the more of a financial genius he was accounted by his class, and by all who were influenced by the standards of that class. As soon as Morse proved that he could exact immense profits, he was hailed as a foremost and very successful capitalist."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"the grasping of the properties of the ousted combination were not the only seizures during those harvest days of the panic of 1907."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"By June, 1908, it was conservatively estimated that perhaps 5-million workers in the United States were out of work, and could get none. Reports from the charity organizations in every city showed that the cities were overcrowded with the homeless and unemployed. Destitution was rife, and cases of starvation of men, women and children, were more frequent than the official reports dared reveal. The jails throughout the country were crowded with men who, thrown out of work, were adjudged vagrants and sentenced. Many of the homeless voluntarily committed some breach of the law in order to be sent to jail. There, at least, shelter and food could be obtained. Many towns adopted the plan of deliberately driving out the unemployed. Everywhere crime increased. Driven to [by] absolute necessity, many workers stole, and, of course, were dispatched to prison. The Social Ethical League, of New York City, reported that crime had increased 50%, within six months.

With destitution and starvation everywhere, what did the Government, whether National, State, or city, do for the unemployed? Nothing except to club and terrorize them when they presumed to hold street meetings to plead for the right to work.

In the whole sphere of government, there was not a single real representative of the workers to speak or act for the workers. The Government was a Government elected largely by the votes of millions of working men, yet the working class did not have a single mouthpiece in that Government."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"The panic of 1907 smashed lesser fortunes right and left, but Morgan [like a typical Arab frontman] emerged with far greater possessions."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"The lives of millions of wage earners are therefore subject to the dictation of a relatively small number of men. These industrial dictators for the most are totally unconcerned with regard to the working and living conditions of the employees in those industries."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"the United States Steel Corporation... During the World War [WWI] its profits... rose... from 11% in 1913, to 48.46% in 1916... Even after payment of Federal income and excess profit taxes, the United States Steel Corporation had, in 1917, a net income of \$245-million remaining from its total revenue of \$478-million."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"To return, however, to the committee's report on concentration of financial control: It itemized the numerous bank, railroad, industrial corporation affiliations of the National City Bank in which J.P. Morgan & Company were large stockholders. It then gave the combined power of J.P. Morgan & Company, the First National Bank and the National City Bank. By their own known resources and through interlocking directorates and in other ways, this group controlled resources of 2,104,000,000. The members of the firm of J.P. Morgan & Company held, in all, 72 directorships in 47 of the greater corporations. Morgan [thus] stood forth unquestionably as the supreme dictator of

cashdom. His entire life had been devoted to the handling and amassing of money.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"In the year following Morgan's death, came disclosures of the enormities in the mishandling of the finances of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company which the elder Morgan had dominated. Relatively small individual investments in this line were widely held in New England. In 1910, when the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad was allowed to merge with the Boston & Maine Railroad and acquire interurban street car lines operated by trolley, many of these investors felt deep concern as to the ways in which funds were being used. Curtis Guild, Jr., former Governor of Massachusetts, declared that repeatedly there had been evasion of a Massachusetts law forbidding a steam railroad operating in that state from acquiring trolley lines operating there...

Later came charges of enormous looting in the affairs of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. In introducing a resolution in the United States Senate instructing the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate, Senator Norris of Nebraska, on February 3, 1914, urged: 'We should have the whole truth about the robberies that have taken place in the past'... Senator Norris referred 'to the depredations of a lot of pirates', and pointed out that the railroad's stock, formerly selling as high as \$200 a share... was at this time down to less than 50 cents on the dollar. Where had vast sums of money gone?...

The Commission had to burrow its way through the affairs of more than 300 subsidiary corporations of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad system. These corporations, the Commission report stated, 'were in a web of entangling alliances with each other, many of which were seemingly planned, created and manipulated by lawyers expressly retained for the purpose of concealment or deception'.

Its research into the financial workings of this railroad system, the Commission reported, had disclosed [discovered] 'one of the most glaring instances of maladministration [mismanagement] revealed in all of the history of American railroading'. Many instances were uncovered of outright violations of law in different States, and 'the great losses and most costly blunders were made in attempting to circumvent government regulation and to extend its domination beyond the limits fixed by law'.

