

The Secret History of the International Court of Justice
Preface to “How I have been made into a different person: Part II: Karin's meetups”
Lawrence C. Chin
June – November 2011

The Secret History of the International Court of Justice
Vol. II

How I Have Been Made Into A Different Person
Part II
Karin's Meetups

Preface

Malgré mes préoccupations, j'étais parfois tenté
d'intervenir et mon avocat me disait alors:
Taisez-vous, cela vaut mieux pour votre affaire.
En quelque sorte, on avait l'air de traiter cette affaire
en dehors de moi.

“Despite my preoccupation, I sometimes wanted to
intervene, and my lawyer would tell me:
Be quiet, that's better for your case.
In some way, they seemed to treat this affair
without my participation.”¹

De viâ, quâ optimè in veram rerum cognitionem dirigitur

“Of the way, which optimally leads to the true knowledge of things”²

This volume describes how Mr Secretary of Homeland Security, with the support of the CIA, has *produced* the evidences they needed to convict the director of China's Ministry of State Security and his spy organization in the International Court of Justice – how Mr Secretary has in this process made up even more bizarre stories about my life to share with the judges of the International Court and his international audience. In this preface to the volume, I want to accomplish two tasks. First, I want to provide some background information for the preceding and following narrative which would constitute my occasional reflection on the evils of the American system in general and of neoconservatism in particular. The references to the literature in its composition are hardly meant to be comprehensive – this is not a research paper – but briefly explanatory. The background information will supposedly add up to a quick profile of totalitarianism the American style, of America, especially since neoconservatism, as “totalitarianism in disguise”, “smart totalitarianism”, and should constitute the stage on which the following story will unfold of the injustices which the United States has perpetrated on me, China, and Russia through the International Court of Justice. American “smart totalitarianism” is the result of corporate capitalists pursuing the head function of a state regarded as a supraorganism to its logical conclusion under the formal constraints, that is, circumventing these

1 Albert Camus, *L'Étranger*; Part II, Chap. IV.

2 Subtitle to Spinoza's *Tractatus de Intellectus Emendatione*.

constraints, of a decaying constitutional government. The profiling of American “smart totalitarianism” is also meant to supplement the analysis of America as the most totalitarian state which I have offered in my *A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*. There, I only talk about American totalitarianism in the aspect of “mass tyranny”, tyranny as a social trend and in the way the society functions without its being consciously directed by any powerful personages. I could not there account for the fact that powerful personages in America did envisage totalitarian control over their people. Then, in the second place, I want to explain something about the forces which I have felt at work in my psyche compelling me to write out my story.

The new age of centralized surveillance and command

My description, in “Government's Investigation of a Schizophrenic”, of our Homeland Security Secretary's operation to discredit, and excommunicate from his community, a person possessed of secret knowledge of his embarrassments – by recruiting his acquaintances and doctors to make false reports and false diagnoses – is in essence a contemporary version of COINTELPRO, the clandestine program of operations which the FBI has carried out between 1956 and 1971 against various leftwing and rightwing groups – from Communist Party USA through black civil rights groups to white hate groups – whose activities were deemed troublesome to the established order but which were perfectly legal or constitutionally legitimate. The techniques then included forging the target's communication, false revelation of the target as a “snitch” in his group, setting up one target group against another, preventing the targets from speaking, meeting, or engaging in political expression through persuasion of hotels or meeting halls to deny space, pressuring the target's employers, etc.³ Without people noticing it, the like of COINTELPRO has started again, this time the work of Department of Homeland Security, since the 911 attacks until 2010 or so. Since constitutional mechanisms exist in America to allow for nonviolent dissent, the American power elite, to crush their oppositions, could not try the most easily imagined, and hence unimaginative, techniques which their Chilean (Pinochet) and Argentinian (the military junta) and countless other predecessors have employed – to find them and kill them. They would have to use this kind of “smart” oppressive techniques – subtly and clandestinely disabling the dissenters' social capabilities without physically touching them at all: “smart” because it is even more effective, as the oppositions seem simply to have unraveled due to their own faults and have not quite an idea as to how it has all happened. The feasibility and success of the like of COINTELPRO depends on power elite's access to centralized monitoring of the society's infrastructure – a bird's eye's view of the target's activities in the artificial jungle of society – and ability to command the human and institutional factors which the target should encounter. The technology of the infrastructure was less advanced at the time of J. Edgar Hoover; the infrastructure was far less centralized then. The “technology of the control center” – recall from the Preface to the first volume – has however achieved lately, to a perfect degree, the capabilities for centralized monitoring and command of the infrastructure, and “American obedience” has taken care to bring all the non-mechanical aspects, the human and institutional factors, into centralized command as well. The new centralized command, as I have hinted, is located in the Department of Homeland Security.

3 See the excellent summary by Frank J. Donner in *The Age of Surveillance*, “Aggressive Intelligence”.

"Power elite" is a term adopted from C Wright Mills. In his *Power Elite* (1956) Mills brushes aside the commoners' illusion that America is some sort of democracy in the sense that it is people's participation which determines the structure which rules over them. On the contrary, just as in most nations and empires that have existed in history, the American commoners have been ruled over passively by a group of power elite composed of the top echelons of the political, military, and corporate domains. The relative positions of the top ranks of these three orders in the power structure have gone through four epochs of transformation before World War Two and a fifth epoch had started after the War. We are currently still in this "fifth epoch".

The fifth epoch is characterized by "the decline of politics as genuine and public debate of alternative decisions – with nationally responsible and policy-coherent parties and with autonomous organizations connecting the lower and middle levels of power with the top levels of decision. America is now in considerable part more a formal political democracy than a democratic social structure, and even the formal political mechanics are weak." That is to say, the people's indirect control of the power structure over them through elected professional politicians has long ago decayed to nothingness. Corporate executives and military war lords have replaced professional politicians in the decision-making process. The orientation of the state has shifted from focus on domestic problems, domestic clashes and balances, to that on international problems, and the economic structure has been transformed into a permanent-war economy and a private-corporation economy. "American capitalism is now in considerable part a military capitalism, and the most important relation of the big corporation to the state rests on the coincidence of interests between military and corporate needs, as defined by warlords and corporate rich. Within the elite as a whole, this coincidence of interest between the high military and the corporate chieftains strengthens both of them and further subordinates the role of the merely political men. Not politicians, but corporate executives, sit with the military and plan the organization of war effort." In sum, "at the top of this [power] structure, the power elite has been shaped by the coincidence of interest between those who control the major means of production and those who control the newly enlarged means of violence; [by] the decline of the professional politician and the rise to explicit political command of the corporate chieftains and the professional warlords; [by] the absence of any genuine civil service of skill and integrity, independent of vested interests." The Boss of neoconservatism is a quintessential example of the power elite of the fifth epoch, shifting about in his positions over the years as Secretary of Defense, chief executive of a major corporation, and the Vice President. The neoconservatives have been the latest evolved form of the power elite of the "fifth epoch" but constitute only a portion of the power elite, concentrated mostly in the Republican Party. In another place, in Janine Wedel's *Shadow Elite* (2009), the neoconservatives' ability to hold position today in the top echelon of the corporate world, tomorrow in that of the military order, and the next day in that of executive branch of the government, has prompted her to call them "flexians".⁴ The controverted elections of 2000 and 2004 may be understood as a civil war within the power elite, split along the lines of two parties.

The NSA's Echelon system which I have mentioned in "My experience..." as the source of my trouble

4 *Shadow Elite*, p. 5. "When such operators work together in longstanding groups, thus multiplying their influence, they are flexnets."

has been a product of the permanent war economy, and so have been the various laws passed in the 1990s requiring all telecommunication companies to use equipment (e.g. digital) compatible with the wiretap technology of the law enforcement agencies. The global listening network called the “Echelon”, which the US (NSA) has constructed with UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and “which [through its network of hundreds of satellites] captures.... virtually every phone call, fax, email, and telex message sent anywhere in the world... then process[es] this information through the massive computer capabilities of the NSA, including advanced voice recognition and optical character recognition (OCR) programs, and look[s] for code words or phrases (known as the ECHELON 'Dictionary') that will prompt the computers to flag the message for recording and transcribing for future analysis”⁵ – this was started in 1947 and was developed during the Cold War. “Intelligence analysts at each of the respective 'listening stations' maintain separate keyword lists for them to analyze any conversation or document flagged by the system, which is then forwarded to the respective intelligence agency headquarters that requested the intercept.” While global, the system of course performs “domestic surveillance targeted at American civilians for reasons of 'unpopular' political affiliation or for no probable cause at all”.⁶ Before, this would require court approval, but a participating country frequently circumvented the law by asking another participating country to spy on its own citizens for itself.⁷ Since 911 attacks the NSA has got a free pass to do domestic surveillance without court supervision. Echelon also spied on the business activities of America's economic competitors, mostly Japanese and Europeans.⁸ This is done by “an office... created within the Department of Commerce, the Office of Intelligence Liaison, to forward intercepted materials to major US corporations. In many cases, the beneficiaries of this commercial espionage effort are the very companies that helped the NSA develop the systems that power the ECHELON network. This incestuous relationship is so strong that sometimes this intelligence information is used to push other American manufacturers out of deals in favor of these mammoth US defense and intelligence contractors, who frequently are the source of major cash contributions to both political parties...” Again, it is the corporate chieftains and the military generals – the power elite of the “fifth epoch” – who have control of the government's apparatus. “The European parliament is now asking [*that was back in 2000*] whether the ECHELON communications interceptions violate the sovereignty and privacy of citizens in other countries. In some cases, such as the NSA's Menwith Hill station in England, surveillance is conducted against citizens on their own soil and with the full knowledge and cooperation of their government”.⁹

After 911 attacks, the neoconservatives, your new power elite, began developing plans to centralize all surveillance apparatus and databases. For example, DARPA's Total Information Awareness program directed by John Poindexter, a collection of computerized systems in the Defense Department able to track every person living in the US and to automatically translate all electronic communications in diverse languages all around the world. Domestically it “will create an intimate electronic portrait of

5 Patrick S. Poole, “ECHELON: America's Secret Global Surveillance Network”, 2000: <http://www.ncoic.com/nsapooe.htm>.

6 Ibid.

7 “European Commission Final Report on the Echelon”, September 2001: <http://cryptome.org/echelon-ep-fin.htm>.

8 Echelon On Line: <http://echelononline.free.fr/>.

9 Poole, *ibid.*; c.f. the defunct Echelon Watch dot Org.

the lives of everyone in the United States... This actual Big Brother dragnet of just about every trace we leave in our daily activities will also include the vast commercial data banks. The cumulative result – when functioning – will have our bank and credit card data, email messages, medical records, prescriptions we order, the pay-per-view movies we click for, travel reservations, telephone calls, passport applications, and any records you leave in any court system, including divorces. And much more...”¹⁰ Although congress cut off funding for this program, something like it must have continued, for centralization of disparate surveillances is the natural next step. The NSA has since 911 attacks been constructing a database of all electronic communications ever made in the country – “the largest database ever assembled in the world” – by diverting telecommunication companies' network flow directly to its systems. “The roundup of domestic calling records is part of a pattern of aggressive seizure of information by the Bush administration, which successfully pressured America Online and MSN to turn over the records of how millions of people had used their computer search engines. Google resisted similar federal demands, but the feds recently turned up the heat. The Justice Department claims the information is necessary to produce evidence to justify reintroducing the Child Online Protection Act, which has been struck down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Technology expert John Dvorak suggests that it is plausible that the government is gathering up the search histories for purposes unrelated to child-porn crackdowns...”¹¹ Doh!

Since the neoconservatives seized power in 2001, gossips were sparse as to their revolution (or “counterrevolution” as shall be seen) in economic policies on the basis of Milton Friedman's teaching, which may be summed up thusly: removing all regulations standing in the way of accumulation of profits (deregulation), selling off government's functions in order for corporations to run them at a profit, and eliminating social services,¹² all of which basically amount to the purest capitalism for corporations. The neoconservative revolution (or, again, “counterrevolution”) swept through the planet in its economic form under the name of “neoliberalism”. When Naomi Klein notes, in her classic *The Shock Doctrine*, that the most essential characteristic of this new system is that it “erases the boundaries between Big Government and Big Business”, she is only noting the culmination of the “fifth epoch of the power elite” long ago described by C. Wright Mills in the 1950s. She defines “neoconservatism” as “a worldview that has harnessed the full force of the U.S. Military machine in the service of a corporate agenda.”¹³ After the 911 attacks – despite the fact that it was the government itself which had perpetrated them – a disaster capitalism complex – “a full-fledged new economy in homeland security, privatized war and disaster reconstruction tasked with nothing less than building and running a privatized security state, both at home and abroad”¹⁴ – rose up to cash in on the new needs, financed not by the naïve investors as the start-ups were during the dot-com boom of the late 90s, but winning sure profit from lucrative government contracts, knowing all about the new Friedmanist stance of the neoconservative administration.

10 Nat Hentoff, “Orwell's 1984 in Our Time”, *The Progressive*, p. 17.

11 J. Bovard, “Reach out and Tap Someone”, *The American Conservative*, 6/19/2006:
<http://www.theamericanconservative.com/article/2006/jun/19/00010/>.

12 Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (2007), p. 68 – 9.

