

The Empire Never Ended

At the heart of fear of the unknown is the fear of freedom, the fear of responsibility, the fear of the self and the fear of life.

These are all the same thing for the hereditary slave.

At the heart of the fear of the unknown is anhedonia.

Anhedonia is the result of idol worship, of putting impossible expectations on ourselves and of hating ourselves for not being able to meet those impossible expectations. It is the result of being a prisoner of the fear that others might discover our secret life, our life of imperfection. Unfortunately for us anhedonics the fact is that most people are mostly imperfect most of the time.

Anhedonia is the inability to love to feel love or to express love. It is the inability to experience pleasure, to give it or receive it. Love is that which comes as a result of the desire to maintain the integrity of a significant Other one who is different from ourselves, but in whose difference we also find a particular and remarkable uniqueness, and thereby an unmistakable humanity. Anhedonia is the result of a preoccupation with the ego-image, a false conception of the self which springs not from the validation implicit in succeeding in establishing authentic relations with others, but from a paranoid hallucination that originates in the oldest and most archaic region of the human brain and otherwise manifests an underlying desire to return the womb.

Anhedonia is the failure to embrace and pursue knowledge and understanding of diversity and otherness as a matter of principle and personal honour. It is the result of the profound failure to value that different from ourselves.

Anhedonia is foreknowledge or anticipation of pain, insofar as we know subconsciously through our repressed intuition repressed out of convenience that our idols won't save us, that no one can save us but ourselves, and that we are making no effort to do the job ourselves. It is the foreknowledge of misery.

Anhedonia is the desire to make others miserable as a substitute for admitting our own unhappiness to pull others down into our stinking hole of shit rather than trouble ourselves with lifting ourselves out.

At the heart of every anhedonic impulse to deny the self and to control others, so that they may not discover that we hate ourselves, worship idols and are prisoners of fear, is a moral absolutism.

Moral absolutisms change, but all are based on the false dichotomy of Good and

At the heart of every moral absolutism is an idée fixe.

Fixed ideas are the codification and systematisation of willing stupidity and the desire to have our thoughts and actions predetermined for us so that we don't have to think and act for ourselves. One example is the dictatorship of the proletariat. Another is the divine right of kings. Another is the free market.

Fixed ideas are the willing denial of reality. Reality is that which, when you stop believing in it, doesn't go away,

At the heart of every idée fixe is amnesia.

Amnesia is the colonisation of consciousness. The degree of individual consciousness relates directly to the success of the individual in incorporating the lessons of the cumulative total of their life experience into their knowledge of themselves and the nature of the world around them. The degree to which we are lulled into a false sense of security by the forces of colonisation and/or frightened into blind conformity with them may be easily gathered by our grasp of history, personal, familial and social.

Amnesia is sleep. Those of us whose minds have been colonised through amnesia sleepwalk through life in a purgatorial existence, being neither alive nor dead, following a flat, straight road with no twists and turns, nothing to break the turgid monotony of the daily grind and nothing to interrupt the essential meaninglessness of our lives.

At the heart of amnesia is oblivion.

Oblivion is the death of identity, the identity of death.

Dead souls walk the Earth without knowing that they are dead. They believe themselves to be the Elect, but this is a paranoid hallucination that results from amnesia. They have forgotten who they really are. The Elect are the colonised. They are the weak. The Elect are dangerous, because they are not responsible for themselves. The Elect project their weaknesses onto others and invent systems and codes to rationalise their criminality. The Elect are the spokespeople of fear. Watch out.

The only thing the Elect have no desire to control is themselves. Watch out.

At the heart of oblivion is empire.

The empire never ended.

If empire is the Sun, the planets of the solar system are its progeny. Saturn is the Pax Americana. Jupiter is the Pax Romana. Mercury is the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Pluto is the Master Race. All the houses of the Demiurge are scattered in between.

The Demiurge is God made in the image of man. God, on the other hand, is the conjunction of all the forces of existence meeting in a unique thought. When we think for ourselves, then do we know God.

The Demiurge is a projection of our paranoid ego image. The Demiurge is the idol we invest with all our own repressed, unrealised potential. The Demiurge is the voice of empire, and speaks to us as a paranoid hallucination. The Demiurge exists for one purpose to crush us, to break our spirit and our will.

Empire is that which we mistake for our own memories, for our own identity, for our own life. Empire is a relationship, a representation and a state of mind. Empire is the matrix of anhedonic social control.

The root of empire is the codification of the irrational paranoid streak in human consciousness, brought about by the evolutionary glitch in the triune brain, into systems of ideological and religious control, manifest in the false dichotomy of Good and Evil.

From the dualism of Good and Evil comes the Known and the Other. Dualism forestalls free will through the polarisation of language and ideas and the imposition of moral absolutes. It encourages a fear of the Doppelgänger, our mirror image opposite, the incarnation of our unknown Self. The primary function of dualism is to prevent the experience of anamnesis, the loss of forgetting, by imposing a programme of Divide and Conquer habitual result of paranoid self-delusion. Gender and race are arbitrary and therefore false distinctions; we all demonstrate human intelligence, and thus human right, through the power of speech, whatever our gender, class or race. The one you are told to hate and fear and to treat as inferior is your sister and your brother. Anamnesis occurs as we transcend the false dichotomy of Good and Evil through a modification of our behaviour in daily life.

Empire is all around us, but is also hidden in plain sight. At one time or another we are aware of empire, but gradually lose our awareness of it. We lose the ability to see empire because we internalise the paranoid assumptions on which it is based. The more we internalise empire, the more we lose ourselves in it. It is not empire that changes, it is us. We allow ourselves to be broken in by empire, to be domesticated like animals. We allow ourselves to be consumed by the worst aspects of our own nature.

Empire is sleep. The colonised are Sleepwalkers.

Empire is fear that has coopted the forms of freedom. Empire takes living words and ideas, and, robbing them of their meaning, turns them into Newspeak. It takes symbols, referentials from things in the physical world, and splits them apart, thus creating a certain crisis of meaning. In order to allay potential rebellion that might arise if we learn we are being lied to in the name of our own best interests, empire creates simulacra, Simulacra look like the genuine article, and sound like the genuine article, but in fact they are copies without originals, referentials to things that perhaps once existed in the physical world, but no longer. The colonisation of representative democracy by corporate plutocracy, a project that began in 1886 and has long been complete, is a prime example of this process successful has it been that, for the most part, we haven't even noticed. Still do we vote between business parties who represent increasingly indistinguishable different factions of empire and imagine were exercising free will, so completely occluded, so successfully colonised, so utterly habituated to lies and deceit are we.

Where empire colonises through fear and amnesia, the difference between form and substance is the difference between freedom and slavery, between liberation and oppression.

Empire maintains hegemony, but maintains a pretence of ubiquity where ubiquity is the domain of nature alone. This is its greatest lie, its greatest pretense and its greatest weakness. The confusion between hegemony and ubiquity manifests as a blind spot at the back of the colonised mind, the place that inspires darkest dread and causes imagination without memory to become paranoid hallucination. To embrace nature is to assert the Self, and thereby to make a direct challenge to the legitimacy of empire.

Empire is the antithesis of the infinite potential inherent to free will.

Empire is the tyranny of appearances.

Empire is normality. Empire is the reduction of reality to a dogma.

Empire impoverishes us in mind, body and spirit, and makes us vulnerable to oppression and exploitation. It brutalises our nature and makes it possible to oppress and exploit others.

Empire in the form of plutocracy robs us of our freedom and sells its representation back to us as branded commodities. Freedom can't be bought and sold. A world that tries to trade in freedom has no right to exist. A world that normalises class oppression and class warfare for the sake of elite privilege and calls it the freedom of the market has no right to exist.

Empire lives through us while we navigate oblivion, struggling blindly and desperately in our chains.

Empire is a prison of temporality. Empire imposes a narrative of linear time to forestall hope of a second chance in life and to instil a dread fear of making mistakes. Time is not linear; time follows the rhythm and characteristics of the seasons birth, growth, decline, death, rebirth.

Empire is living death; the personification of fear.

I must not fear.

Fear is the mindkiller.

Fear is the little death that brings total obliteration.

I will face my fear.

I will allow it to pass over me, and through me.

Where it has gone past I will turn the inner eye to see its path.

Where the fear has gone there will be nothing.

Only I will remain.

This is the Litany Against Fear. Memorise it.

Fear compels conformity and imposes amnesia by stealth. Fear colonises memory, identity and consciousness by stealth.

We will decolonise by stealth.

Leave no trail.

No leaders; no followers.

No aggression.

No machismo.

No playing the victim. Learned passivity and helplessness is part of the problem, not the solution.

No representatives. Anyone who claims to represent is the enemy. Empire is the representation of freedom and the reality of paranoid hallucination, manipulation and control.

When momentum builds, we will know. We will feel it in the air.

We will meet each other reborn as brothers and sisters on the streets. We will have never met, but we will know one another as we know ourselves.

Those of us who live for our chains and our gilded cages and who have become leeches for the opinions of others as a result of our terminal inability to think and act for ourselves and to rescue our personality and individuality from the clutches of paranoid amnesia will never give up our project of anhedonic social control. Those of us in this condition will be sent to hospitals for the criminally insane where we will be taken care of and prevented from harming ourselves or anyone else.