From \$93-million in 1903, the total capitalization of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad had been run up, in the next ten years, to \$417-million, exclusive of stock premiums. This was an increase of \$324-million, only \$120-million of which was expended on its railroad property and for improvements and equipment. This left the sum of \$204-million which was spent for operations outside of its railroad sphere. Through the expenditure of this sum, the Report went on, this railroad system practically monopolized the freight and passenger business in five States.

How was this monopoly accomplished? By acquiring a monopoly of competing steamship lines and trolley systems in the section [of the nation] in which the railroad operated. 'The financial operations necessary for these acquisitions and the losses which they have entailed', reported the commission, 'have been skilfully [sic] concealed by the juggling of money and securities from one subsidiary corporation to another'. Nevertheless, the Commission was able to ascertain many of

the facts. Its Report related how the Boston & Maine Railroad had been despoiled [plundered]. And how in the case of the New York Westchester & Boston Railway, 'the enormous sum of \$36-million was expended for a road only 18.3 miles in extent, which is being operated at an annual loss of approximately \$1,250,000'. The acquisition of this Westchester line 'was planned and executed by a special committee of the board consisting of Directors Morgan, Rockefeller, and Miller with President Mellen as Chairman'.

The purchase of the Rhode Island trolleys was another instance of millions wasted on properties that brought an annual deficit instead of a surplus. For the acquirement [purchase] of these trolley lines \$24-million, or more than double their value, was spent in money and securities. The same prodigality [wastefulness] was shown in the buying of Connecticut trolley lines. For these, as Mellen himself testified, \$10-million more than their value was paid. Also the same features marked the acquisition of steamship lines. [We see the same process today when tech titans overpay for acquisitions.]

When, in 1935, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company filed a petition for reorganization under the Bankruptcy Act, the assertion was made that much of its financial trouble came from the unprofitable investments made nearly three decades previously.

Returning, however, to the Interstate Commerce Commission's narrative, it is seen that squandering of great sums in buying properties was not by any means the sole activity of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad group. The Report told of 'the unwarrantable expenditure of large amounts in educating public opinion'. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent in the aim to influence public sentiment, [and all of the] 'newspapers that could be subsidized were subsidized'. Retainers were lavished on attorneys in five States—attorneys 'who rendered no itemized bills for services, and who conducted no litigation to which the railroad was a party'. There was also extensive use of a paid lobby in legislatures. There was [also] a 'profligate [wasteful] issue of free [rail] passes to legislators and their friends. And there was an unlawful diversion of corporate funds to political organizations'. These were only a few of the disclosed operations...

Indictments under the Sherman Anti-Trust law were later returned by a Federal Grand Jury against the railroad company's directors or ex-directors, but nothing more serious happened to them."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"Asked what the number of employees was in corporations in which he was a director, Morgan admitted ignorance. 'I have not an idea', said he. The only conditions that he knew about, he testified, were financial conditions. The Directors' meetings were very brief, he explained; those of the United States Steel Corporation, for example, lasted on an average of 25-minutes to half an hour, and financial matters and business policies were frequently discussed, although how there could be any adequate discussion in so short a span he did not elucidate [throw light on]. In Morgan's opinion, Directors were not at all responsible for the labor conditions in industries in which they were the directing power. Who, then, was responsible? The executive officials or their underlings, Morgan replied. Interrogated further, Morgan testified that he had no opinion on what the length of a working day for employees should be, or what the income of an unskilled workingman [should be]...

At a period when social problems were matters of widespread agitation, Morgan revealed himself as having no thought for them, and at a time when there was intense public discussion of employment evils and other working problems, he openly and bluntly avowed that he had no opinion as to child labor, working hours or wages of laborers."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"In the first stage of the World War [WWI]... the buying of supplies by the Allies in America was extremely confusing and disorganized. That, realizing the waste, the British Government, on January 16, 1915, publicly announced an arrangement with J. P. Morgan & Company to handle the bulk of its buying in the American markets.... a few months later the French Government made an identical arrangement. The total purchases made by J. P. Morgan & Company for the Allies, said the statement further, reached \$3-billion... The commission on these sales paid to J.P. Morgan & Company, the statement added, approximated 1%" [in addition to markup and secret profits, little doubt.]

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.24

"20 members of his [J. P. Morgan's] firm were holders of 167 directorates in a swarm of corporations"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.25

"It is characteristic of the way in which American history has been written that not a line can be found of [about] the gigantic frauds by which tens of millions of acres of land were expropriated in the Southwest and in the Pacific States after the Mexican War, although court records and other official documents relate enough details to make an extended work by themselves....