13 Ibid., p. 18.

14 Ibid., p. 377.

“Rather than meet the security challenge posed by September 11 with a comprehensive plan to plug the holes in the public infrastructure, the Bush team devised a new role for government, one in which the job of the state was not to provide security but to purchase it at market prices. And so, in November 2001, just two months after the attacks, the Department of Defense brought together what it described as 'a small group of venture capitalist consultants' with experience in the dot-com sector. The mission was to identify 'emerging technology solutions that directly assist in the U.S. Efforts in the Global War on Terrorism.' By early 2006, the informal exchange had become an official arm of the Pentagon: the Defense Venture Catalyst Initiative... a 'fully operational office' that continually feeds security information to politically connected venture capitalists, who, in turn, scour the private sector for start-ups that can produce new surveillance and related products.”¹⁵

Initiatives of such sort brought into being the homeland security and warfare bubble just like the dot-com bubble in 2000, save that it would never burst because the customer was the government rather than real economic free agents (consumers). The surveillance gadgets – surveillance devices doubling, or masquerading, as iPods, earphones, cellphones, laptops, sunglasses – of which I have seen widespread use around me must have certainly been the new acquisitions of the “homeland security industrial complex” which grew up in this bubble. In the making of a surveillance society, the power elite saw that the current surveillance system – the Echelon system turned inward and however many security cameras had already been installed in the public domain – still left many interstices in the social fabric not under surveillance. Some corporate executives must have proposed to embed hidden cameras and audio recorders in the latest fashionable electronic gadgets, which hip-looking youngsters hired as surveillance agents may carry to patrol these interstices – on public transportation system and on the streets – so as to bring these under watch. The point is that people should not know that they are under watch, and these gadgets were preferable to security cameras because they were masquerades. This was a lucrative contract which some private corporations had signed with the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI – renting out surveillance to the Bureau and the Department – and the last thing they would want was for an idiotic-looking “terrorist suspect” to demonstrate to them that the surveillance agents they had hired were inferior to the traditional secret agents on foot and that the gadgets invented were conspicuous anomalies introduced into the target's environment. (I'm talking about the big hype from May to November, 2006, in “My experience...”) The professional agents in the CIA laughed – while Mr Secretary of Homeland Security stood by his contractors – because, although there were never any intelligence failures on their part, nevertheless they had to take the blame for 911, and also because they were duly offended by the intrusion into their turf of these corporate executives – all of whom were laughable amateurs in the intelligence business, bringing with them fancy gadgets not because these were time-proven effective but because these were profitable to sell to the government.

You must understand that the neoconservative administration would have privatized just about the entire government and cut out all social services and social security if they would have realized that this would not create tremendous popular unrest in the domestic U.S. Instead, they could only privatize the security apparatus of the nation, homeland security at home and service of the military abroad. You

15 Ibid., p. 378.

must locate the "filling up of the interstices" in its proper context: "To cite just three statistics that show the scope of the transformation, in 2003, the U.S. Government handed out 3, 512 contracts to companies to perform security functions; in the twenty-one month period ending in August 2006, the Department of Homeland Security had issued more than 115,000 such contracts. The global 'homeland security industry' – economically insignificant before 2001 – is now a \$200 billion sector. In 2006, U.S. Government spending on homeland security averaged \$545 per household."¹⁶

With now every single communication of the people intercepted by the NSA, and every single movement of the people in the public domain under watch, the next step is to bring all the disparate surveillance technologies into a single access point. That is the technology of the control center – with which I have personal experience – from which the representatives of the power elite not only have direct access to all the surveillances, but, as I have noted, can directly control every single piece of electronic machine in society. The commission of technology and laws permitting all manufactured electronics to be remotely controllable must have happened in the past two decades and yet has never been talked about in the media.

You get the picture. Knowing everything about its subjects has always been the foundation on which the government may control them. The ideal which the power elite, lately in the form of neoconservatism, have been pursuing is nothing other than the three fold attributes of the Judeo-Christian God: omniscient – a society of centralized and total surveillance – omnipresent – the higher ratio of law enforcement officers to the population in the Western nations than in China or Russia, your typical mislabeled totalitarian states, but more importantly, the alignment of local law enforcement forces with the federal homeland security offices resulting in the centralization of local forces in federal hands – and omnipotent – the "smart" way to strike down oppositions, "American obedience", and "politics through deception and theater", all of which have enabled the power elite to remotely and yet clandestinely command the hearts and mind of "the people" as if they were just robots. Note that United States' policy has been that the surveillance gathered in the national security apparatus just named should never be used in any ordinary criminal prosecution, namely, no one is to know that the government is watching over his or her every activity. This is again "smart". Everyone in Winston's fatherland in 1984 knows that he or she is being watched by the Big Brother. That's not "smart" – it makes people uncomfortable and unwilling to obey. Just as in my thermodynamic interpretation of history I have noted that government will always grow bigger and more controlling of its subjects when it has the revenues to do so – American government has become the biggest and the most controlling in the world because its largest economy provides it with the biggest funding in the world – so here I will note that the power elite will increase the scope and depth of their government apparatus as far as the technology and revenues will allow it – revenues through borrowing if not through taxation.¹⁷ It's all a *natural* trend when a nation-state is seen as a "supraorganism" in a thermodynamic interpretation: the "head-function" in a supraorganism will grow and magnify when there is surplus energy, and America, with the largest economy in world-history and thus the greatest amount of available surplus energy, will *naturally* become the most totalitarian state in world-history. By 2010, the "top-secret" surveillance

16 Ibid., p. 15.

17 The neoconservatives, remember, prefer not to tax those truly with money.

apparatus which the homeland security bubble has created has grown to the gigantic size for which the investigation “Top Secret America” has taken account:

“Some 1,271 government organizations and 1,931 private companies work on programs related to counterterrorism, homeland security and intelligence in about 10,000 locations across the United States. An estimated 854,000 people... hold top-secret security clearances... Analysts who make sense of documents and conversations obtained by foreign and domestic spying share their judgment by publishing 50,000 intelligence reports each year – a volume so large that many are routinely ignored...”¹⁸

Priest and Arkin emphasize that we the common people are not allowed to know what these 854,000 people are actually doing. It's all top-secret, under the pretext of *your* protection. “Smart totalitarianism”: you should not know, and you should not feel, the working of the totalitarian government over you.

The following is a story about the ingenious interplay between “true surveillance” and “false surveillance” (or faulty surveillance). By the time I returned home from Europe in February 2008, I had been under 24/7 surveillance for three years. I would continue to be under surveillance. A Homeland Security agent had moved into the apartment unit above me to operate the same surveillance device which the police department had used on me in 2006, the sort which could detect my movement in the privacy of my room through the concrete separating my unit from his. Everywhere I went I would be watched, not because Homeland Security and the Agency wanted to find out what I would be doing, but because they wanted to plan operations around me so as to make up stories about me. As if three years of round-the-clock surveillance were not enough, I would now be subjected to orchestrated faulty surveillance, a false surveillance devised to create surveillance of my doing something when I was really doing something else! In the course of three years, the FBI first watched me in order to discover what I was really about; then, when what I was about wasn't bad enough, Homeland Security while watching me would try to lure what evil I could be out of me with all sorts of sting operations; and now, when I couldn't be the evil which Mr Secretary of Homeland Security was expecting, he would employ a “faulty surveillance Machine” to magically produce surveillance of my doing and saying evil things which I had never said or done. As the *modus operandi* of neoconservative evil in the domestic sphere is not physical violence – the constitutional framework and tradition do not allow this – but slandering their opponents, and as Mr Secretary of Homeland Security was the culminating point of this evil, a system which can produce surveillance of your doing something when you have not done it must be the greatest invention. The neoconservatives loved to make up bad stories about their targets – they have made up stories about Bin Laden, Al-Qaeda, Saddam Hussein, the Iranian regimes, etc., in order to demonize them – and our Secretary of Homeland Security took special pride in being able to make up bad stories about his opponents in order to demonize *them*. He had slandered the Clintons during the White Water affair, making up illegal activities in which the couple had never engaged themselves. Now he wanted to use as evidence the surveillance of my engagement in the evils with

18 Dana Priest and William Arkin, “A Hidden World, Growing Beyond Control”, *Washington Post*, July 19 2010: <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/articles/a-hidden-world-growing-beyond-control/>.

which I had in reality nothing to do to convict me secretly in the International Court of Justice, along with the intelligence agencies of China and Russia. He would use *true* surveillance to plan *false* surveillance and hold the former in secret from the International Court while presenting the false surveillance to the Court as if it were the *one and only* true surveillance.

In some sense, the evolution from total, “true” surveillance of everything you do to making up “false” surveillance of your doing something which you have never done is also natural. After we find out “everything”, the next project which would come to our mind is to control this “everything”. We want to be able to remake reality to fit our fancy. This discontent with the way reality is, this refusal to accept reality, this libido to dominate reality is the degenerate psyche which Eric Voegelin has frequently diagnosed in the radical revolutionaries, in both fascists on the right and communists on the left.¹⁹ It is reflected in the Ministry of Truth where Winston works and where stories about what has happened are made up rather than collected. Ignoring what reality is about and making up stories about what it is about in accordance with how you would like it to be about is how omniscience leads to omnipotence in the psychological dimension. It is basically deception, but it is more than that, because, when Mr Secretary had the International Court “certify” the truthfulness of the stories he had made up about me, he really did experience the thrill of having changed reality – changed the past – insofar as, when it comes to events about people, it is only what people believe which really matters. As long as no one knows that he had lied, it wouldn't matter that he had really lied. Lies. We shall examine next how deception – being lied to by the government – constitutes the essence of living under American “democracy”, how government omnipotence is exercised through lies: “smart omnipotence”, again, because the subjects couldn't notice the governmental forces controlling them.

Explaining American obedience

The following story – in this volume and in the volumes following it until “The conspiracy in the International Criminal Court” – is about a real “Truman Show” where our Secretary of Homeland Security instructs every single person I have ever met to put up an act in front of me while we are all under surveillance so that he may present the surveillance of others' reaction toward me to the International Court as evidence showing that I am a different person than I am, a villain so callous and deceitful to a point unprecedented in history. What has most amazed me in this experience of mine has been the total obedience of everyone I have meet to Mr Secretary's instruction to them. Everyone knows that Mr Secretary is instructing him or her to lie and cheat and defraud the International Court, and yet no one gives a second thought about it. Of all peoples on earth Americans are certainly the most obedient to their respective authority. I have wanted to explain this obedience since it is the exact opposite of the stereotype which Americans have of themselves. In the Preface to Volume One I have cited Nietzsche, noting that obedience is easier than making up your own mind. Here I want to go further in the explanation, along the path which Herbert Marcuse has opened up in his *One Dimensional Man*. Marcuse, along with his Frankfurt School fellows, should certainly be most relevant to me because he was also interested in explaining why the German people under fascism were so obedient to their government during World War II as to sacrifice themselves for aggressive wars and

19 *Israel and Revelation* and *The Ecumenic Age*.

turn a blind eye to the genocide in their back yard, and he eventually found the same dangerous obedience among the post war Americans.

Marcuse in his book offers an analysis of how the advanced industrial societies of the Western world have developed new forms of control by which to maintain their population in their grip far more effectively than the “totalitarian regimes” of the communist bloc – how Western societies stifle all possibilities of opposition and resistance within themselves by integrating the oppositional forces – both the masses who may revolt and the art forms through which, traditionally, the artists make themselves stand outside their society. We are here to accomplish our modest aim – explaining American obedience – within this complex analytical framework.

“Technology leads to affluence, which leads to passivity, which leads to servitude,” so has lectured to me Professor Nishiyama in regard to Marcuse's classic.²⁰ Americans could not imagine themselves engaging in real dissent – dissent that may change the political and social system itself. In the past, the oppressed and exploited masses were discontent with the aristocrats because the latter were free from toils and had free time for self-actualization through intellectual and artistic developments. The oppressed thus constituted forces of opposition within this “two-dimensional society”. They dissented.²¹ They wanted the system to change, and the system was in constant jeopardy. They developed the notions of “rights” and “liberties”: freedom of expression, freedom from arbitrary despotism, freedom of religion (including freedom *from* religion), and, underlying these all, the freedom from want, that is, freedom from hunger, misery, and toil. They obtained these rights and liberties and, with these, built a democratic, free market, and technological state which eventually evolved into the advanced industrial societies of the West.²² Marcuse is quick to point out that, the society once built, these rights and liberties which have been developed to change the *ancien régime* and its likes, become obsolete and lose their abilities to develop human potentials against the oppression of society to keep its subjects undeveloped.²³ Unlike the societies which have preceded them, the advanced industrial societies of the West had developed new forms of control to protect themselves from the working of “rights” and “liberties” to change them. Insofar as the “people” employ “rights” and “liberties” to change the system as a way to develop their human potentials, these new forms of control, appeasement and preconditioning, have the exact effect of nullifying the development of human potentials among those situated below the threshold of power. The new power structure of consumerism appeases the masses with the freedom from toils and exploitation and with the complete satisfaction of their needs. The masses call their appeased state “freedom”, but it is, Marcuse points out, every bit of unfreedom because, although they need not expend as much energy working and can satisfy all their needs, their needs are “false needs” which the society has “administered” to them, and they thereby suffer, without even noticing it, a further restriction on their self-actualization (“self determination” in Marcuse words). Administration of “false needs” is the process of superimposing

20 The following owes much to my hours of conversation with Prof. Nishiyama.

21 At least that's how Marx represented the matter when he spoke of the oppressed as “alienated from themselves”, his way of phrasing the obstruction to self-actualization.

22 This is an ideal way to put the matter, not a historical description of course, since those who developed the liberating concepts for the oppressed were invariably at least bourgeois themselves.