Let us assert our right to exist as sovereign individuals.

Let us organise our minds, so that our survival instincts and emotions inform our reason, not control and overwhelm it. Let us overcome the pathological disorder and the all-pervasive paranoid streak in human consciousness associated with the evolutionary glitch in the triune brain (see *The Ghost in the Machine*).

Let us bring an end to the codified schizophrenia and judgmentalism of Good and Evil.

Let us overcome the obsessive compulsion with power, wealth and status.

Let us step out from the bitter cold of the shadow of totems and idols.

Let us seek an intuitive sense of harmony in the spontaneous order of nature, in the interplay of light and dark, in the resolution of the tension between being and becoming.

Let us seek to understand personal, social and psychological history, so that we might not repeat it.

Let us make wisdom the only thing we have any desire to conquer.

Let us manage things, not people. Let us then abolish the tyranny of the institution of private property along with that of its sanctimonious, self-righteous, obsessive compulsive high priests. Let us self-manage.

Let us take the time to look up the meaning of the word empathy in a dictionary.

It starts now, in this moment, and continues forever.

Let nothing before this moment, now, remain except as a reminder and a warning for the future.

This moment loves us for our imperfections, because they are what make us unique individuals.

This moment lets shame and taboo end not with a bang, but a whimper.

This moment protects the vulnerable and weak and gives good courage to the strong.

This moment lets wounds heal.

This moment lets pain be resolved into wisdom.

This moment wants to be filled with sensual pleasure. Dont deny this moment.

This moment laughs at what a bunch of dorks we all are.

This moment mixes personal and community development with training in individual assertiveness and social integration.

This moment remembers those who gave what they had so that we could have this moment. This moment remembers those who didnt make it to this moment.

This moment shares what it has. This moment gives us what we need and asks of us what we have the ability to give.

This moment is all there is. What is past has gone. What will be isnt here yet. In this moment we can do anything we put our minds to. Anything. This moment has a lot of unrealised potential.

This moment allows us to know that we all have a choice between listening to what we are told by the ides of fear, and listening to what we are told by the ides of love. The ides of fear want to keep us ignorant of the fact that we do have a choice; the ides of love want us to make up our own minds what we believe.

This moment frees the mind, so that in the next, the body can follow.

This moment is the Pleroma, the place from where all knowledge derives, and to where it returns. Return to this moment with more knowledge. Knowledge is power.

Tomorrow is a brand new day.

Tomorrow is a promise we will make to each other, forever.

Tomorrow can happen, and will happen if we want it to.

Let us liberate our desire for authenticity and adventure.

Let us not wait for freedom to be given to us; let us take it.

Let us find out what we are capable of when we remember ourselves, when we remember that we are all, and that empire is nothing.

Let us decolonise our minds; let us discover the Kingdom of Heaven within.

Rise like lions after slumber,
in unvanquishable number;
Shake your chains to Earth like dew
Which in sleep had fallen on you.
Ye be many; they are few.

- Shelley

+

Share and disseminate if you agree.

+

VALIS

Vast

Active

Living

Intelligence

System

++

The Decline of Representative Democracy in the United States

Representative democracy in the United States, as elsewhere, has always been beset by a certain ideological conflict between form and substance. This basic conflict is visible even in Rousseau's insistence that the highest expression of democracy is that we may be forced to be free, an idea whose basis in moral absolutism (ie. the evil of man in his state of nature and the good that comes from his coercion into civilised society) gives it common ground with every dictator and religious demagogue who ever justified his rule by invoking absolutist black-and-whites. Absolutism is as central to the idea that forcing people to be free is as much a prerequisite of civilised society and social progress as it was of the workers state

beating the people with the peoples stick (to paraphrase Bakunin) or of racially purified übermenschen engaging in a spot of ethnic cleansing. In all cases, the ends justifies the means, and in all cases and expression of doubt as to the validity of the fundamental premises of the ideology or even the asking of questions to clarify certain issues must be considered tantamount to open revolt. We may not question; we must only nod our heads quietly and accept what we are told to be true.

In the past the idea that people might be forced to be free may have held some currency, but in the present day and age we have learnt that the holy wars of absolute good against absolute evil - evil always taking the form of some unknown, demonised other - have always represented manifestations of a single phenomenon, empire, whatever their window dressing. More to the point, we are slowly learning to be wary of the anhedonic mindset of empire and the ways in which it evolves in order to sustain itself, coopting oppositional movements and assuming their forms as they evolve. The absolutisms at the heart of the theory of representative democracy are wide open to this sort of colonisation, as we shall see.

This basic ideological conflict within representative democracy has become even more manifest, and therefore more subject to ideological obfuscation, in the last hundred years through the emergence of corporationsprivate concentrations of economic power whose internally totalitarian power structures, predatory, pathological lust for profit and often severely limited accountability present an unprecedented threat both to human freedom and to the ecological sustainability of the planet on which we depend for survival. [1] If it is true, as it seems, that representative democracy left to its own devices is little more than an intermediate stage between feudalism and plutocracyor perhaps even that representative democracy (horror of horrors) is a form of covert plutocracyit may be arguable that the rise of corporations and their concomitant colonisation of all parts of human society in the name of the freedom of the market could only be made possible if representative democracy had been designed in such a way as to paper over class divisions, thus leaving intact the more fundamental (and obviously antidemocratic) project of empire intact. This could only be true if there was a sort of cognitive dissonance between the stated ideals of representative democracy and its operation in practisebetween representative democracy on paper and really-existing representative democracy, as it were.

As it so happens, the division of democratic societies into economic classesthe have and the have-nots, those who possess independent means and those who dont, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the Marxist language of oldhas always presented problems for democratic ideology. In fact, it presents problems so much so that, in taking properly into consideration, Rousseaus formula for the height of democratic freedom takes on the character of apologia devised in anticipation of this hitch. It certainly wouldnt have been the first time a public intellectual made the choice to internalise the assumptions of his paymasters and seek through less than

scrupulous means to formulate an a priori justification of his institutional domestication and self-censorship. As Rudolf Rocker points out in such an adroit fashion that his name tends to slip down the memory hole as a matter of course,

Liberalism and democracy were pre-eminently political concepts, and since the great majority of the original adherents of both maintained the right of ownership in the old sense, they had to renounce them both when economic development could not be practically reconciled with the original principles of democracy, and still less with those of Liberalism. Democracy with its motto of equality of all citizens before the law, and Liberalism with its right of man over his own person, both shipwrecked on the realities of the capitalist economic form. So long as millions of human beings in every country had to sell their labour-power to a small minority of owners, and to sink into the most wretched misery if they could find no buyers, the so-called equality before the law remains merely a pious fraud, since the laws are made by those who find themselves in possession of the social wealth. But in the same way there can be no talk of a right over ones own person, for that right ends when one is compelled to submit to the economic dictation of another if he does not want to starve. [2]

In other words, the fact that representative democracies were riddled with class divisions, the ancient divide between master and bondsman, proved the lie of their libertarian form and served to mask the underlying reality, the fact that its myth and symbols were merely simulacra, and that the substance of representative democracies was a form of class rule in which the wage-slaves at the bottom of the pyramid voted for different factions of the master class for bigger or smaller cages, longer or shorter chains, economic exploitation with a concerned, paternalistic face or economic exploitation with a nasty, strict face.

If this was true of the development of really existing representative democracy in any country, it was true of the United States, which, having built its strength on the back of chattel slavery, devoted its revolutionary war to a particular vision of democracy a vision whose moral absolutisms were literally, as well as metaphorically, black and white. While in their revolutionary war the North American colonisers broke the traditional bonds of fealty and feudal obligation, as a result of the fact that they were less occupied with justice and more preoccupied with property, only gradually could they replace the traditional bonds with bonds of patriotism and nationhood. [3]

They were not quite a nation; their reluctant mobilization of the colonial countryside had not fused them into one, and the multi-lingual, multi-cultural and socially divided underlying population resisted such a fusion. The new repressive apparatus was not tried and tested, and it did not command the undivided loyalty of the underlying population, which was not yet patriotic. Something else was needed. Slave-masters who had overthrown their king feared that their slaves could similarly overthrow the masters. Racism had initially been one among several methods of mobilizing colonial armies, and although it was exploited more fully in

North America than it ever had been before, it did not supplant the other methods but rather supplemented them. The victims of the invading pioneers were still described as unbelievers, as heathen. But the pioneers, like the earlier Dutch, were largely Protestant Christians, and they regarded heathenism as something to be punished, not remedied. The victims also continued to be designated as savages, cannibals and primitives, but these terms, too, ceased to be diagnoses of conditions that could be remedied, and tended to become synonyms of non-white, a condition that could not be remedied. Racism was an ideology perfectly suited to a practice of enslavement and extermination. [4]

The fear of slave revolt and the desire to maintain economic privileges within a political system that maintained a rhetorical commitment to freedom and equality did not, needless to say, bode well for the future. The North American Civil War abolished the institution of chattel slavery, only to introduce wage-slavery in its stead. The result was that slaves in the United States were no longer owned, but rented and moreover were left worse off insofar as owned property generally enjoys better treatment and care.