Under the Mexican colonization laws, no individual was entitled to, or could claim more than 48,000 acres.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.25

"Piles upon piles of proofs that the grossest frauds had been committed could not convince the [corrupt] Supreme Court of the United States. In its decision of April 18, 1887, it held that the act of June 21, 1860, was virtually a new grant, and that it confirmed the grant to the full extent of the 1.7-million acres claimed—a decision received with the utmost amazement by the whole country."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.25

"In 1895 he [Elkins] was elected to the United States Senate by the West Virginia Legislature, after a campaign in which, it was freely charged, corruption money, in the form of campaign funds, was distributed throughout the entire State to insure the election of members favorable to his plans. In the United States Senate Elkins was one of the most adroit and useful law-drafters for the plutocracy. One of his notable acts was an amendment to the interstate commerce act expunging the clause providing imprisonment for violations of the anti-rebating law, and giving complete immunity to magnates who testify in such proceedings brought against them."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.26

"During the time that various capitalists controlled the Northern Pacific Railroad, the thefts of mineral lands were [was] so extensive that both Congress and the State of Montana were constrained [forced] to investigate. The people of Montana were greatly agitated over the railroad's claim to lands containing the very richest gold, silver, lead and copper mines, particularly the great copper deposits for which Montana was famous. In fact, the people of the entire West were deeply aroused, for if the courts should finally sustain the action of the Northern Pacific Railroad, then all of the other Pacific railroads could likewise claim all of the mines and mineral deposits within their land grants, consisting of odd numbered section. Already, in 1890, the Supreme Court of the United States had provisionally handed down a decision sustaining the Northern Pacific Railroad's claim that only such mineral lands as were known to be mineral at the date of the land grant were to be excepted from the land grant.

The trans-Mississippi Congress, meeting at Denver, in May and October, 1891, adopted resolutions declaring:

'Whereas, This dictum of the Supreme Court, if it should become law, would invest the Pacific railway companies holding grants of land from the Government with a vast number of the best mines discovered within the limits of said grants by prospectors and miners, who have located thereon in good faith and developed and sold therein in the honest belief that said grants were limited to agricultural lands only, as declared in the acts of Congress making them; and

Whereas, The citizens of the United States have invested millions of dollars in the development of mines on said lands which have been discovered subsequent to the date of said grants; and

Whereas, The consequences of this newly made construction of said grants must be the confiscation of private property and the spoliation of individuals in behalf of said railway companies on a scale so vast that history affords few parallels thereto, and to the bringing of actions to recover the value of ores heretofore mines from said lands, which, if successful, must reduce a large number of our citizens to want and beggary; and

Whereas, If said construction of it becomes the law of the land, it will take vast regions of mineral land out of the market, either for future explorations, or purchase, to the manifest injury of the people. Wherefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress protests against any construction of the statutes of the United States which will result in such a system of wholesale confiscation, and the consequent enrichment of great combinations already enjoying the bounty of the government, and calls upon the representatives of the people in Congress assembled to take such prompt and immediate action as may be within their immediate constitutional prerogative to destroy this threatened danger.'

At the same time Martin Maginnis, Mineral Land Commissioner of Montana, reported to Governor Toole that the 'vast land grant of the Northern Pacific Railway Company stretches from the eastern to the western boundary of the State of Montana in one broad belt which, including indemnity lands, is nearly 120 miles wide and over 700 miles long...

Maginnis then dealt extensively with the long delay of the projectors of the Northern Pacific Railroad in building the railroad... 'it failed in one of the primal purposes of its creation, and in fairly earning that part of its endowment which was intended to secure its completion at least 15-years before it came to us, who, while wearily waiting its advent, had

occupied, subdued and partially developed the country without its assistance. It was never dreamed that the railroad company would set up at any time in its existence a claim to the mineral lands, which were excluded from the grant, in the granting act itself, by specific reservation intended to run with and be as perpetual as the grant itself.' "

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.26

[in] "the lower courts, many of the judges of which had been railroad attorneys, or who had been elevated to the bench by railroad influence, gave decision after decision in favor of the Northern Pacific Railroad...