23 *One Dimensional Man*, p. 1.

alien needs upon individuals, their preconditioning to needs which they themselves have not determined:

“We may distinguish between true and false needs. 'False' are those which are superimposed upon the individual by particular social interests in his repression: the needs which perpetuate toil, aggressiveness, misery, and injustice. Their satisfaction might be most gratifying to the individual, but this happiness is not a condition which has to be maintained and protected if it serves to arrest the development of the ability (his own and others) to recognize the disease of the whole and grasp the chances of curing the disease. The result then is euphoria in unhappiness. Most of the prevailing needs to relax, to have fun, to behave and consume in accordance with advertisement, to love and hate what others love and hate, belong to this category of false needs.”²⁴

Once the subjects have been preconditioned by media and public opinion to acquire false needs, their “free” society proceeds to satisfy these needs completely. The imposition of false needs and their satisfaction are both carried out by technology, since, often, these needs are needs for the newly invented technology. The subjects then become complaisant. They are affluent and call themselves “free”. Marcuse however considers them “unfree”, to the extent that they have forgotten that they can actualize their human potentials and be more than mindless consumers of technology. “The people recognize themselves in their commodities; they find their soul in their automobile, hi-fi set, split-level home, kitchen equipment. The very mechanism which ties the individual to his society has changed, and social control is anchored in the new needs which it has produced.”²⁵

“If the individuals are satisfied to the point of happiness with the goods and services handed down to them by the administration, why should they insist on different institutions for a different production of different goods and services? And if the individuals are pre-conditioned so that the satisfying goods also include thoughts, feelings, aspirations, why should they wish to think, feel, and imagine for themselves?”²⁶

This kind of human being who can only want what the society wants him to want and think what the society wants him to think – who thereby becomes incapable of realizing that he is unfree because he has lost the ability to imagine choices besides those which the society offers to him – is what Marcuse calls the “one dimensional man”. The meaning of his unfreedom can be appreciated by imagining the master's programming of a person to an addiction to the operation of an elevator and imprisonment of the person in an elevator.²⁷ He would be eternally having the greatest fun in living in the elevator and commanding it to go up and down. He would think he is free because his most vital need – the need for the elevator – has been satisfied; yet you must consider him unfree because he has lost the ability to develop his other human potentials; he is no longer capable of self-actualization. It is in reference to

24 Ibid., p. 5.

25 Ibid., p. 9

26 Ibid., p. 50.

27 Of course, Aldous Huxley has thought out similar, but more complex, versions of this sort of conditioning or programming in his classic *Brave New World*. Thus are the Betas, Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons in his dystopia.

this sort of unfreedom masquerading as freedom, unknown in the two-dimensional society of the past, that Marcuse speaks of the “union of freedom and servitude”.²⁸

Americans, as content consumers, are thus unfree, and yet think themselves to be free. They have become addicted to the material possessions which they are allowed to accumulate in the technocratic free market system, at the expense of developing the varieties of thoughts, imaginations, and tastes which have made the past philosophers and artists “free”. Inherent in Marcuse's analysis is not just the belief that the purpose of a society, and a state, is the provision of a medium in which human beings may realize their natural potentials – a common idea among philosophers of modernity from Spinoza through John Stuart Mills to Noam Chomsky²⁹ – but also the notion that a human being can truly develop his own thoughts and tastes only by rebelling against the existing social system which oppresses thoughts and tastes contrary to those it administers, and changing it.³⁰

The American consumers do not notice their unfreedom because there are no longer examples around of a self-actualizing and self-actualized person. The elites – including the “power elite” – in contemporary advanced industrial societies are no longer men or patrons of high culture and intellect, but are simply ordinary persons endowed with more money and power. They differ from the common consumers only quantitatively, no longer qualitatively by dint of a superior taste in art and a superior intellect. At least the commoners can no longer perceive any qualitative difference in the elites – I will name later an *artificial* qualitative difference distinguishing the power elite from the ordinary people in America but of which these ordinary people have no notions. Marcuse devotes special attention to art because it is through art that artists may actualize their mind free from the given reality imposed by society. And yet culture – the ensemble of artistic expressions – has become in advanced industrial societies “pop culture”. “Pop art and culture”, instead of freeing from the given reality the human beings who create it or who witness it, repeat to them the trends in the given reality in order to further imprison them in it.³¹ This is the “one-dimensional society”, a society in which no alternatives can be fancied to its oppressive mechanisms. Marcuse is at pain to describe the manner in which the Western state incorporates resistance and conflict as part of its very constitution so as to contain them, to nullify their harmfulness to itself. Commoners have the right to protest, and the party system allows oppositional parties to work against the ruling party. Citizens' oppositional energy is channeled into these oppositional routes *within* the system and pacified because the oppositional routes have been designed to be incapable of effecting real changes to the system. Vote Democrats or Republicans, but leave the political and economic structure untouched. In this way, people can “speak out against the

28 Which Huxley, from a more simplistic viewpoint, would speak of as “programming you to the love of your servitude”.

29 When Spinoza claims that the purpose of a state is to ensure individuals' liberty, he means by liberty really the liberty to develop one's human potentials.

30 It is thus in such perspective that you should consider Montesquieu's *The Persian Letters*, the first finest example of dissent of the Enlightenment which Montesquieu wrote as soon as Louis XIV died and the censorship in France was relaxed. By exposing the wastefulness and damage of religious bigotry and dogmatism to nation's power, for example, the author rose into new relationship with reality. Durant, *The Age of Voltaire*, p. 340- 344.

31 I hereby supplement the analysis of “pop culture” I have offered in my *A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*, where I distinguish “pop culture” by its effect of “intestinalizing” the mind, whereas traditional art stimulates the mind's understanding capacity until it ultimately reaches “enlightenment”.

society” without ever being able to change it in fundamental ways such as the revolutionaries have done to the *ancien régime*. And, in this way also, the commoners have never noticed that they are not really making an oppositional stand; neither do they notice they never really want any fundamental changes to a system which administers and satisfies their (false) needs. They exercise their rights and liberties in vain, their rights and liberties are hollow.³² The eastern totalitarian societies control their subjects far less effectively because they have not understood the art of integrating those potentially oppositional constituents through satisfying their vital needs – or the art of satisfying their vital needs through integrating them to the system – and even less the art of integrating the tendency to oppose into its very being.

The key to the failure of the eastern totalitarian states in the art of totalitarianism is the unattainment of that gross productivity enough to satisfy to the brim those vital human needs, the physical needs to be fed and housed without unbearable toil, let alone to administer and satisfy false needs on top of these. Insofar as human beings are designed to eat, defecate, and reproduce, once the society has been organized to satisfy these needs without remainder, the subjects are open to preconditioning to all variety of false needs and, through that, to pacification. You may recall that Winston, in *1984*, finds it impossible to believe in the totalitarian system in which he is ensnared simply because he lives in perpetual discomfort and finds the food distasteful. Comfort pacifies and renders obedient. As dissent flourishes in times of want and privation, when everyone gets what he or she wants, “truly or falsely”, there is no possibility of real dissent. When someone does dissent in a “true” fashion – advocating a change to the system – everyone ignores him because everyone now has a stake in the system insofar as this system satisfies a wide variety of his or her vital and false needs. People cannot be said to allow dissent simply because they let the dissenter be and do not chop him up to pieces; ignoring him is not allowance. And yet ignorance of dissent is confused with “freedom to dissent”. Marcuse would deplore the disappearance of the possibility of dissent and taking dissent seriously, because it is (true) dissent which changes the system and improves human beings.

American people's fear of losing the comfort and “false satisfaction” which their system provides is the chief reason for their mindless obedience to their authority's instruction for them to lie and cheat and defraud the International Court, even while they continue to criticize this authority as a way to imagine themselves “free”. They are one of the most unfree peoples on the planet. One of the persistent themes in the following narrative is Karin's bunch's love for criticizing the neoconservative regime and yet blind obedience to the instruction of the regime for them to commit injustice and fraud. The diagnoses which I will offer in the narrative are firstly their unshakable belief in the natural right of the Western world to rule over the rest of humanity, and secondly their complete lack of consideration for my welfare even if they might be moral and fair with respect to each other. The first symptom is a very pervasive sentiment throughout the peoples of the Western world, who are not racist, who perform more charities for the Third World's poor people than any peoples for any other peoples in history, but who, once this sentiment be shaken, would suddenly shift to their dark side. Russia and China cannot

32 It is for this reason that “democracy” – in the sense of voting for your representatives – is praised as more stable than other forms of government. Looked at another way, this fact actually bespeaks “democracy's” superior defense against resistance.

be allowed to win the lawsuit, even if they are in the right, for they cannot be allowed to supersede United States, France, and Germany in international affairs. I am here referring to a certain Sinophobia. The nationalist sentiment and the selfishness in ignoring the welfare of those whose company is a matter of indifference can, however, be metaphysically comprehended as the reasons for unquestioning obedience to authority only when they are appreciated as the outgrowth of a general contentment with the prevailing system. The following story, while mine, is also a story of how mediocre people like Karin's bunch mindlessly obeyed, in reality, those authorities which they have criticized in imagination in order to feel free, and ended up failures to rise above their general contentment and to become the moral beings which they could potentially become.

You may counter that Karin and her friends and my family members and everyone else obey the authority which they have always criticized because they are patriots. But what is patriotism? If patriotism is defined as working for the interest of your nation, it merely leaves the "interest of your nation" undefined. Is the interest of your nation unfettered power over other nations? Soft power or hard power?³³ Or is the interest of your nation a glorious past, such as France is known for? Or is the interest of your nation to become those idealized states which provide a framework in which their people can live happy, fulfilled, and free, like Netherlands and Sweden? C. Wright Mills writes of patriotism: "[L]ike codes of honor feelings of patriotism and views of what is to the whole nation's good, are not ultimate facts but matters upon which there exists a great variety of opinion. Furthermore, patriotic opinions too are rooted in and sustained by what a man has become by virtue of how and with whom he has lived."³⁴ In the end I will find it more profitable to simply define "agendas". Different nations have different agendas and the same nation has different agendas at different times of its history: to rule over others, to provide justice to its people, to be the arbiter in international affairs, or anything. The agendas of the neoconservatives I will describe in the Afterword, and the narrative of Karin and her friends chronicles how a group who have talked constantly about justice for the oppressed have come to serve in actions the agendas of the horrifying oppressors. While the general Americans' habitual obedience to authority forms the background, Karin's and her friends' obedience is on the surface motivated by Sinophobia and Russophobia and the corresponding belief in the natural right of the West to rule over Chinese and Russians. This form of power-hungry patriotism without regard to what is right and wrong is itself preconditioned, or "administered" – and this is another important theme here which I will analyze momentarily. While at the end of the narrative I will characterize Karin's bunch as "morally mediocre", they constitute in a deeper analysis typical examples of failures to transcend their preconditioning and actualize their human potentials. Insofar as their shepherd, Mr Secretary of Homeland Security, is *ultimi malorum*,³⁵ they follow the path shown to them and become likewise.

We are here doing something in the nature of political theory. Political theory is the discipline

33 Hard power is military might. Soft power is the ability to influence other nations by virtue of the nation's moral reputation. Until 2001, United States was a superpower both in terms of hard power and soft power. It is soft power at which China is aiming, as the conservative Chinese leaders recognize that, in today's world of international laws and utterly destructive weaponry, soft power is more important.

34 *The Power Elite*, ch. 12 "The Power Elite".

35 Ultimate evil.

concerned with the study of types of regimes. “Regime” here translates the Greek *politeia*, “which signifies both the way power is shared in a community and something like the fundamental law of the land, the constitutional principles that order a society. The regime refers to more than the form of government in the relatively narrow legal sense; it refers to the entire way of life of a society, its habits, customs, and moral beliefs, as when we speak of the *ancien régime* in France.”³⁶ A regime may be defined as the interplay between power, freedom, and fulfillment of human potentials, and regimes differ one from another by virtue of their respective allowance of a greater quantity of any one of these three elements at the expense of the other two. If power is defined as the ability to control and influence others to your ends, then freedom, at least for the commoners, when you set aside freedom from toils and wants, is freedom from power, from the power of those who have power over you. This is ultimately the freedom to determine yourself, your freedom to actualize your human potentials. We are thus here speaking of America as a “smart totalitarian regime” in which power is absolutely great and freedom absolutely low – where the system has complete power over you, determining that you want to be only the basics of your human potentials, while making you believe that you are free from all external constraints.

If it all sounds like a conspiracy, we have to remember a distinction. “There is a great difference,’ Richard Hofstadter has remarked, ‘between locating conspiracies in history and saying that history is, in effect, a conspiracy...’”³⁷ When we describe the consumer society of advanced industrial states as more capable than ever in stifling opposition and in controlling human beings, we are saying that history is a conspiracy to this end because it is the whole society which evolves into such totalitarianism, everyone having contributed to it and yet no one having planned this in advance. The general habit of obedience formed along the satisfaction of needs is the result of conspiracy *of* history, but mindless obedience to authority to do wrongs is the result of a conspiracy of the power elite *in* history. What the power elite have done is to seize upon the conspiracy *of* history to make a conspiracy *in* history. The power elite in the latest form of neoconservatives have perfected the art of having total power over you while making you believe that you are free to the greatest extent from governmental constraints, that you are in fact *with* the government to fight *for* your freedom. They have noticed that you are docile and subsisting in servitude, and they have decided to seize upon the causes for these and magnify your docility and servitude in order to preempt resistance to their project of a “counterrevolution”. The unconscious conspiracy to chain you in unfreedom has now evolved into a conspiracy consciously orchestrated by a small minority to keep the masses in unfreedom, and this is done through deception and theater.