This situation, far from being rectified, was only exacerbated by the rise of corporate power not twenty-five years after the end of the Civil War in 1865 (and long before the black civil rights campaigns of the sixties). Corporations, originally temporary bodies set up for the purpose of executing public works projects and the like, had quickly grown in power and economic, political and social influence, having been granted the rights of individuals under American law. Soon they were to prove more powerful than individual human beings, since human beings are mortal and corporations are not. Ironically enough, the 1886 Supreme Court decision that endowed corporations with the rights of human beings did so by virtue of the Fourteenth Amendment, originally designed for the purpose of providing due process of law and equal protection of the laws to freed slaves. [5] The irony is inescapable. In any event, so quickly powerful did corporations become that the corporation suffered its first full-blown legitimacy crisis in the wake of the early-twentieth century merger movement, when, for the first time, many Americans realised that corporations, now huge behemoths, threatened to overwhelm their social institutions and governments.

Corporations were now widely regarded as soulless leviathans: uncaring, impersonal and amoral. Suddenly, they were vulnerable to popular discontent and organised dissent (especially from a growing labor movement, as calls for more government regulation and even their dismantling were increasingly common. [6]

Unfortunately these calls went unheeded as, on the one hand, the latent ideological contradictions within really-existing representative democracy and, on the other, its true character began to become manifestan evolved, highly complex version of empire whose advocates had learnt to hide their authoritarianism and agenda of exploitation and control by coopting the forms and language of a free society. Rather than acknowledging the error of their ways, as young children are

taught to do when reprimanded for acting in a way harmful to the freedom and rights of others, business leaders and public relations experts soon realised that the institutions new powers and privileges demanded new public relations strategies. [7] . In this recognition these business leaders and public relations experts shared the implicit understanding of David Hume that the easiness with which the many are governed by the few and the implicit submission with which men resign their own sentiments and passions to those of their rulers was the result of the fact that, while Force always resides with the governed, who are numerically superior, the governors have nothing to support them but opinion, and that tis therefore on opinion only that government is founded; and this maxim extends to the most despotic and military governments, as well as to the most free and popular. [8] If this was true, as the evidence suggests (see below), then it seems fair to suggest that formally democratic societies actually require more indoctrination than do police states, especially if the crux of the ideology on which it is founded suggests that men are to be forced to be free and if no overt police presence or informer network exists to intimidate the population into obedience and conformity.

This realisation of business leaders and public relations experts (that the new corporate order required substation attention to the opinions of the wage-slaves of the class-divided economic order to ensure that they continued to regard voting between different factions of the one business party as the pinnacle of freedom and civilisation) and its practical implications would lead Alex Carey to conclude in the later part of the century that the twentieth century has been characterised by three developments of great political importance: the growth of democracy, the growth of corporate power, and the growth of corporate propaganda as a means of protecting corporate power against democracy. [9] It was at this point that the weaknesses in really-existing representative democracy began to make themselves felt, in the first place as business interests sought to have the free-market system identified in popular consciousness with every cherished value, and interventionist governments and strong unions (the only agencies capable of checking the complete domination of society by the corporations) with tyranny, oppression and even subversion. [10] Really-existing representative democracy would therefore become synonymous with capitalist relations of production, and representation with the opinions of those who could afford to purchase favours in the form of campaign donations from prospective candidates for political office (for example). The moral absolutisms on which representative democracy is based in particular the transcendent morality of popular sovereignty, an article of blind faith that requires no more proof than that of the dictatorship of the proletariat or the divine right of kings coupled with the democratic myth identifying authentic, meaningfully organic freedoms with the artificial, ideologically-constructed structures of state power, normalised the moral absolutisms at the heart of free market ideology and made possible its own cooption before it had even been invented to rationalise processes already in motion.

When Corporate North America turned its attention, then, to the primary challenger to the Godhead of private property, Communism (in its broad spectrum of

authoritarian and libertarian varieties), it not only sought to have business interests identified with the national interests of the United States and thus the concept of popular democracy with the totalitarian power of the captain of corporate industry but also to redefine the latter in terms by which the United States is represented to the world as the Manifest Destiny of the world in Piety and Virtue. Lacking such supreme moral virtues was the enemy of the Godhead, which was universally malevolent, evil, oppressive, deceitful and destructive of all civilised and human values, and otherwise not very nice.

Notions like the American Way of Life, the Meaning of America, the Spirit of America, became symbols with the irrational power of the Sacred, and from an equally calculated exacerbation of American apprehension about the alien ideology of Communism and its allegedly un-American characteristics, communism/socialism, etc. became symbols of the Satanic. So long as these symbol identifications can be maintained in popular sentiment it is a simple matter to curb popular demand and support for significant reform of the institutions and conditions of American society. [11]

This was what was really at issue behind the Red Scares of the twentieth century. It was perhaps to be regretted that the threat of popular democracy had been extended at roughly the same time as the contradictions within really-existing representative democracy gave birth to the corporation and plutocratic corruption to the decision-making process. The rascal multitude were in so danger of becoming so curious and so arrogant that they will never find humility enough to submit to a civil rule [12] through the extension of the franchise between 1880 and 1920 and a flurry of popular agitation, that they aroused the fear of leading students of Rousseaus formula, who worried that the popular groundswell might provoke the holders of wealth and power to make the full use of their resources. As it turns out, their fears were well-founded. A 1913 congressional Committee investigating a mass propaganda campaign initiated by the National Association of Manufacturers appears to have been no little awed by the apparent ambitions of the NAM for meeting the challenge to its interests from popular democracy by controlling public opinions.

It reported that the aspirations of the NAM were so vast and far-reaching as to excite at once admiration and fear: admiration for the genius that conceived them and fear for the effects which the accomplishment of all these ambitions might have in a government such as ours. [13]

The entry of the United States into the First World War in 1917 precipitated a propaganda campaign by President Wilson that filled every home, workplace and leisure activity with its messages. The reaction to this campaign was so widespread, and the hatred for Germany engendered so intense, that it not only caught the attention of Adolf Hitler, who would borrow it for his own campaign of nationalist xenophobia a decade or so later, but that of American business as well, who realised that the great public could now be harnessed to their cause as it had

been harnessed during the war to the national cause, and the same methods could do the job. [14]

Coinciding and then merging with this war propaganda was a simultaneous Americanisation campaign initiated in 1912 by business groups who adopted a pattern that was to become common currency in the popular imagination over the following decades, and that has in fact not only lasted right up to the present day, but snowballed so:

(1) A threat (real or imagined) from outside the United States achieves a dramatic impact on popular consciousness; (2) This effect occurs at a time when liberal reforms and popular hostility to the large corporations and the power they exercise are perceived by conservative interests as a profound threat from inside the U.S. social and political system. Finally, (3) The two perceived threats merge, to the discredit of the internal reforms and of any political party, persons or policies associated with them. [15]

It may be worth noting at this point that Alex Carey wrote of this pattern in 1995, long before the attacks of September 11, 2001, which predictably enough have not been used not to educate the populations of really-existing representative democracies as to the nature of causes of terrorism, but to create an atmosphere of fear, hatred and confusion and to maintain the political ignorance always so amenable to the class war simmering just under the surface of every representative democracy, an invention designed to throw a few rhetorical sops to the masses while the business of empire continues as usual. This seems especially true here in Australia, where, following the American political model as in most other spheres of social endeavour, the lack of a repeat performance of the anti-WTO protests that took place in Melbourne exactly a year before the terrorist attacks in the United States, is a clear illustration of the way in which the tragedy of the attacks have been manipulated to create fear and stifle already marginalised dissent even further.

This is even more true again when we remember the other 11 September 11 September, 1973, the day Salvador Allende, the elected President of Chile, was overthrown in a CIA-backed coup and the dictator Augusto Pinochet installed in his place. [16] If we care to remember that Allende's programme of nationalisation of Chilean industry presented a threat to the interests of corporate North America, our vision of representative democracy in the United States might not fare so well, so better for the long term health of our western political systems and the stability of the corporations that have captured and are now in control of them that our understanding of ourselves and the world around us is colonised and neutralised via fear-induced amnesia.

At any rate, the development of the corporate campaign to subvert and control public discourse in the United States and to invest it with the language of Americanism, which was amenable to its own interests, and which would in time

become a campaign to capture and dominate the political system per se and which has succeeded grew, Carey argues, from a fear of organised, popular rebellion against corporate tyranny of which the Industrial Workers of the World, a relatively small anarcho-syndicalist union whose programme of violent revolution as the only solution to labour's condition the imposition through state violence of wage-slavery was by far the best representative. From the moment in 1905 when the IWW was founded, the federal government saw internal security largely in terms of this body.

The significance of this reaction was that it set a pattern for all subsequent ideological crusades in the United States. Each one has been portrayed in terms of an internal security problem which has been seen as a Communist threat. [17]

It appeared to be no problem for the Americanisers that the IWW were anarcho-syndicalists and of the breed who were prosecuted in Communist Russia for being petit-bourgeois and inured by the bourgeois prejudice of freedom, to borrow from Leninist jargon, and in the mind of Trotsky worthy only of being shot down like partridges at Kronstadt in 1921 (anarcho-syndicalists are hated equally by everyone, apparently, presumably for reasons that are not entirely dissimilar). Thus the campaign to have the private interests of corporations confused with the public interests of North Americans and the national interests of the United States identified as one of the same through Americanisation took a road well travelled, and one in fact on which the ruling class had amassed its wealth the invocation of racist xenophobia towards newly arrived immigrants, many of whom were low-paid and ultra-exploited, as part of an exercise in what we know today as ethnic cleansing. Admittedly there was a difference this time around; these feared and hated others had emigrated to the United States voluntarily.