The Supreme Court could only affirm the numerous decisions already rendered in favor of the railway company. The property rights of the corporation were beyond the reach of legislation."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.26

"One of the leading American multimillionaire fortunes, that of Frederick Weyerhaeuser, resulted from his purchases of Northern Pacific Railroad timber lands... The timber holdings of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Company expanded until they reached the enormous area of 1,945,000 acres [3,039 square miles], 80% of which were brought from the Northern Pacific Railroad Company."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, 3.26

"The Northern Pacific Railroad Company had carried on operations in large coal mines in Montana and Washington. These mines were in its land grant and also along its railway line. The Northwestern Improvement Company also dealt in land sales, irrigation works and other activities. So much money did it accumulate as surplus that on November 5, 1908, Northern Pacific stockholders received the announcement of a special dividend of \$11.26 a share to be paid to them by the Northwestern Improvement Company. The total distribution thus made was \$17.4-million by a corporation with a capital stock [market capitalization] of only \$2.8-million. This was equivalent to a dividend of 629%.

Nor, it may be added, did the showering of such benefits end then. For years thereafter the company paid a regular dividend of 4%. Beginning in 1929 came another outflowing of special dividends: \$3.5-million in that year; none in 1930; \$5-million in 1931; \$5.6-million in 1932; \$4-million in 1933; and 2.5-million in 1934. At this last named date, the Northwestern Improvement Company owned 721,352 acres, including not only coal mines by a considerable quantity of iron ore."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, Epilogue

"The Standard Oil Company was the first trust [monopoly] devised, and its example was followed by many other industrial organizations.

Soon after its formation, the Standard Oil Company adopted the method of bringing persuasion or pressure to bear upon railroad owners to discriminate in its favor in giving low freight rates. [3rd mention. This is propaganda] This, in 1878 [only 19 years after the world's first oil well], moved William H. Vanderbilt to declare before the New York Legislative Committee investigating Railroads that if the policy continued, the Standard Oil Company interests, with the enormous profits

they were making, could soon own the railroads of America. [3rd mention.] This apprehension or prediction turned out to be considerably true.

Public agitation was furious, for the doctrine that free competition was the life of trade was then deeply rooted in the popular mind... In response, State after State enacted laws which, of course, had no jurisdiction outside of State boundaries. But to prevent even such laws from being enforced, public officials were subsidized and political organizations corrupted. Then came a popular demand for a national law. Resolutions and memorials denounced trust oppression and the acts of 'arrogant millionaires' and 'plutocratic nabobs'. The Interstate Commerce Commission was established in 1887 to propitiate public opinion demanding a regulatory power over railroads, but its powers were long weak.

In introducing his bill for the suppression of trusts, Senator John Sherman, in 1890 related how 'the popular mind is agitated with problems that disturb the social order. Among them, none is more threatening than the inequality of condition, of wealth and of opportunity that has grown within a single generation... [This has resulted from] the concentration of capital into vast combinations to control production and trade and to bring down competition'.

Various powerful members in the United States Senate at that very time were either Standard Oil beneficiaries or lawyers who had represented great corporations. Congress passed the Sherman Anti-Trust act which declared combinations in restraint of trade illegal. But as the law contained only a slight penalty, making a mere misdemeanor of the act of monopolizing products, it did not in the slightest degree prove a deterrent.

The Sherman Anti-Trust law as well as other laws were indifferently brushed aside by the magnates rushing forward to organize trusts. Only a year after the enactment of the Sherman Anti-Trust law, the Havermeyers and associates formed the American Sugar Refining Company, a combination of 121 plants... Henry O. Havemeyer... admitted before a special committee of the United States Senate, in 1894, that trusts, railroad companies, corporations of all kinds, and rich individuals periodically contributed large amounts for campaign election purposes. Such 'politics of business', he testified, was the custom of 'every individual and corporation or firm, trust or whatever you like to call it'. Always in State campaigns, he further testified, the dominant party received the contribution.

This corruption was widespread and continuous. In return, official favors and immunity from molestation, or at any rate from serious prosecution was expected—and was given. And in such cases as disclosures and the indignation of public opinion forced officials to take some action, the result did not inconvenience the money magnates.