You should by now have some notion about the exact definition of “totalitarianism”. It means total control over your body *and* mind, over what and how you think as well as what you do. China during the Mao era has attempted to become “totalitarian” but has failed. China today is only authoritarian, namely the government has attained control over what people do but not what and how they think. The American government has attained both, and in a “smart way” because it practices the art of deception to perfection, having seized upon the art of deception which has grown up naturally in the consumerist society. The totalitarianism in 1984 is “stupid totalitarianism” because the lies perpetrated by the

36 Steven B. Smith, *Reading Leo Strauss*, p. 188.

37 C. Wright Mills, *ibid.*

Ministry of Truth are stupid and not really believable. Don't expect people to believe your lie that they live in a paradise when every inch of their body tells them that they are miserable. The dictatorship in North Korea continues in “stupid totalitarianism”. It has not succeeded in the art of totalitarianism at all since people simply don't believe in the lies told about the magical benevolence of the dictator. The dictator in question can learn a lot from the American neoconservatives who know how to tell “smart lies” which are believable – and this, not just because their lies have a ring of realism to it, but mostly because the conspiracy *of* history has already convinced the American people of the truthfulness of the falsehood that they are free, live under a transparent government, and have access to “free press”, so that they are not really expecting to be lied to by their government.

Politics through deception and theater

It has been a widespread practice in the press and among the “conspiracy theorists” to trace the politics of neoconservatives to their Straussian roots and to Leo Strauss himself. Shadia Drury has once offered a concise, non-esoteric, exposition of the connection between Leo Strauss, Straussianism, and the neoconservatives, in *Leo Strauss and the American Right*. (A short version is her “Saving America: Leo Strauss And The Neoconservatives”).³⁸ The Straussians themselves however may have justification in denying that every one of the neoconservative policies can be traced back to Leo Strauss.³⁹ The most notable and frightening of the neoconservative projects, the creation of supranational entities, eventually a single world government, seems to be something against which Strauss has specifically spoken.⁴⁰ I have here neither the expertise nor the intention to participate in this debate. I'm here writing a memoir about intelligence agencies and neoconservatism whose dominant themes is the art of deception, and I'm here to show you that no one practices deception better than the American bureaucrats during and after the neoconservative reign. My argument, or rather my portrait, here is that “politics through deception and theater”, which establishes American “smart totalitarianism”, is the result of power elite's seizure of the conspiracy *of* history, as said, and is more a part of the tradition of the power elite than a product of Straussian intervention, although some of its current features may be attributed to Straussian adaptations.

I have not deemed it worth my time to labor through the terse language of Strauss' works just to find out his true relationships to the latest stage of American “smart totalitarianism” as represented by the neoconservatives. What I have gathered from Shadia Drury's and others' exposition of Strauss' worldview and his motivating concerns is this. Leo Strauss is a nihilist: there is no God, no afterlife to serve as punishment of evil doers or reward for good doers. We have but the cold universe in which we inhabit and which is completely indifferent to the evils we do to each other. This may well be true, but Strauss' view was that all philosophers and geniuses in the past have believed likewise. About this, I'm sure, he was wrong. He would not find agreement in the ancients he so admired but only in the modern thinkers like Thomas Hobbes or Machiavelli – the former of whom has degenerated into relativism: “The object of any appetite or desire... a man calleth the *good*; the object of his hate or aversion, *evil*;

38 <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article6750.htm>.

39 Steven Smith, *Reading Leo Strauss*, p. 157.

40 *Ibid.*, p. 192 – 3.

for these words... are ever used with relation to the person that useth them, there being nothing simply and absolutely so, nor any common rule of good and evil to be taken from the nature of the objects themselves";⁴¹ and the latter of whom has used the terms "virtue" and "reputation" in *The Prince* to refer to the shrewdness and daring to win power and rule and the weak's admiration for the strong ruler who is possessed of this shrewdness and courage. "Courage" is the courage to *not* be good, contrary to the call of conscience and empathy.

The duty of the philosopher, in Strauss' scheme of things, is to cure nihilism. He must first hide this cruel reality from the commoners and then create a tradition of rules and justice as the mechanism to maintain order among them. For if the common people are conscious of the fact that in this cold universe the good do not necessarily end up well and the bad end up badly, that there is no objective foundation for the tradition of rules and justice which has held society together, they would descend into chaos. The tradition that is created by these philosophers-lawgivers-prophets – what Nietzsche has called "Supermen" (Übermenschen)⁴² – have usually been religious in nature, invoking supernatural beings which would punish the evil doer and reward the good in some other dimension than this life. Commoners must not know the truth, that the evil doer will in fact never be punished in this cold, indifferent universe, lest society descend into chaos. Philosophers until modern time have carefully written their texts in multilayers, with both exoteric and esoteric dimensions, the latter hidden behind the former, the truth of nihilism hidden behind an apparent admission about the existence of God and the eventual reward for the just. When the texts are read, only other philosophers will discover the hidden truth, while commoners see only the apparent admission. The old philosophers have thus been sensitive to the effect of rationalism on public order, to the damage which unveiled truth might have on the delicate traditions which have kept up the harmony in society. The fault of the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment is that the philosophers of Reason like Spinoza and the *philosophes* of Enlightenment have exposed the truth, have spoken openly of atheism,⁴³ such that they have had to scramble to find new foundations for the rules of altruism and goodness which have henceforth cemented human beings in harmony. New foundations, such as the social contract theories. This is "liberalism". It espouses secularism, but behind it is a "flagrant disregard for the effects of knowledge on the public at large".⁴⁴ Those philosophers of Reason were so wrong headed that they even felt it to be their Messianic duty to spread the truth to the common people, believing that the enlightenment of

41 Cited in Durant, *The Story of Civilization, Part VIII, The Age of Louis XIV*, p. 554.

42 The intellectually and spiritually superior one who, confronted with the vacuum of values – the abyss, *Abgrund*: when all existing values turn out to be meaningless – bravely invents a new value system to guide existence. See *Thus Spake Zarathustra*.

43 It is loose speaking here. What the philosophers of Reason have in common is hostility to the established Christian religion. Some are atheist or agnostics, such as Diderot, some Deist, such as Voltaire and the English philosophers, who profess belief in God but reject Christian theology, and some pantheist, such as Spinoza. Often, Strauss would regard even pantheism, the more realistic form of the admission of the existence of God, as an exoteric lie to cover up the esoteric true belief that there is no God at all – just to avoid complete persecution by the Church. Note that Strauss has regarded Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* as "as a foundational event in the establishment of modernity." See Benjamin Aldes Wurgaft, "Persecution and the Art of Critique: Leo Strauss between Secularism and Religion": <http://www.politicsandculture.org/2009/11/09/persecution-and-the-art-of-critique-leo-strauss-between-secularism-and-religion/>

44 Ibid.

everyone would bring paradise.⁴⁵ It is then witnessed that the opposite happened, that liberalism, though of good intention, has led to the holocaust. Strauss came to America only to find that America was at the early stage of liberalism, but that it could still be rescued from repeating such disaster as the holocaust. What America needed was a “counterrevolution” to turn back the tide of liberalism. To achieve this counterrevolution, Strauss graduated, from his base at the University of Chicago, more than a hundred disciples, many of whom would seek out high positions in the government. Thus were formed the warriors to bring about a counterrevolution. But America had been so enamored of liberalism and would most likely not appreciate the “turning back of the clock”. The counterrevolutionaries must therefore effect the change quietly and secretly. They would furthermore have to employ the mechanisms of democracy already in place. “Strauss's political solution is to create an aristocracy in the midst of American liberal democracy... Strauss's project is premised on the assumption that the mass never rules, but no one can rule without its consent.”⁴⁶

Other groups of intellectuals than the Straussians have come to make up the neoconservative movement, notably the descendants of the Trotskyite New York intellectuals⁴⁷ and the Chicago school of economics founded by Milton Friedman – which would make Chicago the origin of the American counterrevolution. The best documentation of the Chicago school of economics side of the neoconservative movement is Naomi Klein's aforementioned *The Shock Doctrine*. The three intellectual strands influence one another, and together neoconservatism may be characterized as the combination of social conservatism, or rather social control – tight control over common people's morals and characters – with liberal capitalism, or rather unfettered freedom for giant corporations – freedom from regulation and taxation. Since the Reagan era, neoconservatism has been infecting members of the power elite, converting them to its ideology, mostly in the Republican party, although there have always been many in the power elite who do not share it, mostly in the Democratic party. During the “infection” the Straussian project of a “counterrevolution” merged with the infected power elite's new project to increase their power against the foreseen corrosive effect on their power base of the upcoming “peak oil” crisis. “Counterrevolution” now became the return to “fascism” – corporate profit-making in collusion with a government transformed into absolute monarchy, which, remember, is just the logical conclusion of the “fifth epoch” of the power elite: it is merely the latest expression of corporate chiefs colluding with war lords to magnify their power and wealth. The power elite now set themselves on the path of world-conquest. “Absolute monarchy” is their response to the new need of imperialism, and, like the original plan for a counterrevolution, it must be effected clandestinely because people would fare poorer, because people have no interest in sacrificing themselves for the interests of the powerful and the wealthy, and because people have become enamored of constitutional mechanisms even if they have been exercising these only formally and in a hollow manner. As Chris Floyd explains:

“[The neoconservatives] believe that the time for democracy and the rule of law has passed.

45 Hence Diderot's *Encyclopédie*.

46 Drury, *ibid.*, p. 16.

47 Kevin MacDonald, “Thinking about Neoconservatism”: <http://www.vdare.com/articles/thinking-about-neoconservatism>. I don't subscribe to his new way of using evolutionary biology to justify racialism, although I frequently find his analysis of neoconservatism insightful.

Constitutional government and legal accountability are 'quaint notions' that can no longer be indulged by a massive state with 'responsibilities' for managing the affairs of the entire world – and a myriad of 'enemies' challenging this benign domination. Only a Leader-state – run by a small, secretive cadre of dedicated elites able to operate beyond any restraints of law or outside supervision or public consent – is supple enough to deal with the duties and challenges faced by the 'world's only hyperpower.' This is their vision of government. It is a radical transformation, in both substance and structure, from what we have known before. It is authoritarian. It is arbitrary. It is ruthless, corrupt, brutal and vile, but because it is clothed in modern garb, in business suits, PR-packaged, slick and airbrushed, we don't see it for the barbaric throwback that it is. As I wrote in November 2001:

“It won't come with jackboots and book burnings, with mass rallies and fevered harangues. It won't come with 'black helicopters' or tanks on the street. It won't come like a storm – but like a break in the weather, that sudden change of season you might feel when the wind shifts on an October evening: everything is the same, but everything has changed. Something has gone, departed from the world, and a new reality has taken its place.”⁴⁸

While the neoconservatives have consciously attempted to repeat the history of the Roman empire – of which Montesquieu has noted that its transformation from “a republic in which there had been a division and balance of powers to an empire better fitted to govern dependencies” was precisely the prime cause for its decay, in “so centralizing all rule in one city and one man as to destroy the liberty and vigor of the citizens and the provinces”⁴⁹ – they have wanted to veil the transformation via “politics through deception and theater”. Power elite's solution to people's resistance to the constitution of absolute monarchy – the logical conclusion of the “fifth epoch” – is to avoid it, to hide the fact from the people. A two-tier reality will be *consciously* created, a reality *behind the scene* and a reality *on the scene*. Behind the scene the United States government has been transformed into an absolute monarchy – with a serious effort at centralization of the federal system⁵⁰ – but on the scene the formal (already hollow) mechanisms of a federated representative government persist. “American democracy” will henceforth be an exoteric lie which the people believe to be true and which hides the esoteric truth of absolute monarchy of which people shall have no notion. It is the task of the absolute monarch to present itself to the world and to its people as a transparent and open democratic system to which people may even obtain direct access through Freedom of Information Act requests, etc., while it remains in reality the most secretive in the world, on a par with the North Korean government perhaps. We emphasize here that the two-tier reality is a *conscious* creation because we have already noted

48 “The Legal Perverts' Parade: Executive Privilege Über Alles”: <http://www.lewrockwell.com/floyd/floyd80.html>; emphasis added.

49 Montesquieu's *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence*; Durant, *The Age of Voltaire*, p. 346.

50 The real purpose in the creation of Homeland Security Department and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence is the centralization of the government and intelligence apparatus. The CIA for example has resisted the DNI's intrusion into its “turf” not only because it has been its “turf” but also because the intruders are laughable amateurs – politicians and subcontractors – whose stupid and dirty fingers should not be allowed to touch the Agency's precious secrets wrought by true professionals.

above that, since the beginning of the fifth epoch, "American democracy" (in the sense of a representative government by which the people rule themselves indirectly through representatives) already looks more like an aristocracy, the rule by the few independent of the will of the many, and that methods of deception have naturally grown up to mislead people into the perception that they are ruling themselves and determining their own destinies. The power elite will now consciously seize upon the use of deception to completely veil the final transformation of "aristocracy" into "absolute monarchy".