The development which galvanised business into action in this connection was the active liaison in the Lawrence [Massachusetts, 1912] strike between the IWW, with its radical message, and dissatisfied foreign workers. This liaison would lend itself to the creation in the public's mind of images depicting a violent alliance between a foreign immigrant threat to American culture and a radical labour threat to American institutions. [18]

The strike at Lawrence represented one of the few unequivocal victories in the history of American labour to that date, [19] and so the threat it posed to North American business, the chosen elect, and its licence to do as it pleased regardless of the human effects was obvious. The Boston Chamber of Commerce met soon after the end of the strike at Lawrence and shortly thereafter issued a general call to arms designed to awaken the various chambers of commerce and boards of trade to a realisation of their duties as the conservators of the best interests of their communities, but perhaps not to conceal their own paternalistic arrogance, lust for power and greed. In a short time

The Americanizers had succeeded in arousing an interest in their campaign

among the various commercial and industrial bodies of the New England area; they had inaugurated a movement which was to spread to the Middle Atlantic states and the middle west until practically every chamber of commerce or similar organisation of every municipality of significance containing an alien population had a special immigration committee taking a vigorous and active part on behalf of the Americanization of the immigrant. [20]

Reading between the lines, the concern on the part of the Americanisers for immigrants may be seen for what it is, a pathological lack of concern for flesh and blood people and a not particularly subtle indoctrination process, both of the immigrants, who were to learn what a threat they and their lack of doctrinal purity represented to the United States of America, and of the wider population, for whom immigrants represented an example of what must be done with those of whom we are ignorant and for that reason afraid of.

When the First World War arrived, corporate North Americas Americanization drive married like a charm with the anti-German sentiment manufactured by President Wilsons administration, an act admired as noted by one of the subjects of the propaganda whose disrepute will last ten thousand years, having found a population receptive to propaganda and ideological control. [21] The business community proved itself quite open to riding on the back of paranoid fear of foreigners created by war hysteria to advance its own agenda; as far as it was concerned the time was ripe for a campaign of crusading proportions. [22] Crusade it did. Amid the chaos of war, the Committee for Immigrants in America (CIA) campaigned for the fourth of July to be declared Americanization Day, a day for great nationalistic expression of unity and faith in America. The scope of this racist and xenophobic corporatist propaganda campaign and its effect on political discourse in the United States may be measured by the outcome of this proposal. The CIA created a National Americanization Day Committee (NADC) composed of leading corporate executives, which issued a pamphlet arguing the need for a domestic policy on the immigrant. While stressing however well government, business and philanthropy might conceive and launch a national policy for the Americanisation of the immigrant, nothing was more important than the compulsive pressure of public opinion and the effectiveness by which

the average American citizen could be induced to bring the influence of his [sic] views to bear on the immigrant Such a citizen is the natural foe of the IWW and of the destructive forces that seek to direct unwisely the expressions of the immigrant in his new country and upon him rest the hope and defence of the countrys ideals and institutions. [23]

Unspoken in this revival of feudal paternalism was not the unwisdom of counselling immigrants to stand up for themselves, but rather the wisdom that fused nationalist xenophobia with a compulsive obsessiveness for national security and embedded the finished product into the national psyche of the United States on July 4, 1915, with what has become the annual ritual of Independence Daythe name change a

tacit admission of the implicitly compulsive and authoritarian (one is tempted to bite the bullet and say fascist) character of Americanist ideology.

The incorporation of the fourth of July as a day for the foreign born to demonstrate their loyalty to their adopted country set the scene for the incorporation of government policy into corporate North America's agenda; in 1918, two new government agencies were formed: the Council of National Defence (CND) and the Committee on Public Information (CPI). [24] This came about as part of the war programme, through efforts on the part of the Federal Bureau of Education in particular, its Division of Immigrant Education to merge its own programme with the corporate propaganda campaign. For the latter, this represented complete identification of business interests with patriotic endeavours. [25] Needless to say, from this point on, it became patriotic to pursue the corporate agenda, and unpatriotic to oppose it. Rousseau's formula had been cracked. It was the beginning of the end for representative democracy, and the birth of plutocracy.

The 1920s brought with them the moral panic of the Great Red Scare, the inevitable result of corporate North America's campaign to undermine social cohesion in the United States and to weave into the social fabric obsequiousness and fear of the unknown, and the illegal Palmer Raids on the offices of the IWW. The stock market crash of 1929 and the suffering inflicted on the North American people by the Great Depression of the 1930s put a dampener on the campaign to beat the Godhead of private property into the popular imagination, which for a time became preoccupied instead with finding a solution to the fruits of market-driven licentiousness. The Popular Front years of the mid-1930s saw the re-emergence of the threat of democracy and popular participation in social affairs until everything was put on hold by the arrival of World War Two.

In the years immediately following 1945 the corporate agenda contained in Americanism was rekindled by a number of demagogically tempered congressmen of the far-right via the House Committee on Un-American Activities. [26] The second Red Scare spawned Joseph McCarthy, an opportunistic paranoiac whose obsession with unmasking Communism in government seemed to represent a barometer of his inability to formulate positive ideals and his utter lack of imagination. Focusing on Communism in Hollywood, HUAC took its investigations into the mythmaking heartland of the United States, using a cover story of a Communist fifth column subverting a democracy that no longer existed except on paper to beat back the reforms of the New Deal, purge the industry of anyone willing to question the assumption that corporate interests and the national interests of the people of the United States were absolutely identical in every way, if not the moral absolutisms and xenophobia of Americanism. So confident had the crusaders become that they no longer felt compelled to hide their prejudices.

I look at that fellow. I watch his smart-aleck manner and his British clothes and that New Dealism, everlasting New Dealism in everything he says and does, and I want to shout, Get out, Get out. You stand for everything that has been wrong with the

United States. [27]

The rise of HUAC and McCarthy represented a new era of corporatism as government policy, and the change was reflected in the profoundly antidemocratic character of the period in which any residual democratic spirit in the United States was broken for good, and the collective consciousness of North American society colonised, again, by fear-induced amnesia. The schizophrenic character of Americanist xenophobia a characteristic trait of fascism, and for that matter, empire had become transparent:

A nation of immigrants developed a great fear of the immigrant; hyphenated Americans strove to become hyper-Americans. The quest for Americanism, the hunting down of un-Americans, reflected the insecurities, the historic fragmentation of the national culture. But it was a class question too, firmly embedded in an economic system that taught the survival of the fittest, which for the majority implied middle-class and petit-bourgeois conformism: the standard portfolio a house of ones own in the suburbs, a car, insurance policies, a bank account, a few shares eventhat distinguished Mr. Citizen, from the tenement proletarian. Each generation, climbing desperately away and upward from the port of entry, turned its back on the scum of Europe following in the next wave. The cry enough translated itself finally into the immigration acts of the twenties . . . The Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 set the Congressional Seal on widespread xenophobia. People were afraid, and also ashamed; a survey taken in 1954 found that 20 percent of white people would not say where their ancestors came from. McCarthyism was the umbrella held out to all Americans, a repudiation of the Other (the alien), even when the Other was the Self. [28]

To be a respectable American according to the prescriptions of Americanism and anti-Communism, then, it was a necessary prerequisite to fear and hate oneself. If any single event epitomised the seedy character of anti-Communist hysteria during the nineteen-fifties, it was the appearance in 1956 of the blacklisted playwright Arthur Miller before HUAC. Miller offered testimony about himself after turning down an offer from Committee Chairman Francis Walter to cancel the hearing in return for a photo of Miller and himself with the formers fiancée, Marilyn Monroe. Chairman Walter went ahead with the hearing, having been denied his photo (and sucking sour grapes at his inability to meet women without having to subpoena their fiancés first, and even then not having much luck). Unleashing on the hapless playwright HUAC counsel Richard Arens, the latter, projecting his own sensibilities onto Millers play *Youre Next*, interpreted the text as an attack on the Committee (criticism of HUAC being tantamount to aggressive hostility in the mind of this zealot, inured by moral absolutisms and incapable of thinking for himself). Arens also expressed his displeasure at comparisons made in the communist press between the Committees investigations and Millers portrayal in *The Crucible* of the seventeenth century witch-hunts in Salem, Massachusetts. Millers reply was as nuanced as it was crucial: The comparisons are inevitable, sir. [29]

Irony speaks volumes, particularly where its employment in humour annihilates the personal pretences masking ideologically fuelled prejudice, as it did here. Not only were the comparisons inevitable, to be expected from those with no sense of their place in the social hierarchy, a consequence of the annoying tendency of uncontrollables to question accepted dogmas about reality; they were, in fact, the central message of Miller's work, which Arens had obviously not read. The idea that the comparisons were inevitable was a gross understatement; the inability to perceive basic reality a reflection of the psychological depths to which the corporate campaign to rewrite the narratives of the American political system and thereby to entrench plutocracy had come. In actual fact, the comparisons were a damning exposé of the mentality that underwrote HUAC, the phenomenon of anti-Communism generally and the ideology of Americanism in particular. Miller had been brought before the Committee because he dared to expose to plain sight the obvious fact that the ideology of Americanism was constructed for the singular purpose of hiding: the dynamics upon which the Salem witch-hunts were constructed were identical to those powering the robust engine of anti-Communism. Just as the witch-hunts were rooted in fear as a tool of political manipulation and social control, so too was the moral panic over Communism in the United States.