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, Epilogue

"The 1909 Annual Report of the Attorney-General of the United States (pp.11 and 12) gave this account: 'An investigation was undertaken during the year 1907 into certain alleged frauds upon the Government in the underweighting of sugars imported into the United States by the American Sugar Refining Company... This investigation resulted, among other things, in a suit by the United States against the American Sugar Refining Company based upon proof of systematic frauds practiced in the weighting of sugars on the docks of the Havemeyer & Elder refineries in Brooklyn, N.Y., between the

years 1901 and 1907.'

As a matter of fact, it may be interpolated, the Custom House records published by the Sun [newspaper] of New York... on November 11, 1909, showed that the frauds had been going on for at least two decades. The Sun's front-page, 9-column article, running over to the second page, giving the evidence began: 'The Sugar Trust has stolen boldly and enormously, as the subjoined article shows, from the United States Treasury for at least 20-years. It stole with the assistance of officials employed by the United States. It was nursed and protected in its steadings by powerful politicians... Weighers knew it. Officials within the Custom[s] House must have known it. The Sugar Trust silenced revelations'. Further, the article declared, the \$30-million that the American Sugar Refining Company had stolen in 20-years had been done 'with the assistance and connivance of powerful and petty politicians'. including men of both of the old political parties, who 'shared in the plunder'...

the company paid to the Government the amount of the judgement of \$134,411 and in addition the sum of \$2-million on account of duties fraudulently withheld by it... This compromise was approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and by this department and was accepted in full settlement of all civil liabilities.

In its article, the Sun ridiculed the trivial judgement thus accepted from a corporation capitalized at \$90-million. It pointed out that the Federal District Attorney in his opening address to the same jury which according to the judgement, had declared that the Government could have asked for a far greater sum on Custom House entries in the previous 3-years, a period not covered by the statute of limitation. For it was upon this statue that the American Sugar Refining Company was able to base its main defense against full restitution. Even so, the Sun article stated counsel for the company had informed its directors that a total of \$9-million could have been demanded."

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, Epilogue

"Trust magnates were superior to [above the] law and could well afford to contemplate it with disdain. More anti-trust [anti-monopoly] legislation enacted by Congress in years subsequent to 1890 did not accordingly retard the organization of a host of industrial trusts. Between 1894 and 1901, hundreds were formed with an aggregate capital of \$4-billion. And even if prompted by public agitation, the Government did make a brave show of bringing criminal proceedings, the highest court [the corrupt U.S. Supreme court] found a way of 'interpreting'. In particular, in a suit against the Standard Oil Company, the [corrupt] Supreme court of the United States applied what it termed the 'rule of reason'; to prove a trust criminal, the ruling held, it was necessary to prove it 'undue and unreasonable'. As for the civil aspect, the consequences of decisions caused some rearrangement of trust construction but neither impaired power or revenues. A way was easily found of continuing with the components as legally distinct but all remaining under the ownership of the same men or interests. Before the decreed dissolution of the Standard Oil Company in 1911, it had yielded gigantic total sums in dividends [to the Arabs mostly]. How did dissolution and the resolving of one company into a group of companies affect the revenues? From the dissolution to the end of 1927, according to compilations made by Dow, Jones & Company, leading stock-market statisticians, the dividend distributions of the group of Standard Oil Companies totalled \$3.3-billion. Of this

sum \$1.9 billion was in cash, and \$1.4 billion in stock dividends.

At its maximum, the fortune of John D. Rockefeller, the principal of the Rockefeller brothers, perhaps exceeded \$1-billion. After devoting all of his energetic years to acquisition, he had personally retired from business. Storms of denunciations had been leveled at him. His corporation and his methods had been an endless target of attack. He had surmounted proddings which would have made a nervous wreck of many men. His endurance was such as to sustain a vitality which, with the most careful ministrations [attendance and care], prolonged his life decade after decade until now he is approaching the centenarian age.

Before about the year 1910 money magnates, battling with much hostile opinion, believed in the corrupt use of money to over come it [the public opinion]. To procure necessary legislation, the strangle inimical [harmful enemy] legislative proposals and to circumvent such laws as were enacted, indirection based upon the distribution of masses of money was depended upon. Lobbies, flush with funds, were maintained at legislative centers. Their operations provoked such scandals and finally became so offensive that laws were passed in an attempt to regulate them. The subsidizing of a portion of the newspaper press and magazines was a regular procedure.