Now "the Leader-state run by a small, secretive cadre of dedicated elites operating beyond all laws" – how much would the neoconservatives find resonance in Strauss' idea of the nature of things, that nature has made it that the intellectually superior, the wise, should rule the uncultivated masses and do so above the constraints of law.⁵¹ This thus seems to be the first adaptation of particularly Straussian ideas to the latest expression of the "fifth epoch", the constitution of absolute monarchy. Insofar as the absolute monarchy is constituted in response to the need of world-conquest, social conservatism is about the control of the population to obtain their consent to empire-building and corporatism: remember that your consent to the counterrevolutionary elites is necessary, even though you will never rule. This would be the second task of deception. It is the task of the absolute monarch to present to its people the coming wars as defensive moves when in reality they are wars of conquest. The wars to conquer the oil fields that are left in response to the "peak oil crisis" should be thought of by the people as wars to defend their "democracy" against terrorists ("War on Terror"). This second way in which the neoconservatives have seized upon the conspiracy of history to make it into a conspiracy in history, perfecting an art of having total power over you and commanding you to fight while making you believe that you have freely chosen to fight for your own freedom, is where, as I have commented in the Preface to Volume One, neoconservatism bears such resemblance to "education by deception" which Rousseau has presented to us in *Émile*. As Alan Bloom summarizes:

"Given that the child must never confront other wills, Jean-Jacques tells us that [Émile] cannot be given commandments. He would not understand even the most reasonable restriction on his will as anything other than the expression of the selfishness of the one giving the commandments. [*Justice as advantage of the stronger, as Thrasymachus argues in Plato's Republic.*] The child must always do what he wants to do. This, we recognize, is the dictum of modern-day progressive education, and Rousseau is rightly seen as its source. What is forgotten is that Rousseau's full formula is that while the child must always do what he wants to do, he should want to do only what the tutor wants him to do. Since an uncorrupt will does not rebel against necessity, and the tutor can manipulate the appearance of necessity, he can determine the will without sowing the seeds of resentment. He presents natural necessity in palpable form to the child so that the child lives according to nature prior to understanding it."⁵²

Jean-Jacques' "education by deception" reaches a climax when he has secretly selected Sophie as Émile's mate, then carefully orchestrated a trip to Paris for Émile to meet all the Parisian girls whom he has calculated Émile will not like, and finally made arrangement with Sophie's parents to stage an

51 Drury, "Saving America".

52 *Émile*, translated with an introduction by Alan Bloom, introduction, p. 13

overnight stay at Sophie's house during the trip back. Émile has no idea that his tutor has planned everything and has calculated that, with all these circumstances fulfilled, he would fall in love with Sophie at first sight. Without knowing it, he has been manipulated to want the girl whom his tutor has wanted him to want, thinking all along it is his free choice. This is precisely what the Neoconservative administration has done to the American people since the 911 attacks. Recall the parallel made in the Preface to the first volume between the attack on Pearl Harbor and the 911 attacks. People are wanting what they want, wars to clean out the terrorists, but they are only wanting what their government wants them to want. People think the government is protecting them when the government suspends their liberties and rights while the esoteric reality is just the opposite, that the government is exploiting them. The ultimate support for this esoteric truth is of course the esoteric truth that there have been no real terrorist attacks at all, but only government-orchestrated *Schein* (seeming) of terrorist attacks. The manipulation works because the neoconservatives could carefully manipulate the necessities the people encounter – the terrorist activities which arrive at them through the television and computer screen in front of them. Just as Émile does not know that the source of necessities he has encountered is the tutor himself, that these are not *real* necessities at all, the people do not know that all the terrorist activities have actually been engendered by their own government and that the news have all been carefully crafted fiction.

My story is about my personal encounter with the two-tier, exoteric and esoteric reality which one neoconservative has intentionally created. In this Preface I'm presenting the public's encounter with the two-tier reality which the neoconservatives have created for everyone: a "counterrevolution" which has established in esoteric reality an absolute monarchy on the path of world-conquest while maintaining people's belief in the exoteric illusion that they live under a "democratic" government allowing them to be "free" and protecting their freedom; a by now *consciously* orchestrated preconditioning to believe falsely that United States is a open government while in esoteric reality United States has become the most secretive government in the world, with no one outside it knowing what it is doing. Some of you might have here been reminded of the title of the famous book by Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, "Manufacturing Consent", a term first coined by Walter Lippman to describe a necessary condition insofar as the common interest always eludes the common people and can only be envisaged by a specialized class; and a version of which Reinhold Niebuhr has also expressed: that, insofar as rationality belongs only to the observer while the common people follow their faith, it would be up to the "myth makers" (the elite) to keep the ordinary people on the course of "common interest". Both have viewed the "manufacture of consent" to be the essence of democracy rather than its anathema. This kind of ideas is indeed very Straussian, and the two men have noted the same origin we have of "smart totalitarianism", the totalitarians' need to circumvent constitutional mechanisms: it is because in democracy the authority cannot beat people to conform that it has developed an unprecedented expertise in controlling people's minds.⁵³ In talking about the "manufacture of consent" in America, Chomsky and Herman have made a splash about some tacit collusion between the power elite in the government and the "free press" for the latter to be selective and practice double standard in its reporting in precisely the way which would shape the people's opinion according to what the power elite wants them to believe: that America and America's allies are "free countries" where people enjoy

53 See the documentary "Manufacturing Consent".

democracy and human rights and that America's enemies are oppressive regimes where people are persecuted and cannot vote.⁵⁴ This quite concerns me because I am in complete agreement with Chomsky and Herman when I assert that the most important instrument for the preconditioning to false beliefs – the most important of the “necessities” – has been the press and the media in general, and emphasize that underlying this instrumentality is the false belief that American people live under the “freedom of the press” which enables the news to tell them what is *really* going on in those regions of reality outside their immediate experience. My assertion however differs from that of Chomsky and Herman in this, that, knowable only from behind the scene, the news outlets have all been carefully controlled by the power elite to report the *opposite* of what is going on. While Chomsky and Herman have exposed American news as basically propaganda, I explain American news by the model of esoteric and exoteric messages. (In Straussian reading of classical texts, esoteric messages usually say the opposite of the exoteric message behind which they hide.) It is through the news outlets' report of the opposite of reality that people are programmed for the exoteric reality. If I use the perception of the Pakistani ISI as cultivated by the news media to illustrate the process:

The major news outlets have been in the habit of portraying the Pakistani ISI as a troublesome and untrustworthy partner in America's War on Terror because it is filled with sympathizers of Al-Qaeda and Islamic Chechen rebels. The reality is however the opposite. The ISI is probably more loyal to the CIA than to its own government, and, while it indeed controls the Islamic guerrillas in Afghanistan, Central Asia, and Chechnya, it does so as the intermediary allowing the radical Islamic rebels to act as puppet forces accomplishing American strategic interests in the Central Asian region. See Michel Chossudovsky's *America's "War on Terrorism"* (2nd ed., 2005). While the United States publicly condemns the Islamic rebels in Chechnya as it condemns all terrorist guerrillas in its War on Terror, it in fact secretly supports the Chechen rebels via the ISI because it wishes to break up the Russian hold on the oil resources in the Central Asian region. “The evidence suggests that the CIA was behind the Chechen rebels, using Pakistan's ISI as a 'go-between'. Washington's 'hidden agenda' consisted in weakening the control of the Russian oil companies and the Russian state over the pipeline routes through Chechnya and Dagestan. Ultimately, Washington's objective is to separate Dagestan and Chechnya from the Russian Federation, thereby bringing a larger part of the territory between the Caspian and the Black Sea under the 'protection' of the Western military alliance”.⁵⁵

C. Wright Mills has noted that the power elite would not have come into the shape they are in the fifth epoch had the American people not transformed themselves from “public” to “mass”, and that a primary way to conceive the difference between the two was that, while the members in the former equally express and receive opinions one to and from another – they discuss matters – in voluntary

54 See the 2002 introduction to *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of Mass Media*. Chomsky and Herman were specifically drawing attention to how the “free press” in America reported plenty on the atrocities of America's enemies on their own people and scarcely on the same sort of atrocities of America's friends on their own people; how this “free press” represented the victims of the atrocities of America's enemies as worthy and those of the atrocities of America's friends as unworthy, how this “free press” reported elections in America's friends as always fair and “advancement to democracy” even when these were obviously frauds and elections in America's foes as always frauds and manipulation by dictators even when these were fair by all standards.

55 Chossudovsky, *ibid.*, p. 75.

associations, the members in the latter only receive opinions from the media without the chance and channels to express any. Face to face discussion in groups characterizes the former and being impressed with information from the media in the privacy of the home characterizes the latter.⁵⁶ Now, after programming by the media to the opposite of reality, a member of the mass, even when he or she does go into face to face discussion with others in a group, can only carry on discussion by discursing the opposite of reality as if it were the true reality; he or she has lost the ability to imagine that reality can be otherwise. Can you imagine the American people *believe* that MSNBC and CNN are lying to them most of the time?

The double standard which Chomsky and Herman have noted of America's news outlets I'm here reinterpreting as operation of the two-tier esoteric and exoteric reality. I will use the two examples of China and Russia in Klein's aforementioned classic as illustrations. She has there recounted the real issues which have driven the Chinese students, workers, teachers, etc. toward mass demonstration in the Tiananmen Square and motivated the Chinese Communist Party to put down the demonstration by force: how Deng, desiring to transform the command economy of communism to a free market economy (China's “counterrevolution”) and advised by Milton Friedman himself in this regard, decreed the deregulation of the market and the privatization of state-owned enterprises, and how this reform resulted in the lowering of wages, mass unemployment, and the soaring of prices. This is why a wide segment of the city's population – not just students – protested: not because they wanted “reform” – sure they would like democratic reform, but what prompted all was dissatisfaction with “reform”: economic reform. “For the most part, the massacre was covered in the Western press as another example of Communist brutality: just as Mao had wiped out his opponents during the Cultural Revolution, now Deng, 'the Butcher of Beijing,' crushed his critics under the watchful eye of Mao's giant portrait. A *Wall Street Journal* headline claimed that 'China's Harsh Actions Threaten to Set Back [the] 10-Year Reform Drive' – as if Deng was an enemy of those reforms and not their most committed defender, determined to take them into bold new territory.”⁵⁷

The similar instance in Russia has received a different spin by the American news media. Yeltsin during 1992 was surrounded by his own Russian Friedmanites and Western advisers in Friedmanism, and, after obtaining from the parliament monarchical power to unilaterally decree laws, started the reform toward the purest free market. The deregulation of the market and elimination of social services resulted in the same old mass impoverishment and the super enrichment of the few which had accompanied Friedmanist counterrevolution elsewhere. The super rich then moved their new wealth oversea. The parliament, representing the people's interests, revoked Yeltsin's imperial power, and Yeltsin dissolved the parliament and sent the army to set the White House (the parliament building) on fire. That was October 1993. “Yeltsin Receives Widespread Backing for Assault’, read a headline in *The Washington Post* the day after the coup, 'Victory Seen for Democracy.' The Boston Globe went

56 *Power Elite*, Ch. 13, “The Mass Society”.

57 Klein, *ibid.*, p. 238. Surely, if the news media reported the truth that segments of the Chinese people might not like the complete retreat of communism, the American people would find it too unsavory. Klein's point is that ordinary people want neither pure communism nor pure capitalism but a sort of mixture of both, free market with a strong safety net, like the Swedish model.

with 'Russia Escapes a Return to the Dungeon of Its Past.'"⁵⁸ The parliamentarians were portrayed as "communist hardliners".

The reason why the press in one case reports unfavorably about the neoliberalist reform and favorably in the other is, it seems, this, that, while Friedmanite capitalism wrecked Russia entirely, China has been the only example where this economic attachment of neoconservatism – the myth of the *completely* free market – has actually succeeded, not only lifting hundreds of millions of Chinese people out of poverty but quickly setting the country on the path to becoming a super power on a par with United States. This is the essence of totalitarianism as the conscious construct of a power elite: they want total power not only over their own subjects, but also over foreign powers. Their goal has been the mobilization of the people for world-conquest. They do not want Russia and China – the two recalcitrant powers whose resources they covet – to remain powers in their own right and on a par of equality with them. They have wanted a weak Russia and a weak China. They would not want a Friedmanite or neoconservative China if China can actually profit from their own ideology. The American power elite supported Yeltsin because he was bad for Russia. The reporting accords with the propaganda function of the news outlet as analyzed by Herman and Chomsky, but I emphasize here the inversion of reality which has occurred in the propagandizing. Then my second point is that the neoconservatives have very consciously seized upon this propagandizing in order to not only magnify this effect but also to create an entire division between esoteric and exoteric reality one inverse of the other. In the Afterword, when I comment on the love of our Secretary of Homeland Security for this two-tier reality, I will make an analogy with Lévi-Strauss' "mythologique".

The consideration of power elite's foreign competitors is utmost essential because my thesis since my thermodynamic interpretation of history has always been that no nation-state will evolve into totalitarianism which does not have "enemies" to compete with. America has evolved into a totalitarian state during the fifth epoch in direct response to World War Two and then the Cold War, and at the "age of terrorism" in direct response to the new crisis of Peak Oil which has forced the power elite to confront a newly risen China and the old foe Russia.