If Arthur Miller had committed a crime, it was to use the device of literature for the purpose of which it had been intended, to wield culture against forces antithetical to freedom, civil society and social cohesion, for which there was no better example than the subversive effects of the Americanist moral crusades. In exposing the patterns common to the Salem witch-hunts and the Red Scare, *The Crucible* represented in fact a psychohistorical prism through which their manipulative dynamic and unspoken agendas of domination and social control were reflected. Anyone who wished to could, by reading the play or watching it being performed, see clearly the manner in which fear of the unknown could be invoked by those of a demagogic temper as a way of polarising society and burdening public discourse with inflexible, compulsive moral absolutisms, the function of which being to enforce conformity to the tyrannical maxim that you're either with us or against us. The light refracted by the psychohistorical prism suggested the moral panic was Koestler's blind alleyway of evolution manifest, the inability to falsify history and free oneself of the baggage contained in the collective unconscious and therefore to recognise that the crimes of violence committed for selfish, personal motives are historically insignificant compared to those committed *ad majorem Dei*, out of a self-sacrificing devotion to a flag, a leader, a religious faith or a political conviction and that, as a result of the colonisation of his integrative potential, man has always been prepared not only to kill, but to die for good, bad and completely futile causes. [30]

Most historians would agree that the part played by impulses of selfish, individual aggression in the holocausts of history was small; first and foremost, the slaughter was meant as an offering to the gods, to king and country, or the future happiness of mankind. The crimes of a Caligula shrink to insignificance compared to the

havoc wrought by a Torquemada. The number of victims or robbers, highwaymen, rapers, gangsters and other criminals of any period of history is negligible compared to the massive numbers of those cheerfully slain in the name of the true religion, just policy, or correct ideology. Heretics were burnt at the stake not in anger but in sorrow, for the good of their immortal souls. Tribal warfare was waged for the purported interest of the tribe, not of the individual. War of religion were fought to decide fine points in theology or semantics. Wars of succession, dynastic wars, national wars, civil wars, were fought to decide issues equally remote from the personal self-interests of the combatants. [31]

The ultimate success of the Americanisers in having their private corporate interests identified with the national interests of the United States may be considered the invocation of this dynamic; in becoming either seduced by or compelled into conformity with the ideology of Americanism, one would assume that ones own selflessness would be shared by the guardians of the idol to which you prayed, although sadly we now know this not to be the case.

At any rate, Arens, looking to make a sacrifice of his own in the name of mankind's future happiness, had reasons to feel upset. Miller had demonstrated conclusively that history was no longer merely being repeated; it had become a single moment being experienced again and again in a multiplicity of different forms, here overt and there covert, thus coming, to all intents and purposes, to a standstill. It was fortunate then that such a suggestion had been made in the communist press, which as everyone knew was too occluded by blind conformity to the interests of a foreign power to display anything of the finely-tuned moral and ethical sensibilities of us in the West. Any further suggestion that moral panics might be construed as last ditch efforts at historical rehabilitation of morally and ethically bankrupt political institutions easily be construed as offensive to the dignity of the state, much less to say the progress narrative of capitalist mythology, and would no doubt make necessary what Bakunin in his debate with Marx called the peoples stick if not for the grace of anti-Communism.

Just as the moral panic over witches depicted in *The Crucible* had served the interests of a young woman somewhat desperately confused by the differences between emotional dependency and love (as it did those of the judge basking in the power granted to him by the situation), so too did the myth of a Communist fifth-column subverting American democracy in the service of a foreign power serve the private interests of the anti-Communist investigators, as it did notable others with vested interests in reducing the acceptable spectrum of respectable public discourse to mere obsequiousness. In *The Crucible*, Abigail Williams throws the accusation of witchcraft first at the black slave, Tituba, to distract from and then apologise for her own deviance from the oppressive and strict puritanical mores of Salem, and then at Elizabeth Proctor as a form of revenge against John Proctor for rejecting her and returning to his wife following a brief affair. Here, as later, fear was the mindkiller, and fear of the unknown doubly so. [32] Instead of engaging in introspection, the society of Salem, seeking someone or something to blame for its

inability to live up to the impossible expectations set by its precious orthodoxy, escapes ultimate responsibility for the predicament it finds itself via the well-trod escape route of the scapegoat.

The vendettas underwriting the unspoken subtext of the national obsession over ideological pollution in the body politic during a later cycle of neurotic self-purification were hardly less venal. Invented for the purpose of bending free and open public discourse over a barrel, so to speak, any opposition to anti-Communism would be tainted with the stain of Communist authoritarianism (a principled commitment to freedom would be out of the question). Rigorous opposition suggested any number of additional personal failings. The identification of corporate interests with patriotism had taken a leap into heretofore unexplored territory; submission to the corporate agenda had become a matter of personal integrity. The colonisation of popular North American consciousness by the corporate Leviathan had reached an unprecedented extreme of compulsion. Those who opposed it were no longer heretics; they were also subhuman, beset by irresolvable character flaws whose depth rendered them incapable of rational thought. This is the logic that, in one form or another, appears to have defined respectable political discourse ever since.

In the decline of the democratic ideal (such as it was), combined with the emergence of a plutocratic empire, the New Rome which the United States has become, we find a meeting point between the mindset of empire and the phenomenon of postmodernity. At this point, in finding the intersection point between the two, we can only hope to find the first clues to lead us towards an explanation for Hume's wonderment at the implicit submission with which men resign their own sentiments and passions to those of their rulers, or the ease with which we have allowed our individual and collective memories to be usurped by the colonising project of Americanism and empire what has been described by Erich Fromm as the fear of freedom.

Our contemporaries, wrote Alexis de Tocqueville, anticipating with remarkable clarity the need for a clue, and at the same time the central dilemma of postmodernity, are constantly excited by two conflicting passions; they want to be led, and they wish to remain free; as they cannot destroy either the one or the other of these contrary propensities, they strive to satisfy them both at once. [33] The champions of American democracy, de Tocqueville implies, wish to hold themselves to the idol of state power, being in love with their chains, but wish at the same time not to know it; a series of ideological rationales must therefore be set in place to justify their varying degrees of irresponsibility. In this striking observation, made permissible through a certain distrust of the ideals of democracy but still nevertheless correct, de Tocqueville speaks directly (1) to the dilemma of postmodernity in general the crisis of meaning caused by the decline in relevance of institutions and values associated with modernity and the associated separation of the symbols of modernity from their subjects and in particular (2) to the pretensions and anhedonic dynamic of fear, manipulation and control at the core of

Americas War on Terrorism, a war we are told will not end within our lifetimes. [34]

If the paradox of democracy is best expressed in Rousseaus ambiguous and cynical assertion that men must be forced to be free, De Tocquevilles observation is striking on a number of counts. In the first place, it shows that the conflicts between means and ends at the heart of representative democracy were apparent to commentators in the early part of the nineteenth century. On the other, it begs the question as to why, when the excitement of conflicting passions appears to be such a good description of the cognitive dissonance engendered by the differences between the form of representative democracy and the substance, no serious attempt has been made within democratic discourse to correct the problem and more to the point, why the obvious contradictions and the cognitive dissonance they create have been left to fester to the point where a new problem has emerged, namely that of the emergence of plutocratic governance by fostering a political environment conducive to the expansion of the imbalance between capitalism and democracy. [35] While this expansion of imbalances is tantamount to the destruction of the latter, which, as noted, implies the forcible imposition of plutocracy, the publics desire for the representative as agent remains strong. [36] If this is true of the political system of any country, it is true of North American plutocracy. De Tocquevilles conflicting passions are nowhere as evident as in the pronouncements of President George W. Bush, whose cartoonish Axis of Evil one would expect to find in a Monty Python movie or Bill Hicks routine lends to the War on Terrorism a certain sense of life imitating art and yet in the War on Terror we still find that the notion of right should be understood again in terms of Empire. [37]

The central problem of postmodernity appears to be whether or not the publics desire for the representative as agent remains strong because the discourse surrounding representative democracy is still perceived to be relevant and meaningful, and has therefore not yet ceased to be credible in the public mind, or if it is instead because although man has rid himself of old enemies of freedom, new enemies of a different nature have arisen; enemies which are not essentially external restraints, but internal factors blocking the full realisation of the freedom of personality. [38] If this is so, then the publics desire for the representative as agent can be regarded fairly as a reflection of the disastrous effects of the market-driven usurpation of representative democracy manifest in Americanism, based not on overt compulsion characteristic of police states, but covert compulsion effected through colonisation of culture by economic fundamentalisms and the concurrent individual internalisation of unprecedented strains of moral absolutism. It may be considered a major innovation in the history of authoritarianism indeed that the architects of plutocracy have dispensed with the need for overt forms of compulsion by recognising the power of the conscience, duly subverted and turned into a weapon against the individual a cop in the head, as it were. The effect of this is of course that

the concrete relationship of one individual to another has lost its direct and human character and has assumed a spirit of manipulation and instrumentality. In all social

and personal relations the laws of the market are the rule. [39]