There now came a notable change of technique on the part of a number of corporations [fronting for the Arabs about their new ways]. Jerome D. Greene, a Rockefeller spokesman, thus put the case in his testimony before the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations, on February 2, 1915: 'But as to publicity, there are two meanings to that word, Mr. Chairman. The word has been given quite a black eye, chiefly because of a discredited method of publicity. I am referring now to the method of ingratiating the public and winning over the support of newspapers either through the publication of advertisements, which may be thought to bring pressure on the expression of editorial opinion, or by the deliberate buying up of editorial and news space, if that is possible. Suspicion that that has been done has undoubtedly existed in the United States. Now, that method of publicity has been entirely discredited and its place has been taken in the enlightened usage, I think, of most of our corporations by a method of frankly stating the facts from an interested point of view of the corporations'. . . . Green added that 'the chief exponent [spouter] of that honest, candid and fair method of publicity. . . is Mr. Ivy L. Lee.'

The Commission examined Lee... The fact emerged that he was one of the most industrious of the high-salaried propagandists invested with the impressive appellation of 'public relations counsel'. This term seemed to carry the implication that the corporations were fully taking the public into their confidence and appealing to its good will and fair judgment. But the Commission's Final Report ridiculed the claim that certain 'literature' thus distributed by a central bureau was fair publicity. It was entirely partial [biased], and some of it the Commission denounced as not only untrue and misleading but... positively malicious"

Gustavus Meyers, History of the Great American Fortunes, Epilogue

"Meanwhile, a number of leading millionaires gave themselves a new character—that of humanitarians and philanthropists. This they did by establishing Foundations. One of the first to enter this field was Andrew Carnegie [ak•our•negi] ...

John D. Rockefeller had, on May 14, 1913,

incorporated that Rockefeller Foundation chartered to promote schools, libraries, scientific research and assist educational institutions. His original gift to this institution comprised securities then having a market value of \$100-million. Further, he established a group of other Foundations, all heavily endowed. He himself gave this explanation to the U.S. Industrial Commission: 'The sole motive underlying the various Foundations which I have established had been the desire to devote a portion of my fortune to the service of my fellow men'. ...

'The funds of these Foundations', the Final Report stated, 'are largely invested in securities of corporations dominant in American industry. . . . The policies of these Foundations must inevitably be colored, if not controlled, to conform to the policies of such corporations... The power of these Foundations is practically unlimited, except that they may not directly engage in business for profit. . . . Foundations are subject to no public control, and their powers can be curbed only by the difficult process of amending or revoking their charters. . . . The extent of the possible influence (in shaping education and opinion) of these Foundations. . . is shown by a large amount of evidence in the possession of the Commission'. Examples were cited of 'a degree of control over the teachings of professors in our colleges and universities which constitutes a more serious menace'."

APPENDIX—6 THE FIRST SOPHISCITE

Questions for the first sophiscite

Questions for our new democratic oracle

Can you think of a better oracle for our society than our own broad democracy? Here, in no particular order, are some sample questions that we might ask annually. The Sub-Senate will of course have the power to add new questions with a 50% vote and take questions away with a two-thirds overmajority. We will soon be asking our new democratic oracle thousands of questions like these:

Do you believe in god?

Do you believe in Roman Catholicism?

Do you believe in Judaism?

Do you believe in Islam,

Are you an Atheist?

Are you Agnostic?

Do you believe it is possible to gain insights into the future through the position of the stars?

Do you believe it is possible to gain insights into the future by looking at the wrinkles in someone's hands?

Do you believe in life after death?

Do you believe in life before birth?

Is the Pope the vicarious presence of god/Christ on earth?

Is the Roman Catholic Church Corrupt?

Should Religions be allowed to collect taxes?

Is Islam corrupt?

Is Islam the state religion of the secret empire of Arabia?

Is Islam a religion of enslavement?

Is/was one bloated family orchestrating most terrorism in this world?

Should we discriminate against Muslims?

Should we expel 10% of the nation's Muslims?

Should we expel 50% of the nation's Muslims?

Should we expel all of the nation's Muslims?

Should we cancel all our unaccountable debts because they are probably secretly owned by the Arabs?