My point is that the "counterrevolution" is really an "evolution" of the fifth epoch – the neoconservatives being instrument of the "general movement" rather than aberrations⁵⁹ – with special adaptation to the coming crisis of Peak Oil, and with occasional adaptation of Straussian contributions to the "evolution." One can find abundant instances of such sort in *1984*, but American totalitarianism, American "total mobilization", is smart, because the American people actually believe that America's competitors are "oppressive regimes", that American government is "democracy", that American news outlets provide an accurate view of reality, and that the American people themselves are "free". The American power elite do not want their subjects to know that they have been secretly mobilized against the elite's competitors. They do not even want "the people" to know that the power elite *have been* competing, just as they do not want "the people" to know that they *have been* watching them and controlling them. The operations of the government – the elite's apparatus which "the people" call

58 Ibid., p. 289.

59 Again, Montesquieu's great work on Rome. Durant, *ibid.*, p. 345.

"democracy" – must remain in complete secrecy, and have been so since the beginning of the "fifth epoch" in 1950s.

"Moreover, in a formally democratic polity, the aims and the powers of the various elements of this elite are further supported by an aspect of the permanent war economy: the assumption that the security of the nation supposedly rests upon great secrecy of plan and intent. Many higher events that would reveal the working of the power elite can be withheld from public knowledge under the guise of secrecy. With the wide secrecy covering their operations and decisions, the power elite can mask their intentions, operations, and further consolidation."⁶⁰

The technique by which the power elite – especially their latest expression in neoconservatism – not only hide their operations from the knowledge of "the people" but also keep in secrecy this very fact that they have been hiding their operations in secrecy is to instruct the news outlets to report them doing something when they are actually doing something else. The technique of "fake news" which I have mentioned already in the narrative of the first volume. Putting up decoy information on government's websites belongs in the same vein. (That the Secretary of State was in Germany for an emergency UN Security Council meeting to discuss Iran on January 22 2008 or so; that Mr Secretary of Homeland Security was in Congress reporting on budgetary issues in mid-February 2008 or so; when in both cases they were really just talking about my case at the International Court of Justice!) This is how "smart totalitarianism" operates: by digesting decoy information the people will never find out what their government has been hiding from them, since they will not even know that their government is hiding things from them, the gaps in their mind about what their government is doing having been filled up. The misinformation, when added up together, is supposed to constitute the exoteric illusion which the people have been preconditioned to believe. The power elite put up all this hype about Iran's "nuclear ambition" in order to dupe the people into believing that their government is so concerned about their security, when you can bet that in reality the government is quite aware that Iran has not harbored any hope of making nuclear bombs and that the power elite are actually pursuing some other strategic interests by harassing Iran – interests that have to do with their own hold on the world's dwindling resources. I am afraid all the media reports about the political struggles in congress and senate and between the congress and the White House, about all the political controversies here and there, have been another sort of decoy information, matters which are either unimportant to the power elite's real business or shows which are staged to give people the false impression that they live in a "democracy". While Chomsky and Herman have spoken about the manufacturing of consent, they have forgotten about the manufacturing of dissent. When people see one camp of politicians battling with another camp without knowing that this is actually a show staged by the power elite from behind the scene, they are more likely to believe that they are "free", living under some sort of transparent representative government, a "democracy": they would be proud to live in a country where there are "debates", in a free society where "oppositions" are allowed; caught in the "debates" among the ineffective professional politicians in the middle level of power, the people would miss the reality that something else, some other reality, has been hidden behind the transparency, an absolute monarchy composed of the power elite whose members the people cannot name and who pursue their strategic

60 Mills, *ibid.*

interests in the world clandestinely, under the garb of illusory concerns about nonexistent "terrorism" or "nuclear proliferation".

Although China has been portrayed in the American media as a totalitarian regime under which the Chinese people hunger for "freedom of information", my personal experience has been that the Chinese media has been offering the most insightful view into the real nature of the American government apparatus. I don't bother to name all the examples. I shall recount this. I spent part of my first morning in Shanghai at a bookstore reading a book entitled "Strategies for China's Rise" (中国崛起策 by 劉濤).

⁶¹ A most enlightening paragraph came into my view:

我们每年都可以读到美国国防部和五角大楼关于美国的国防战略报告和战略文件，这是公开的、放在桌上的文章。我们设想五角大楼还有很多不能公开的、放在桌子底下的秘密文件，在这些文件中，美国国防部对未来的美国的战略目标一定作了清晰而又长远的规划。如果有这样一份文件的话，我们可以作一个有趣的猜测，美国对未来20年或50年的战略规划究竟是什么呢？美国究竟要达到什么样的战略目标呢？

美国最重要的战略目标就是维持美国独一的超级霸主的地位，并防止在全球范围内出现任何一个可以挑战美国霸主地位的国家...，这一点应该是毫无疑问的。美国人梦想的是美国统治下的世界，美国人也可以允许 "一超多强" 的格局存在，但绝对不允许有 "多超（多个超级大国）"、也就是我们通常所说的多极格局的出现。

"Every year we can read reports and documents on America's strategic defense furnished by the United States Department of Defense and the Pentagon; these are documents open to the public, 'on the table' so to speak. We do not notice that the Pentagon has also many secret documents which cannot be accessed by the public, 'left under the table' so to speak. The US Department of Defense must have delineated in these documents a clear and long-range plan for America's future strategic goals. If these documents exist, we may make some interesting guesses, What exactly are United States' strategic plans for the next 20 or 50 years? What sorts of strategic goals is United States trying to achieve?"

"United States' most important strategic goal is certainly the maintenance of United States' status as the *sole* super dominant power in the world, and the prevention of the appearance in the international domain of any power which may challenge United States' status as the dominant power. There should be no doubt about this. Americans may allow that, in a world ruled by America, there exist several powers next to America the sole *super* power, but Americans will not permit the appearance of other *super* powers beside themselves. In other words, Americans will not stand for a 'multilateral' world."

The "Project for a New American Century", in short. The exoteric reality which the US government has put forward can only fool its people; the professional politicians of other countries of course know better. The comment about the Pentagon obviously applies to all branches of the US government. The

61 It can be accessed at: <http://book.qq.com/s/book/0/11/11193/index.shtml>.

United States' strategy has been to put forward a face of transparency to direct people's attention away from what it is really doing behind the scene. The information it puts forward about its intentions and concerns is invariably either false, minor, or telling the opposite of truth which it hides from the world more securely than North Korean government can do. Your “Freedom of Information Act” requests serve the same function of decoy. Information that is relatively unimportant to the power elite they'll let you have, so that you might develop the delusion that you can and do know what your government is doing. This is “smart totalitarianism” – totalitarianism which no one can identify. Note that your usual suspect of totalitarianism, China, is not so talented at all. As I have mentioned in the preceding narrative, like all other governments in the world, the Chinese government keeps its operations in secrecy from its people, not by decoying, but by simply keeping silent.

It is when “the people” have been systematically duped to believe the opposite of reality to be the reality, or the irrelevant reality to be the relevant reality, that they develop a worldview which prompts them to want what the government wants them to want, its protection when this protection is servitude, and it is when “the people” are not even conscious of the sad state of affairs that they are only wanting what the government wants them to want that all possible resistances to the power elite are nullified. This how “smart totalitarianism” achieves omnipotence.

I hope I have gone one step beyond the ordinary acknowledgment that a busy consumerist society is never really conducive to true democracy because “the people” are too preoccupied with work and pleasures to have even interest in what their government is doing. That would be merely how the conspiracy *of* history might have made a totalitarianism not of a conscious design.⁶²

Now I can sum up the aforementioned *artificial* qualitative difference between the elite and the common people which the neoconservatives have invented for themselves: *it is the access to truth*. This invented, artificial qualitative difference will be a dominating theme in all my subsequent narratives. I call this difference “artificial” not only because it is invented by the elite, but also because it would not have existed if effort had not been spent inventing it. That United States has been supporting the Muslim rebels fighting the Chinese and the Russians, that United States government has itself planned 911 attacks in order to take over Central Asia and the Middle-East, that ordinary people prefer a mixed system to both communism and capitalism – these truths, if “the people” were told them, they would understand, because these are merely facts. The elite would have to spend effort to direct the populace away from these facts in order to distinguish themselves by access to these facts. If the elite distinguish themselves by access to scientific truths, such as the latest theories in physics describing the unification of the fundamental forces of the universe, the qualitative difference between the elite and commoners would be *natural*, and not artificial, because, even if these “truths” are thrown onto the common people's face, they will not understand the slightest bits of them. The access to truth as a qualitative difference between two levels of people is “artificial” when the “truth” in question is only “mediocre

62 Thus Mills continues: “It is not that the elite 'believe in' a compact elite behind the scenes and a mass down below. It is not put in that language, It is just that the people are of necessity confused and must, like trusting children, place all the new world of foreign policy and strategy and executive action in the hands of experts. It is just that everyone knows somebody has got to run the show, and that somebody usually does. Others do not really care anyway, and besides, they do not know how. So the gap between the two types gets wider.”

truth" or "facts", and "natural" when the "truth" in question is "profound truth".

Now, Rousseau's idea of clandestine control aside, the true face of the neoconservatives is straightforwardly Machiavellian. It's not just that they believe as Machiavelli's *The Prince* advocates, "politics... should not accept rules of any kind or from any source where the object is not to win or prevail over others",⁶³ but that, as the quotation from Floyd already indicates, to win and to prevail over others is the goal of life which only the elites shall be able to actualize. This is evident from the actions of the neoconservatives, and it conforms to Hobbes' view of human nature: "I put for a general inclination of all mankind a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death."⁶⁴ It also reflects somewhat Nietzsche's notion that the original human instinct, that of the "blond beast", was the will-to-power, the drive for domination, before it was repressed and condemned by the "slave morality" – the distorted morality of the oppressed people – born of *ressentiment*.⁶⁵ In any case, this sort of goal of life reflects the distorted meaning of life as the satisfaction of appetite, just the opposite of Plato's philosopher, the opposite of the meaning of life which Plato has offered us in *The Republic*. Hobbes' degenerate notions of "good" and "evil" and Machiavelli's brutish notions of "virtue" and "reputation" are all consequences of their unspoken degenerate notion of the meaning of life. The power elites have been preconditioned to "false needs" by the market economy and the hollow democracy just as much as the common people have been.

I have so far found C. Wright Mills' concept "the power elite" much more useful in explaining the neoconservative reign than recourse to Leo Strauss' philosophy, although I have noted interesting convergence between Straussianism (the absolutist rule of the elite through deception), those classic philosophers whom Strauss has admired, and the latest evolution of the power elite. One particular operation of the power elite's "counterrevolution" that does not have direct roots in the "fifth epoch" but which is the legacy of Straussian intervention seems to be the promotion of religion among "the people". In a lecture at the American Enterprise Institute Irving Kristol specifically noted the necessity to "encourage religious belief in ordinary people who would otherwise succumb to nihilism without it."⁶⁶ Now Leo Strauss' notion of religion as a big lie with which the Superman (the elite) dupes the people in order to keep order is of course a frequent idea among philosophers of politics, no less Machiavelli and Rousseau,⁶⁷ and both Hobbes and Spinoza saw religion as a tool which the government

63 Harvey Mansfield's introduction to his translation of *The Prince*, p. vii.

64 Cited in Durant, *The Age of Louis XIV*, p. 553. In Hobbes' analysis of human nature, passion is the main motivator, and includes "appetite (or desire) and aversion, love and hate, delight and fear. Behind all these are pleasure and pain... The basic aversion is fear, the basic appetite is for power" (ibid.).

65 *On the Genealogy of Morals*. See also "Von verkleinernden Tugend" in *Also Sprach Zarathustra*.

66 Ronald Bailey, "The Voice of Neoconservatism": <http://reason.com/archives/2001/10/17/the-voice-of-neoconservatism>. "In other words, Kristol believes that religion, which may well be a fiction, is necessary to keep the little people in line."

67 Rousseau thus writes in *The Social Contract*: "[N]o state has ever been established without a religious basis"; "The legislator..., being unable to appeal to either force or reason, must have recourse to an authority of a different order, capable of restraining without violence... This is what in all ages compelled the fathers of nations to have recourse to divine intervention, and credit the gods with their own wisdom, in order that the peoples, submitting to the laws of the state as to those of nature,... might obey freely, and bear with docility the yoke of the public good." Cited in Durant, *Rousseau and Revolution*, p. 175.

must appropriate to rule.⁶⁸ Reflected in such insight is the cynical view of the common people shared by Machiavelli – “that all men are bad and ever ready to display their vicious nature” – and Hobbes – that before men came together to invest their power in a sovereign to protect each from the others, their only attitude toward each other was aggression: “This being so, men can be made good – namely, capable of living with order in a society – only by the application, in sequence, of force, deceit, and habit. This is the origin of a state: the organization of force through army and police, the establishment of rules and laws, and the gradual formation of habits, for the maintenance of leadership and order in a human group.”⁶⁹ The counterrevolutionaries thus seize upon the conspiracy *of* history to make it a conspiracy *in* history because the cynical view of human nature, not originally shared by the power elite in the beginning of the fifth epoch, has prompted them to take for granted that the counterrevolution is not just good for themselves but necessary for the order of society – that America is headed toward disaster without their intervention. “The more developed a state, the less force will have to be used or visible in it; indoctrination and habit will suffice... The best means of habituating naturally wicked men to law and order is religion.”⁷⁰ The neoconservative counterrevolutionaries' cynicism toward the common people's nature has led them to a particular anti-intellectual attitude and preference for simple-mindedness in regard to the masses. Now one of Rousseau's admonitions in *Émile* captures somewhat the spirit of all this:

“Si nos dogmes sont tous de la même vérité, tous ne sont pas pour cela de la même importance. Il est fort indifférent à la gloire de Dieu qu'elle nous soit connue en toutes choses; mais il importe à la société humaine et à chacun des membres que tout homme connoisse et remplisse les devoirs que lui impose la loi de Dieu envers son prochain et envers soi-même. Voilà ce que nous devons incessamment nous enseigner les uns aux autres, et voilà surtout de quoi les pères et les mères sont tenus d'instruire leurs enfants. Qu'une vierge soit la mère de son créateur, qu'elle ait enfanté Dieu, ou seulement un homme auquel Dieu s'est joint; que la substance du père et du fils soit la même, ou ne soit que semblable; que l'esprit procède de l'un des deux, qui sont le même, ou de tous deux conjointement, je ne vois pas que la décision de ces questions, en apparence essentielles, importe plus à l'espèce humaine que de savoir quel jour de la lune on doit célébrer la pâque, s'il faut dire le chapelet, jeûner, faire maigre, parler latin ou françois à l'église, orner les murs d'images, dire ou entendre la messe, et n'avoir point de femmes en propre. Que chacun pense là dessus comme il lui plaira: j'ignore en quoi cela peut intéresser les autres; quant à moi, cela ne m'intéresse point du tout. Mais ce qui m'intéresse, moi et tous mes semblables, c'est que chacun sache qu'il existe un arbitre du sort des humaines, duquel nous sommes tous les enfants, qui nous prescrit à tous d'être justes, de nous aimer les uns les autres, d'être bienfaisants et miséricordieux, de tenir nos engagements envers tout le monde, même envers nos ennemies et les siens; que l'apparent bonheur de cette vie n'est rien; qu'il en est une autre après elle, dans laquelle cet Être suprême sera le rémunérateur des bons et le juge des méchants. Ces dogmes et les dogmes semblables sont ceux qu'il importe d'enseigner à la jeunesse, et de persuader à tous les citoyens. Quiconque les combat mérite châtement sans doute; il est le perturbateur de l'ordre et

68 Durant, *The Age of Louis XIV*.

69 Durant, *The Renaissance*, p. 556.

70 Ibid.

l'ennemi de la société. Quiconque les passe, et veut nous asservir à ses opinions particulières, vient au même point par une route opposée. Pour établir l'ordre à sa manière, il trouble la paix; dans son téméraire orgueil, il se rend l'interprète de la Divinité, il exige en son nom les hommages et les respects des hommes, il se fait Dieu tant qu'il peut à sa place: on devoit le punir comme sacrilège, quand on ne le puniroit pas comme intolérant."⁷¹

The disdain for excess is the foundation for neoconservatives' anti-intellectualism. There is no need to teach "the people" anything theoretical; "the people" need not but learn the rudimentary of the morals embodied in the Christian religion. "The people" should remain as uneducated as they can be, just as the teenage Émile has read nothing more than a simple novel "Robinson Crusoe" during his "education". The prescriber of religion is however himself an atheist, just as the neoconservatives have all been atheists and nihilists, but this, the people shouldn't know. This is still Machiavellian.⁷² While keeping themselves in order, the religiously pious people will less likely stand in the way of the power elite's project for world-conquest, and will in fact be more easily mobilized against the power elite's competitors. The neoconservatives have always practiced precisely what the wise philosophers have warned against – Thrasymachus' view in Plato's *Republic* that justice is the rule which the powerful elite imposes on the masses for the promotion of their own advantage – either because the Straussians have taught them that the philosophers' true, esoteric message is the inverse of the false, exoteric warning, or because the philosophers are naïve and disregarding the delicate mechanism for keeping social harmony with venerable tradition. We have so far seen that the neoconservatives are embracing precisely the despotism which Spinoza deplors:

"Granted, then, that the supreme mystery of despotism, its prop and stay, is to keep men in a state of deception, and with the specious title of religion to cloak the fear by which they must be held in check, so that they will fight for their servitude as if for salvation, and count it no shame, but the highest honor, to spend their blood and their lives for the glorification of one man."⁷³

("Verum enimvero si regiminis Monarchici summum sit arcanum, cuiusque omnino intersit, homines deceptos habere, & metum, quo retineri debent, specioso Religionis nomine adumbrare, ut pro servitio, tanquam pro salute pugnent, & ne turpe, sed maximum, decus esse putent, in unius hominis iafactionem sanguinem animamque impendere...")

It should be said that the neoconservatives would regard the people's confusion of their servitude as salvation as "good for them." A second specifically Straussian intervention in the power elite's "conspiracy *in* history" is the "ennoblement of the people through war." After exposing Strauss' teaching of nature's predestination for the intellectually superior to rule, Drury explains:

"Of course, Strauss believed that the wise would not abuse their power. On the contrary, they

71 *Émile*.

72 "Morality in general is a code of conduct given to the members of a society or state to maintain collective order, unity, and strength; the government of that state would fail in its duty if, in defending the state, it should allow itself to be restricted by the moral code that it must inculcate in its citizens." Durant, *The Renaissance*, p. 559.

73 Spinoza, *Theological-Political Treatise*, Preface, translated by Samuel Shirley.

would give the people just what was commensurate with their needs and capacities. But what exactly is that? Certainly, giving them freedom, happiness, and prosperity is not the point. In Strauss's estimation, that would turn them into animals. The goal of the wise is to ennoble the vulgar. But what could possibly ennoble the vulgar? Only weeping, worshiping, and sacrificing could ennoble the masses. Religion and war – perpetual war – would lift the masses from the animality of bourgeois consumption and the preoccupation with 'creature comforts.' Instead of personal happiness, they would live their lives in perpetual sacrifice to God and the nation."⁷⁴

Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori ("It's sweet and right to die for your country"), so goes the famous saying of Horace. If one asks what ennoblement could possibly mean for a nihilist, the neoconservative would certainly offer "health" and "vigor" – power, in short – as the criteria to judge whether war ennoble. For the neoconservative would say with Machiavelli (and many other philosophers as well) that war induces health, of the people as well as of the state: "When a state ceases to expand it begins to decay; when it loses the will to war it is finished. Peace too long maintained is enervating and disruptive; an occasional war is a national tonic, restoring discipline, vigor, unity."⁷⁵ Just as the neoconservative power elite finds support for their imperial cadre of elite in Strauss' idea of the rule of the wise beyond law, so they couldn't find the idea of the ennoblement of the masses through war more convenient for their project of world-conquest. Religion is the opium with which "the people" can best be mobilized to ennobling war: "One nation under God" or the "Chosen nation of God" vs. the infidel forces guided by evil – the War on Terror, in short. Hence would "the people" "fight for their servitude as if for their salvation" under the guidance of the omnipotent totalitarian government. Again, what Spinoza has specifically condemned is precisely the ideal pursued by the power elite of the latest period of the "fifth epoch".

The neoconservative tactic of presenting a exoteric reality that is the opposite of the esoteric truth is of paramount importance for understanding our Secretary of Homeland Security in the following narrative. He has prided himself on doing just this – basically hypocrisy. The warning to the airline personnel about me, evidently attached to my Passenger Name Record, *looked like* it was for my protection as well as for the protection of other passengers: exoteric reality. Its real function was to preemptively discredit me and excommunicate me from the human community: the esoteric reality. In the third volume I will also describe how the election of 2008 to return the reign to the Democrats was also no more than an exoteric illusion, hiding behind it the esoteric absolute monarchy which the Boss of neoconservatism had created and which still persisted. In the fourth volume, I will also describe how it is only after 2010, when the Russians themselves had liberated the Democrats, that the American government was restored to the Democrats who had supposedly been elected in late 2008. The Democrats, however, after their liberation of America, have found it necessary to perpetuate the lies and illusion with which the neoconservatives have enveloped the American people. They continued "politics through deception and theater" by means of which America may project itself as a democracy and a free society when it is in reality a totalitarian state, "totalitarianism in disguise". For one thing, ghosts, once invoked, cannot be invited to leave. Can you imagine the Democrats

74 Drury, "Saving America".

75 Durant, *The Renaissance*, p. 559.

dismantling the Department of Homeland Security and the Director of National Intelligence even though these are useless organizations? Jobs are at stake, for one thing. For another, they cannot simply tell “the people” that it was their former Vice President who has orchestrated the 911 attacks. People's world view has already been formed around the myths of the War on Terror; it would be like the Pope telling the world that God does not exist.

Would that someone may write a history of America in the same way in which Montesquieu has written a history of Rome, describing how dissolution is fated to follow its full evolution.⁷⁶

Our Secretary of Homeland Security: not ideology, but Antisocial Personality Disorder

While I suffer from Borderline and Schizotypal Personality Disorder, I will maintain throughout my narrative that our Homeland Security Secretary suffers from some virulent form of Antisocial Personality Disorder. The most distinguishing characteristics of his personality are his love of deceit, his fondness for beating down his opponents, and his selfishness. My experience of his techniques and style has taught me that he joined the ranks of the neoconservatives not so much out of any ideological fervor⁷⁷ as because he enjoyed the thrill of lying and domination. He loves to distinguish himself in his neoconservative clique as the most ferocious in attacking their political opponents, as he has done so during the White Water Affairs, and as he will do the director of Ministry of State Security in the subsequent narrative – and it is for this ferociousness that the Boss, the Vice President, has had such high esteem for him. The relevant characterization of Antisocial Personality Disorder as found in DSV-IV runs thusly: “The essential feature of Antisocial Personality Disorder is a pervasive pattern of disregard for, and violation of, the rights of others... [D]eceipt and manipulation are central features of Antisocial Personality Disorder...”⁷⁸. Mr Secretary was proud to be an antisocial when he read the description of it in DSM-IV; he took it to be the precinct of the elite. He would be even prouder if he could play the game of esoteric-exoteric reality so well that he may project his opponent as himself – knowing how people would hate him if they really know him – and project himself in accordance with the goodness which others may see in his opponent. Thus, Mr Secretary has constructed his David Chin exactly in accordance with DSM-IV's description of Antisocial Personality Disorder:

“Individuals with Antisocial Personality Disorder fail to conform to social norms with respect to lawful behavior... *They may repeatedly perform acts that are grounds for arrest... such as destroying property, harassing others, stealing, or pursuing illegal occupations. Persons with this disorder disregard the wishes, rights, or feelings of others. They are frequently deceitful and manipulative in order to gain personal profit or pleasure (e.g. to obtain money, sex, or power)... They may repeatedly lie, use an alias, con others, or malingere. A pattern of impulsivity may be manifested by a failure to plan ahead... Individuals with Antisocial Personality Disorder tend to be irritable and aggressive and may repeatedly get into physical fights or commit acts of physical*

76 Durant, *The Age of Voltaire*, p. 345.

77 I'm sorry to say that he certainly would like a world secretly ruled by an elite composed of Jewish interests: the awful myth of a Jewish conspiracy to rule the world is precisely an ideal which he would like to realize – in accordance with his Antisocial Personality Disorder.

78 DSM-IV TR, p. 645.

assault... These individuals also display a reckless disregard for the safety of themselves or others... *They may engage in sexual behavior or substance use that has a high risk for harmful consequences...* Individuals with Antisocial Personality Disorder also tend to be consistently and extremely irresponsible... They may be indifferent to, or provide a superficial rationalization for, having hurt, mistreated, or stolen from someone (e.g. “life's unfair,” “losers deserve to lose”...)”⁷⁹

“Lack of empathy, inflated self-appraisal, and superficial charm... may be particularly distinguishing of Antisocial Personality Disorder in prison or forensic settings....”⁸⁰

The diagnostic criteria in italics would figure straightforwardly in the summation of David Chin at the end of Chapter 9. Mr Secretary of Homeland Security himself escaped the diagnostic criteria of physical aggression because he prided himself in the use of intellect to manipulate the system to do the dirty work for him – he has tried very hard to conform to Strauss' description of the intellectually superior whom nature has destined to rule – and he was not sexually improper because he had little interests in womanhood. The diagnostic criterion of reckless disregard of others' rights and interests is reflected in his extreme selfishness. In the previous volume, in “My experience with the FBI, the CIA, and the Department of Homeland Security”, you have seen how he broke into the Agency's clandestine service's secret box, copied its methods, and created, on its model, a clandestine operational unit within his own Homeland Security Department. He wanted his own clandestine force and, after he got it, he still forbade the Agency to recruit me: he didn't care about the CIA at all, and even less about what the CIA could do for America. Mr Secretary of Homeland Security was the quintessential atheist whom Rousseau has described:

“Que tous les autres hommes fassent mon bien aux dépens du leur; que tout se rapporte à moi seul; que tout le genre humain meure, s'il le faut, dans la peine et dans la misère pour m'épargner un moment de douleur ou de faim: tel est le langage intérieur de tout incrédule qui raisonne.”⁸¹

“That all other men do good to me at the expense of their own good; that everyone relates himself or herself to me only; that humanity dies, if need be, in pain and misery in order to save me a moment of pain and hunger: such is the language interior to all the disbelievers who use reason.”

Why I write this story

Valerie Plame speaks of “cognitive dissonance”, “a psychological phenomenon which refers to the discomfort felt at a discrepancy between what you already know or believe, and the new information or interpretation”, something she says she experienced when she watched Powell's presentation on Iraqi's WMD capacities in the United Nations.⁸² I experienced “cognitive dissonance” quite often as well

79 DSM-IV TR, p. 646.

80 Ibid. p. 647.

81 *Émile*, Suite du Livre quatrième.

82 *Fair Game*, p. 129.

when I was reading her *Fair Game*, but especially Lindsay Moran's *Blowing My Cover*.