The result of this loss of authenticity runs parallel with the preoccupation of late capitalism with the fabrication, exchange and sale of images rather than artefacts and the commodification of culture, which suggest the intermingling of culture and economics (or better yet, perhaps, the colonisation of the former by the latter). [40] Subversion via branding of representative democracy, its conversion into a product to be bought and sold in the marketplace of ideas, implies the conversion of already-limited personal agency under conditions of representative democracy (with all its contradictions) into an object of marketplace instrumentality, effectively rendering partially formal freedoms completely so. Individuals are stripped of their freedom and its representation sold back to them in the form of branded commodities; thus in Australia it becomes possible to purchase furniture from a company named Freedom and an internet connection from a company whose name is Soul, and whose television marketing informs the obsequious, unquestioning consumer that you've got to have soul. [41] This we can learn while resting on our Freedom sofa after eight, ten or twelve hours of wage-slavery. The long-term effect of this is of course postmodern anomie, the melancholy of societies without power which has already stirred up fascism, that overdose of a strong referential in a society that cannot terminate its mourning. [42] If democracy has been murdered, perhaps we are still grieving for its corpse and too much in denial of our loss to hunt down the killers.

An engineered destruction of meaningful referentials demands the introduction into public discourse of ideologically constructed simulacra, an ideologically-driven slight of hand whose function is to act as a counterbalancing force against the threat to social cohesion posed by human engineering work. [43] The branding of democracy and its transformation into a commodity to be sold on the marketplace of ideas is the single greatest defining characteristic of plutocracy; so inured have we become by the secular fundamentalisms of market licence that we no longer feel it when our freedom is taken away from us, and so willing are we to be sold back its representation that we invest the totality of our personality with the idol and demonise anyone who tries to make us fall out of love with our chains.

Those of us still doubting the truth of this observation may have real cause to wonder then at the curious paradox of American plutocracy: that real democratic freedoms can be invoked in the name of their destruction. In this paradox, the fact that an act destroyed the constitutional freedoms of North American representative democracy could be called the Patriot Act, that the true face of Rousseau's idea that citizens in a democracy could be forced to be free finally came to full flowering. This flowering was in turn anticipated by the American populist Huey Long, who observed that, when fascism comes to America, it will be on a programme of Americanism—a prediction that began to come true in the anti-Communist hysteria of the 1950s Red Scare, and whose fulfilment we are witnessing in the anti-Terrorist hysteria of the present Terror Scare. Our all-too-human tendency to confuse form from substance represented as well as anything else by Rousseau's democratic

formula gives chilling weight to Longs prediction; our innate awareness of our own tendency to make this mistake was noted at least as far back as Plato, who regarded it as a streak of the irrational in the World Soul. A similar recognition forms a central part of Chinese Taoism, from whence the yin and yang symbol derives, and which, on the basis of its unity of light and dark forces, suggests the possibility of transcending the false dichotomy of good and evil, on which the irrational is founded, by developing a non-judgemental understanding of the interplay between that which is and that which is to be.

Others closer to our own age have also tried with not a little success to uprooting the paranoid streak in the human psyche. We find this in the writings of Nietzsche, who devoted himself with notable energy and no small success in uprooting this irrational streak, most notably perhaps via the aphorism that when we look into the void, the void looks into us maybe explaining why so many of us dont. We find C.G. Jung, whose depth psychology addressed itself specifically to the collective unconscious upon which the World Soul is partly founded and from which the irrational streak draws its psychological and emotive power, particularly where yin and yang are out of balance. We find Arthur Koestler, writing at the time of the Second World War, lamenting in no uncertain terms the evolutionary mishap of codified and institutionalised irrationality and the cataclysmic consequences when different loci clashed. We find the science fiction writer Phillip K. Dick, who, basing his stories on Gnostic cosmology, noted with an amazing brevity that the codification and institutionalisation of the irrational streak could be taken as evidence that the empire never ended, ie. that the past re-invents itself in the present through the power of the irrational, localised in precisely those centres of codified, institutionalised control of which Koestler spoke, and appearing as a chronic mental disorder characterised by systemised delusions of persecution and of ones own greatness. In the paranoid style the feeling of persecution is central, and it is indeed systematised in grandiose theories of conspiracy. But there is a vital difference between the paranoid spokesman in politics and the clinical paranoic: although they both tend to be overheated, oversuspicious, overaggressive, grandiose and apocalyptic in expression, the clinical paranoid sees the hostile and conspiratorial world in which he feels himself to be living as directed specifically against him, whereas the spokesman of the paranoid style finds it directed against a nation, a culture, a way of life whose fate affects not himself alone but millions of others. Insofar as he does not usually see himself singled out as the individual victim of a personal conspiracy, he is somewhat more rational and more disinterested. His sense that his political passions are unselfish and patriotic, in fact, goes far to intensify his feeling of righteousness and his moral indignation. [44]

In this we are reminded of Koestlers earlier remarks. Most powerful of all in terms of the paradox of freedom is the conclusion that follows naturally from an observation of the stranglehold of paranoia over the public imagination which we know otherwise as empire: namely, that the human race has not only fallen into a state of arrested development, but that we have also forgotten how to evolve that we have

become trapped within an unprecedented and most pitiful state of misery, ignorance and servitude, endlessly reliving the exact moment our alienation from nature became the basis for our way of life, the moment we allowed our freedom to be taken away from us via the Americanisation campaign and sold back to us as market representations. The paradox of American democracy lends itself easily to this conclusion. This state Koestler described as a blind alleyway of evolution; Phillip K. Dick referred to it as the Black Iron Prison:

Once, in a cheap science fiction novel, Fat had come across a perfect description of the Black Iron Prison, but set in the far future. So if you superimposed the past (ancient Rome) over the present (California in the twentieth century) and superimposed the far future world of *The Android Cried Me a River* over that, you got the Empire, as the supra- or trans-temporal constant. Everyone who had ever lived was literally surrounded by the iron walls of the prison; they were all inside it and none of them knew it. [45]

This trans-temporal constant had been on the cards ever since Plato's streak of the irrational, becoming less of a streak and more akin to Wilhelm Reich's emotional plague, broke out of the realm of personal character pathologies and was elevated to the level of religious orthodoxy and political dogma.

The term emotional plague is not a derogatory phrase. It does not connote conscious malevolence, moral or biological degeneracy, immorality, etc. An organism whose natural mobility has been continually thwarted from birth develops artificial forms of movement. It limps or walks on crutches. In the same way, a man goes through life on the crutches of the emotional plague when the natural self-regulating life expressions are suppressed from birth. The effects of the emotional plague can be seen in the human organism as well as the life of society. Every so often the emotional plague develops into an epidemic just like any other contagious disease, such as the bubonic plague or cholera. Epidemic outbreaks of the emotional plague become manifest in widespread and violent breakthroughs of sadism and criminality, on a small and large scale. One such epidemic was the Catholic Inquisition of the Middle Ages; the international fascism of the twentieth century is another. [46]

Fear and hatred of the irrational aspects of the self, in other words, the yin or dark force in the psyche, were such as to lead to the pathological denial of the self as a whole through orthodoxy and dogma, both of which promised freedom from external constraints but which were simultaneously devoted to the creation of new ones in their stead. This was the source of the paradox of freedom, the basis of the Black Iron Prison; the freedom spoken of was always a negative freedom, freedom from external compulsion, but never positive freedom, or freedom from internal compulsion. Thus, the development of modern thinking from Protestantism to Kant's philosophy, can be characterised as the substitution of internalised authority for an external one. With the political victories of the rising middle class, external authority lost prestige and man's own conscience assumed the place which external

authority once had held. This change appeared to many as the victory of freedom. To submit to orders from the outside (at least in spiritual matters) appeared to be unworthy of a free man; but the conquest of his natural inclinations, and the establishment of the domination of one part of the individual, his nature, by another, his reason, will or conscience, seemed to be the very essence of freedom. Analysis shows that conscience rules with a harshness as great as external authorities, and furthermore that frequently the contents of the orders issued by man's conscience are ultimately not governed by demands of the individual self but by social demands which have assumed the dignity of ethical norms. The rulership of conscience can be even harsher than that of external authorities, since the individual feels its orders to be his own; how can he rebel against himself? [47]

He can't, unless he recognises the colonisation of individual consciousness in ideologically-induced amnesia and sees religious orthodoxy and political dogma for what they are (the codification and institutionalisation of irrationality), but the irrational dynamics underpinning the paradox of freedom depend on him having neither the willpower nor the desire to do so much less to say the knowledge of anything existing on the other side to break on through to. As long as the individual is beholden emotionally and psychologically to power through ignorance and socially-conditioned repression of his own natural inclinations, freedom within the Black Iron Prison assuming for the sake of argument it actually exists can only be conceived of negatively. His active participation in the reinvention (or better yet, rehabilitation) of the past in the present becomes the natural result of his general fear of individual self-knowledge and self-assertion via the spread of positive freedoms beyond more or less circumscribed limits, with all that such concepts entail in terms of personal responsibility. He is as afraid of freedom as he is of the unknown, for the two are one and the same thing; this is the natural lot for the hereditary slave. Where he recognises something to be wrong with the world, and tries to fix things by tinkering with the political fabric of the Black Iron Prison while leaving the irrational streak untouched, he tends only to reproduce and ultimately reinforce it.