Should we cancel all large non-citizen ownership rights in our nation?
 Should we prohibit all religions from owning property outside their churches?
 Is broad democracy the best form of government?
 Was the previous government corrupt?
 Is CO2 the independent variable in global warming?
 Should we scrap all our environmental laws and start over from first principals?
 Do you believe in giant 2,000-year tsunamis?
 Is outgassing the primary cause of atmosphere and climate?
 Is \$1,500 per capita enough for the national healthcare program?
 Is \$2,000 per capita enough for the national healthcare program?
 Is \$2,500 per capita enough for the national healthcare program?
 For vehicle owners in big cities, are 92% clean emissions enough?
 For rural vehicle owners, are 85% clean emissions enough?
 Should abortion be legal if the unborn cannot survive outside the mother?
 Should abortion be legal at any time before birth at the mother's request?
 Should abortion be legal at any time before birth if the unborn is damaged?
 Should all international flows of church money be prohibited?
 Should the use of expensive religious sacraments be regulated?
 Should all churches have to file tax returns and be subject to audit?
 Should the maximum compensation of priests be capped by the government?
 Should the maximum compensation of Corporate executives be capped by government?

APPENDIX—7—EDWARD GIBBON

Of all my sources, none was as impenetrable as Edward Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. While this work does contain some nuggets, they are few and far apart and separated by an ocean of useless and hard to follow writing. Anyway, there are some things about Gibbon's book that need to be pointed out:

- 1) It was started in 1776, the same year America's Declaration of Independence proposed to revive democracy.
- 2) It was completed in 1788, just one year before America sat down to draft its new constitution. Here America's founding fathers were given a brand new and "definitive" work on how America's predecessor Rome went wrong. However this book wasted the time of everyone who read it.
- 4) Gibbon's book does not even address Rome's democracy, or where it went wrong. In fact, *Decline* starts after the fascist dictatorship of Julius Caesar seized power. Gibbon's book begins after Rome's senate had become a sham.
- 4) Gibbon's book is so horribly difficult to read (like De Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*) that we have to wonder if it was intentionally written that way, so as to waste the energies of America's founding fathers in their quest to not make the same mistakes Rome made.

5) Gibbon was welcomed as a celebrity into many elite social circles, but then he was quickly rejected. Was he thought a fraud by some?

6) Gibbon puns on both griffon and Ghassan.

I read until Gibbon's book exhausted me, which despite my determination, was not very far. Here are the three sections of text that I found noteworthy.

1. "The various modes of worship, which prevailed in the Roman world, were all considered by the people, as equally true, by the philosopher, as equally false; and by the magistrate as equally useful. And thus toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious concord."

[The implication is that mostly protestant America (at the time) should have complete freedom of religion, an absolute freedom that first permitted all religions, including the Arabian religion of submission, a religion that seeks to dissolve and enslave our society. And once again, Islam means submission in Arabic.]

2. "The grandsons of the Gauls, who had besieged Julius Caesar in Alesia, commanded legions, governed provinces, and were admitted into the senate of Rome."

[The implication is that America should have a government that is not closed to immigrants. Now while Gibbon is technically correct here, Gaul is a special case and this remark is misleading.]

The emperors from North Africa and the Mideast in fact presided over Rome's decline. Septimius Severus (r. 193 - 211) was born in Libya, and like all the Severan emperors was married to a "Syrian queen". Severus' successor Caracalla (r. 211-217) was half 'Syrian'. Both of Emperors Elagabalus (r. 218-222) and Alexander Severus (r. 222-235) were of pure Syrian descent. Elagabalus was only 14 when he became ruler of the Roman Empire. Maximinus (r. 235-238) was North African. Then there were a number of emperors in 238, the last of which was Gordian III (r. 238-244). Then Philip the Arab (r. 244-249) and then six emperors in four years (249-253). It would appear that someone was "vetoing" Roman Emperors that were not of 'Syrian' extraction.

Now here, it is worth noting that all available Amphora evidence says that Rome peaked economically around the 230. Rome's currency collapse happened around 250.

It is also worth noting that Rome only started declining after its patrician families lost control of the Roman Senate.

"With its power, the senate had lost its dignity; many of the most noble families were extinct. The republicans of spirit and ability had perished in the field of battle, or in the proscription. The door of the assembly [the senate] had been designedly left open, [By Julius Caesar] for a mixed multitude of more than a thousand persons, who reflected disgrace upon their rank, instead of deriving honor from it."

[Here it is gently suggested that a thousand people is too many for a senate and that such large numbers bring down the quality of the decision maker. The opposite is in fact true. A small number makes for a more corrupt democracy. Later I explain the whys and hows of BROAD DEMOCRACY in greater detail.]