As confused and bewildered as he is by the self-congratulatory and self-laudatory myths of empire precisely because the yang remains repressed, and remaining ignorant of the reality which is somewhat closer to Ghandi's definition of western civilisation (a nice idea), he will, given time and the sense of powerlessness his alienation creates, seek out the security and protection of the codes and institutions of negatively-defined freedom in order to alleviate his suffering, without ever understanding that its true source may be found in his inability to experience the pleasures associated with spontaneous freedom. He will become an anhedonic embodiment of Koestler's blind alleyway of evolution, part of a kind of feedback loop wherein the codes and institutions of a society marked by arrested development work themselves back into the individuals who form its constituent parts. Manifesting in the flesh Dicks' observation that the empire never ended, he will perpetuate his own suffering by means of a negatively-gearred, fear-based, hateful morality which he will mistake for his own unique thoughts and that will bind

him to the machinery of power that enslaves him and to whose perpetuation he is wholeheartedly devoted.

Thus, through this dynamic the individual trapped by the Black Iron Prison recreates the paradox of freedom through a multitude of different forms in an attempt to free himself, substituting one form of slavery for another, and will continue to do so until we either commit collective suicide through global warfare in the desire to assert one hallucination at the expense of another or, alternatively, manage somehow to learn the lessons of history and discontinue the reinvention of the past. Until that time, just as the repressed subconscious always finds a way to express itself, so too will the entirely repressed parts of our personalities continue entirely to express themselves subconsciously through the codification and institutionalisation of Platos irrational streak. Our inability to acknowledge the profound truth underlying Ghandis humourous stab at the pretenses of the Western Roman Empire will remain testament to our bewilderment in the face of the predicament we find ourselves as we continue failing to sublimate the irrational streak in our psyche, which the violence, destruction and suffering of our history as a species reflects so strongly as to be shortlistable for primary theme thereof.

Huey Long was clever to make an implicit recognition of this dynamic, but not a memorable politician for his lack of cunning in articulating his true agenda openly; in the Black Iron Prison we find a hegemonic system of social control so all-encompassing we take it for granted as natural, so ingrained we can swallow the paradox of freedom often without even blinking. Thus the National Socialist movement in Germany destroyed individual freedoms in the name of negative freedom from the harsh obligations of the Treaty of Versailles and the paranoid fear of Jewish pollution; the Communist experiment in the Soviet Union introduced new and unprecedented forms of exploitation and social control as the workers state liberated the Russian people from bourgeois domination. Perhaps the truest comment made about the present War on Terrorism is that the democratic dream has become corrupt, and politicians, being seen as little more than managers of public life on behalf of an increasingly oligarchic elite, have turned instead to selling us nightmaresseeking thereby to break our will in preparation for the theft of our freedoms by inculcating us with hallucinations, thus undermining our sense of security for which we must naturally seek redress in the traditional manner.[47a] It is neither reductionist nor arrogance to note the thread common to them allthe fundamental irrationality of ideologically-constructed, negatively-g geared freedom founded on fear and hatred of the Other, a dualistic pretence whose purpose is avoidance of introspection and escapism, and whose driving force is Platos streak of the irrational. All are illusions borrowing to one degree or another from the paradox of freedom, the crucial lie of the Black Iron Prison upon which the rehabilitation of the past is founded and from which the ideology of Americanism and the institution of plutocracy draws its power.

Besides his suggestion that democracy involves a situation in which we are forced to be free, Jean-Jacques Rousseau is renowned for, amongst other things,

lamenting that man is born free, but everywhere he is in chains. This interpretation of the human condition seems not to have faced serious challenge since it was first articulated, even despite the dated assumptions on which it is based and the sanctimoniousness and duplicity attendant to any attempt at finding its reflection in the daily operation of representative democracies in the first world. His lament did not stop Rousseau from arguing in *The Social Contract* that the height of representative democracy and human freedom consisted of forcing men to be free a formulation that made the laws of logic scream, but one that has proved greatly expedient nevertheless. Had Rousseau, by contrast, suggested that man is born in chains, but everywhere he is free, he might have been somewhat closer to the truth. In our inability to distinguish form from substance, and in our willingness to believe that we are free because that is what we are told, will eventually be the lesson of Americanist plutocracy and remains, for the moment, the legacy of representative democracy in the United States.

Postscript.

Until we learnt the lesson of plutocracy and recognise the legacy of representative democracy, we can expect authentic freedom to continue to be stolen from us through the system of wage-slavery and the lordship of the corporate order. We can expect the lines of mass communication in our society to remain under corporate control such control, needless to say, being the antithesis of the free flow of ideas. Such a situation demands clarity about who we are and where we are at. Empire has become more adept at assuming the forms of its opposite and has adopted the forms of representative democracy; its high priests imitate the language of freedom while they pursue their project of self-enrichment and self-glorification. We have become possessed by their simulacra, and so do not even blink as the language of democracy is invoked in order to undermine and destroy freedom. We imagine ourselves to be free, but at the same time are not active agents pursuing our own dreams and goals. We have learnt over generations to become passive receptacles of information sent to us through a medium over which we have no influence, which is subject to no democratic control and which is accountable to nothing and no one other than itself. Big Brother has no need to watch us; we watch Big Brother. The one tool we still have left to communicate with each other, we don't know what to do with, so passive and weak are we becoming, so much have we internalised the fundamentalisms of the ideology which is colonising every part of our lives, every aspect of our identity. We have traded our own memories of our own lives and our common history for its moral absolutisms, for the artificially constructed memories upon which its credibility depends. In so doing, in trading our own authentic memories for the ideologically constructed memories of the dominant ideology of our society, we have begun to forget ourselves and who we are and in so doing allowed our sense of individuality to be subverted and colonised by the identity chosen for us by the high priests of the fundamentalism; the identity of the passive consumer, the identity of the obsequious, cringing serf. We have unlearned to think for ourselves and act as our own agents, and have learnt ontological helplessness and dependency on the fundamentalism. We have

unlearnt to own our mistakes, blaming them instead on the enemy of our idol. We have learnt to let our idol do our thinking for us, so degraded have we become. We have allowed this to happen, we have found the fundamentalism easy to swallow because it has shown us the easy road through life, the road free of personal and social responsibility and the road free of the ethical obligation as sentient beings capable of independent thought and feeling to resolve the tension between being and becoming on our own terms, to define who we are as individuals through the process of trial and error with all its attendant pain and suffering. In our desire to avoid having to admit mistakes to ourselves and each other we have built ourselves a black iron prison in the shadow of an idol, but what we fail to see is that our attachment to the idol is degrading us more and more as time passes, and the longer we cling, and the more venal and corrupt we become, the more decadent we become, the less able we are to turn ourselves around, to check our decline and to pull ourselves out of the blind alleyway of evolution into which we have fallen. We become so blind as to not see the end approaching, the time when our decline becomes terminal and our investment (both literal and metaphorical) in the idol becomes so great that we are unable to admit any wrongdoing on our own part at all, and make our schizophrenic break with reality complete. At exactly the same moment as we become completely blind, we also become completely convinced of our own moral superiority. At the same moment we become incapable of functioning as ethical agents, we become convinced that we are the only thing standing between the world and Armageddon. At the same time as we lose touch with a sense of natural, spontaneous order, we inherit the narcissistic, paranoid and megalomaniacal delusion that we are the only thing standing between the world and total chaos. The closer we get to the penultimate experience of the decline of our civilisation, the tighter our grip on the idol becomes, and the less we tolerate dissent or criticism. The more we equate mere acknowledgement of elementary reality with a conspiracy to undermine and overthrow our way of life in the name of some demonised Other. As carnage, destruction and horror creeps ever closer to home, the more afraid do we become, and the more do we cling to that which is the source of all our problems. Thus do we ensure our fate. This is happening right now, all around us. Its not too late, but the lines of communication are dying, and the ones we have were forgetting how to use. We are forgetting ourselves. Amnesia is the colonisation of consciousness. Moral absolutism is the absolute negation of the infinite progress inherent to the idea of free will. Fear is the mindkiller. We have the tools to free ourselves within ourselves. These ideas are the keys to unlock them. We cant be shown where to go to reach freedom because our goals evolve as our knowledge of ourselves and our world deepens and becomes more harmonious. We can only be shown how to find the way. Its not too late. Its never too late. Empires are, after all, only manmade, and can be unmade by men if enough of us so desire (although the result, to paraphrase James Brown, wouldnt be a damn thing without a womans touchnot least of which being the removal from public discourse of aggressive masculinism [48]). Empire resides within our tortured, colonised, anhedonic souls, making us blind servants of the forces of control, but if this is so, then so too must (to borrow the lingo of a long-forgotten anti-imperialist) the kingdom of heaven.

Bibliography.

- Bakan, Joel, *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power*, London; Constable & Robinson, 2004.
- Baudrillard, Jean, *Simulacra and Simulation*, Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Carey, Alex, *Taking the Risk Out of Democracy: Propaganda in the U.S. and Australia*, Sydney; University of New South Wales Press, 1995.
- Caute, David, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower*, New York; Simon and Schuster, 1978;
- Ceplair, Larry, *The inquisition in Hollywood; Politics in the Film Community, 1930-1960*, Garden City, N.Y.; Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1980;
- Chomsky, Noam, *Deterring Democracy*, London; Verso, 1995.
- De Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America*, New York; Mentor Books, 1956.
- Dick, Philip K., *VALIS*, London; Gollancz, 2001.
- Eisenstein, Zillah, *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racism and the West*, Melbourne; Spinifex Press, 2004.
- Fromm, Erich, *The Fear of Freedom*, London; Routledge, 2001.
- Griffith, Robert, *The Politics of Fear: Joseph McCarthy and the Senate*, Amherst; The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio, *Empire*, Cambridge; Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Hartman, E.G., *The Movement in America to Americanize the Immigrant*, New York; Columbia University Press, 1948.
- Hofstadter, Richard, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and other Essays*, New York; Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- Koestler, Arthur, *The Ghost in the Machine*, London; Hutchinson, 1967.
- Navasky, Victor S., *Naming Names*, New York; Viking Press, 1980.
- Palmer, Christopher, *Philip K. Dick: Exhilaration and Terror of the Postmodern*,

Liverpool; Liverpool University Press, 2003.

Perlman, Fredy, *The Continuing Appeal of Nationalism*, <http://www.libcom.org/library/fredy-perlman/continuing-appeal-nationalism-fredy-perlman.htm>, accessed 14.6.06.

Reich, Wilhelm, *Character Analysis*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1990.

Rocker, Rudolf, *Anarcho-Syndicalism*, London; Phoenix Press, n.dd.

Williams, Walter J., *Reaganism and the Death of Representative Democracy*, Washington D.C.; Georgetown University Press, 2003.

Footnotes.

[1] The best argument against corporate rule is to look at who we really are and to understand how poorly the corporations tenets reflect us. We are basically organisms of feeling, of empathy, says scientist and activist Dr. Mae-Wan Ho. When other people suffer, we suffer. We want a safe, equitable, just and compassionate world because it is a matter of life and death to us. Dr Vandana Shiva, another scientist turned activist, notes that In every period of history people have risen up against systems that are based on illegitimate measures and that deny people the right and freedom to live and survive with dignity. No social and ideological order that represses essential parts of ourselves can pasta point as true of the corporate order as it was for the fallen Communist one. We only have to remember who we are and what we are capable of as human beings to reveal how dangerously distorted is the corporations order of narrow self-interest. Bakan, Joel, *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power*, London; Constable & Robinson, 2004, pp. 167.

[2] Rocker, Rudolf, *Anarcho-Syndicalism* , London; Phoenix Press, n.d., pp 17.

[3] Perlman, Fredy, *The Continuing Appeal of Nationalism*, <http://www.libcom.org/library/fredy-perlman/continuing-appeal-nationalism-fredy-perlman.htm> , accessed 14.6.06.

[4] *ibid.*

[5] Bakan, *op. cit.*, pp. 16

[6] *ibid.* pp. 17.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Carey, Alex, *Taking the Risk Out of Democracy: Propaganda in the U.S. and Australia*, Sydney; University of New South Wales Press, 1995, pp. viii. I have relied

a great deal on this book over the discussion that follows; unfortunately this is the only study of its kind.

[9] *ibid*, pp. 18.

[10] *Ibid*.

[11] *ibid*, pp. 16.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp vii.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 21.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 22.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 37.

[16] There was a great deal of effort made to eliminate the Allende regime in Chile. There were two parallel operations. Track II, the hard line, aimed at a military coup. This was concealed from Ambassador Edward Korry, a Kennedy liberal, whose task was to implement Track I, the soft line; in Korry words, to do all within our power to condemn Chile and the Chileans to utmost deprivation and poverty, a policy designed for a long time to come to accelerate the hard features of a Communist society in Chile. The soft line was an extension of the long-term CIA effort to control Chilean democracy. One indication of its level is that in the 1964 election the CIA spent twice as much per Chilean voter to block Allende as the total spent per voter by both parties in the US elections of the same year. Chomsky, Noam, *Deterring Democracy*, London; Verso, 1995, pp. 395.

[17] Carey, *op. cit.*, pp. 38.

[18] *Ibid*.

[19] *ibid.*, pp. 43.

[20] Hartman, E.G., *The Movement in America to Americanize the Immigrant*, New York; Columbia University Press, 1948, pp. 92-6, quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 44.

[21] *Ibid*.

[22] Hartman, *ibid.*, pp. 105-9, quoted in Carey, *ibid*, pp. 47.

[23] Hartman, *ibid.*, pp. 115, quoted in Carey, *ibid*, pp. 48.

[24] *Ibid*, pp, 58.

[25] Ibid.

[26] See for example Caute, David, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower*, New York; Simon and Schuster, 1978; Ceplair, Larry, *The inquisition in Hollywood; Politics in the Film Community, 1930-1960*, Garden City, N.Y.; Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1980; Navasky, Victor S., *Naming Names*, New York; Viking Press, 1980; and Griffith, Robert, *The Politics of Fear: Joseph McCarthy and the Senate*, Amherst; The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.

[27] Navasky, *ibid.*, pp. 21

[28] Caute, *op. cit.* pp. 224-5.

[29] Caute, *ibid.*, pp. 536-7.

[30] Koestler, Arthur, *The Ghost in the Machine*, London; Hutchinson, 1967, pp 234.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] The Litany against Fear appears in Frank Herberts novel *Dune*: I must not fear. Fear is the mind-killer. I will face my fear. I will permit it to pass over me and through me. And where it has gone past I will turn the inner eye to see its path. Where the fear has gone there will be nothing. Only I will remain.

[33] They devise a sole, tutelary, and all-powerful form of government, but elected by the people they console themselves for being in tutelage by the reflection that they have chosen their own guardians. Every man allows himself to be put in leading-strings, because he sees that it is not a person or a class of persons but the people at large, who hold the end of his chain. De Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America*, New York; Mentor Books, 1956, pp. 304

[34] In his study of the form that machochism takes in modern man, Theodor Reik puts form an interesting view. Macochism is more widespread than we realise because it takes an attenuated form. The basic dynamism is as follows: a human being see something bad which is coming as inevitable. There is no way he can halt the process; he is helpless. This sense of helplessness generates a need to gain some control over the impending pain any kind of control will do. This makes sense; the subjective feeling of helplessness is more painful than the impending misery. So the person seizes control over the situation in the only way open to him. he connives to bring on the impending misery; he hastens it. This activity on his part promotes the false impression that he enjoys pain. Not so. It is simply that he cannot any longer endure the helplessness or the supposed helplessness. But in the process of gaining control over the inevitable misery he becomes, automatically, anhedonic (which means being unable or unwilling to enjoy

pleasure). Anhedonia sets in stealthily. Over the years it takes control of him. For example, he learns to delay gratification, this is a step in the dismal process of anhedonia. In learning to delay gratification he experiences a sense of self-mastery; he has become stoic, disciplined; he does not give way to impulse. He has control. Control over himself in terms of his impulses and control over the external situation. He is a controlled and controlling person. Pretty soon he has branched out and is controlling other people, as part of the situation. He becomes a manipulator. Of course, he is not consciously aware of this; all he intends to do is lessen his own sense of impotence. But in his task of lessening this sense, he insidiously overpowers the freedom of others. Yet, he derives no pleasure from this, no positive psychological gain; all his gains are essentially negative. Dick, Philip K., VALIS, London; Gollancz, 2001, pp. 87-88.

[35] Williams, Walter J., Reaganism and the Death of Representative Democracy, Washington D.C.; Georgetown University Press, 2003, pp 251.

[36] Ibid, pp. 232.

[37] Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio, Empire, Cambridge; Harvard University Press, 2000, pp. 12.

[38] Fromm, Erich, The Fear of Freedom, London; Routledge, 2001, pp. 90.

[39] Ibid. pp 102.

[40] Palmer, Christopher, Philip K. Dick: Exhilaration and Terror of the Postmodern, Liverpool; Liverpool University Press, 2003, pp. 4.

[41] For more information on personality acquisition, visit <http://www.mysoul.com.au>. Have your credit card ready.

[42] Baudrillard, Jean, Simulacra and Simulation, Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press, 1994, pp 23.

[43] Carey, Alex, Taking the Risk Out of Democracy: Propaganda in the U.S. and Australia, Sydney; University of New South Wales Press, 1995, pp. 55.

[44] Hofstadter, Richard, The Paranoid Style in American Politics and other Essays, New York; Alfred A. Knopf, 1965, pp. 4

[45] Dick, op. cit., pp. 54-55.

[46] Reich, Wilhelm, Character Analysis, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1990, pp. 504.

[47] Fromm, Erich, The Fear of Freedom, London; Routledge, 2001, pp 143.

[47a] <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/video1037.htm>, accessed 18.6.06.

[48] Eisenstein, Zillah, *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racism and the West*, Melbourne; Spinifex Press, 2004, pp. 41.