Blowing My Cover is a popular book, a "pop book" even, very chic. Her description of the Agency differs from my experience of the Agency – granted that her experience of it is from its interior in her capacity as an operative and mine from its exterior in my status as its target – in five respects. Firstly, for the Directorate of Operations and the clandestine service she describes only an intelligence-gathering function and mentions nothing about covert operations. The operation in China for which the Agency naïvely came to me was a covert operation to destabilize China, having nothing to do with intelligence gathering. I wonder if Moran's omission is intentional, that it is because the Agency did not want the public to know that it was still engaged in the sort of things which once gave it a bad name during the sixties, the seventies, and the eighties – from the Invasion of Bay of Pigs to the Iran-Contra scandal. Philip Agee, the Agency operative turned rebel, did mention in his book that the Agency considered covert operations as more sensitive than intelligence-gathering operations.⁸³

Secondly, she describes the clandestine service as if it were just another government bureaucracy. I, throughout my confrontation with the Agency's clandestine personnel, have no other descriptive for them than a "cult". It's not just that, when it recruits someone, it recruits that someone's entire circle of significant others – and Moran gives a contrary impression to this – but that the recruit would feel herself or himself to have joined a secret order of superior human beings distinctively marked off from the rest of the profane humanity. In this manner it is quite like the Straussian circle or any secret society and cult. But this cult's secrecy is supreme. As I have noted, no one outside, not even the President of the United States, knows who is in it and what it does. The recruit's loyalty to the cult is absolute insofar as she or he is conscious of her or his status as part of a secret elite. There is rampant in the Agency's clandestine service an intense narcissism: "We are the best of the humanity," which justifies their maintenance of power and dominance over things to ensure their survival as the elite and which prevents its members from ever desiring to defect to its counterparts in Russia or China or wherever. In answering the question "What does the CIA clandestine service do?" your most accurate response would be Spinoza's characterization of the essence of life as *conatus sese preservandi*, "effort at preserving the self". You can only be regarded as hopelessly naïve if you believe that CIA officials are every day sitting around preoccupied with "the protection of America" – as has been advertised. Like all secret societies, and like multinational corporations, the CIA exists in order to protect and magnify its elite status in humanity. The better among you might object with Max Weber's insight that the purpose of any government bureaucracy is self-preservation rather than the function for which it has been created. True. The *conatus sese preservandi* as pertains to the Agency's clandestine service however is imbued with a certain religiousness or moral righteousness not found in the self-preservation efforts of other government bureaucracies: those in the CIA have always felt it to be a moral imperative for them to be selfishly devoted to their self-preservation because – *they believe they are the better part of creation*.

Thirdly, Moran accuses the clandestine service of continuance in a very traditional form of sexism. She repeatedly comments that, not only was the rank and file of the clandestine service predominantly

83 *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*, part of which online: http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/CIA/CIA_Diary_Agee.html.

male, but that it was run through by the all-too-familiar double standard which stringently warned the few female recruits against casual romance with targets (the “potential moles” to be recruited) and strangers while turning a blind eye to the same sort of things in which a male officer may engage himself when looking for targets to recruit. My impression of the Agency's clandestine service has been that it is predominantly female, at least in the lower ranks, and that it cannot have better understood the advantages which women especially possess in the domain of clandestine operations. Women simply make better spies than men – if only because most of the targets of intelligence and clandestine operations will be males. (It's not that women can “read people” better than men, as Moran has claimed in another place,⁸⁴ but that men want to be with women more than women want to be with men!) It's not clear to me when the “feminization of the world of intelligence” has occurred – it has occurred throughout the world. It is simply impossible that an organization so conscious of female superiority and so composed of a preponderance of female souls would continue in old-fashion prejudices which are highly obstructive to intelligence operations in practice.

Moran is evidently purposely misleading her readers to a portrayal of the Agency as less than its capabilities. It is then no wonder that she, together with Plame, would like to present the Agency as lacking in capacity to know. When Plame portrays the Agency in accordance with the official story, that is, as lacking the capacity to distinguish that the vague phenomena in Iraq were no weapons of mass destruction, and when Moran portrays the Agency as so unprepared in the intelligence business as to fail to get wind of the “terrorists' plan for 911”, they are speaking, well, pure bullshit. They are playing the official game of “intelligence failures” in order to satisfy their political bosses in the neoconservative administration. The reality is that the American intelligence system is so evolved that no one can do anything significant anywhere in the world without the notice of the American government.

Now like all other “911 conspiracy theorists” I do believe that foreknowledge of 911 attacks was widespread at least among the upper echelons of Agency's ranks – it was probably not shared with street-level case officers like Moran – but I would be cautious not to exaggerate the role which the CIA might have played in the orchestration of the 911 attacks.⁸⁵ Given the large number of holes in the official story – like that biggest hole called “the collapse of Tower Seven” – the 911 attacks were obviously the works of amateurs, and the Agency was professional. In order to understand what has really happened, we need to resort to the concept of “private government”. Webster Tarpley has spoken of this in one of his lectures, “a secret government, which has all the faculties and abilities of the visible government, which is actually embedded in the visible government, and which is free to pursue its own idea of the national interests, free from all of the mechanisms of check and balance and from the law itself...”⁸⁶ This rogue network, he said, was the only candidate capable of carrying out the 911 attacks. It was composed of many, *but not all*, of the top officials in the executive branch of the government, the military, and the intelligence agencies. They were not loyal to the existing government

84 “Women in the CIA: Problems and Prospects”: http://www.virginia.edu/topnews/07_26_2004/mcr_spy.html.

85 The latest example of a conspiracy theorist who regards the 911 attacks as the work of the Agency is Andreas von Bülow's *Die CIA und der 11 September*. Christian Stöcker, “Politician turned conspiracy theorist”: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,784673,00.html>.

86 “The Osama bin Laden Myth and The Neocons - History, Context and Future”: <http://vimeo.com/23398352>.

but to a "private network with a privatized command center." It was the product of Executive Order 12333, promulgated during the Reagan years. The top officials in each domain of the government who had been recruited into this private network had thus become "moles" in the visible government, and these moles, together with "patsies" (whether real fanatics manipulated without their knowing such as the Chechen rebels, or double agents, or provocateurs) and "professional killers inside and outside the government", constituted the entire network which has carried out 911 attacks: the moles planned the attacks, the professional killers carried out the killing, and before the killing, the moles tried to protect the available "patsies" from being arrested by those field officers in the intelligence and law enforcement agencies who were not part of the "network" – because the patsies needed to be there to be scapegoated; after the attacks, the "moles" would make sure that the "patsies" get rounded up, demonized, and blamed. The top officials in the FBI who had been recruited into the network thus persistently ordered the agents investigating the 911 hijackers to back off, and the top officials in the Agency who had been recruited into the network thus withheld from the FBI information about the 911 hijackers.⁸⁷ It must be this private government which has attempted to recruit the former FBI translator Sibel Edmonds;⁸⁸ and it is this private government which the neoconservatives have joined and infested with their ideology. This private government was a subset of the "power elite". My impression however is that the CIA *clandestine service* was *not* part of this private government.

When it comes to the invasion of Iraq, the neoconservatives of course knew beforehand that Iraq had no weapons of massive destruction. There had not been any "intelligence failures" at all. The neoconservative administration pretended that they didn't know; after the invasion, they "played dumb". That's the strategy: the cake already baked, a *fait accompli*, they thus got to keep the cake. All they had to do was to blame the Agency for the intelligence failure – those not of their private government network and those they truly disdained – even though all the "faulty intelligence" were manufactured out of the Pentagon, in the Office of Special Plans, by the neoconservatives who held sway there. Once again: "intelligence failure" is the exoteric illusion; "playing dumb" is the esoteric truth. Under political pressures, the Agency instructed its operatives to always conform to the official story – the exoteric reality – in their subsequent words.

Finally, Moran specifically denies that the Agency was still engaged in its tradition of recruiting mainly academics from Ivy League universities. Although the Agency's clandestine service has indeed been diversifying in all sorts of white collar professions – lawyers, doctors, business executives – the core of its spies is still very much constituted by academics. Academic achievement continues to be emphasized in the scouting for new recruits. It appears that Moran intentionally plays down this emphasis in order to hide the true nature of the organization she has served.

This really shouldn't surprise you if you exercise your common sense. After the Agency has spent millions of dollars training you and stationing you, would they simply let you spill their secrets and

87 See a podcast "Who is Richard Blee", narrating how three CIA analysts working under Richard Blee, the long unknown former head of CIA's Bin Laden Station, deliberately withheld intelligence from the FBI regarding the two would-be 911 hijackers already in the US: <http://valtinsblog.blogspot.com/2011/09/911-documentary-delayed-due-to-cia.html>.

88 See the documentary film "Kill the Messenger": http://www.anniemachon.com/annie_machon/2009/11/fbi-whistleblower-sibel-edmonds.html.

profit from it when you retire? When a retired CIA operative writes a memoir, she – usually she, remember – is certainly not going to tell you anything she has *really* done and experienced. Her writing a book is always itself an operation, the Agency's operative having never really retired: "Once of the Agency, always of the Agency". I'm talking about an operation of disinformation – to systematically mislead the public to an inaccurate view of the real nature of the Agency, a view which the Agency wants the public to have of itself but which, by being a mixture of a *false* portrayal of itself as *its opposite*⁸⁹ and a *mere* partial portrayal of its *minor* functions, serves to hide what the Agency is really about and is really doing. "American obedience" and Americans' long-standing illusion about their government as "transparent" would certainly not allow them to know that they have been systematically deceived as to the Agency's true nature. The Agency also plays the game of "manufacture of dissent" extremely well. As soon as Moran had published her book, the Agency would put up a review on its website ridiculing her for ridiculing the Agency. The public, when they witnessed the argument *not knowing that it was all staged*, would thus assume that Moran must be telling something true – while, in reality, a greater part of her story was a carefully crafted lie. Only when the operative has turned out to be something of a rebel – like Philip Agee – can his story be believed.⁹⁰

When a "retired" operative of the Agency is not lying to you about her experience, you can bet that what she says is simply unimportant. At one point in *Fair Game* Plame writes of Moran's book:

"Some [memoirs] were done by former Operations Officers and gave very revealing insights into the esoteric training done at the Farm, such as Lindsay Moran's *Blowing My Cover* in 2004. Frankly, I was surprised at how much latitude they had granted to Moran for her book."

I can assure you that *violence is rarely the trade of espionage*. If all the paramilitary training indeed occurs at the Farm – if the new recruit would actually be required to complete training at the Farm at all – you can bet that it is considered an unimportant part of the Agency's trade, just as "finding terrorists and killing them" is a minor preoccupation of the Agency – that's why you are allowed to hear about it! Plame must be putting up a show here.

What compels people to write a book, when it is not about writing whatever just to make money? When the author feels a compulsion to tell something, that is. When a neoconservative partner writes a book about the evil Iranian regime's attempt to build a nuclear bomb, it is to make you fear some non-existent threat and to thereby recruit you onto their wagon of agendas. When a "former" CIA operative writes a book, it is to nurse in you a false impression about the Agency so as to veil its existence in secrecy. They are writing books in order to deceive their readers. They are not writing books because they have felt the compulsion to tell which I have felt and which is akin to the kind of compulsion that

89 With the portrayal of the Agency as overrun by sexism, people would not expect that the majority of Agency's operatives are females.

90 The Agency's criticism of Agee's book, posted at its website: https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol19no2/html/v19i2a06p_0001.htm, does not seem "staged", although it is worth wondering whether the Agency's admission of the truthfulness of the narrative is an indication that much of its revelation *no longer* applies. See also Agee's two-part interview at Alternative Views, "Haunted by Jackals" (1995); and Scott Shane, "Philip Agee, 72, Is Dead...", *New York Times*, January 10 2008: <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/10/obituaries/10agee.html>.

constitutes the inner core of psychotic delusion:

“Delusion provides a certain, often unbreakable identity, and its absolute character can maneuver the self into an unyielding position. In this respect, it is the internal mirror of political authoritarianism, the tyrant inside the self... an internal domination as deadly as any external tyranny.”⁹¹

My desire to write down this complex story of mine has also assumed an unyielding, absolute character inside my psyche, forcing me to do what it wants me to do, to lay it out in the open in a precise chronological order understandable by another human being; it is an internal totalitarianism which enslaves me each day to this task. This kind of compulsion only exists when it comes to telling truth, sharing beauty, or making known suffering. My story is about all three, and these are intertwined with each other.

When it comes to telling the truth, I feel myself to be a philosopher who is here to unveil the esoteric reality of which the world is ignorant. While telling of my personal drama, I'm also revealing world events which I feel compelled to tell of both because these have been purposely hidden away from view by the mechanism of power and because knowledge of them will have didactic effects. In other words, my psyche is fundamentally that of a prophet – like the prophets in the Old Testament or Nietzsche's prophet Zarathustra: the prophet is governed by a compulsion to tell.⁹² I have to bring to light the fact that the United States has once wreaked great vengeance on China and committed great wrongs against Russia; that the United States in my environment has once been ruled by such evil; that, for two years, 2008 and 2009, the once fearsome spy agency of China was under the command of the United States Secretary of Homeland Security, and not working for China's president at all; that Russia has once saved America and the world.

These world events, in themselves compelling their narration already, have the didactic dimension of revealing the new face of evil. The world has had an unhealthy exclusive preoccupation with physical suffering and physical harm as the worst evil in the world. Without making the commensurability between evils a topic, I'm here to berate another worst evil in the world which has been overlooked: lies, deception, hypocrisy. Dante wrote his fictitious memoir of a journey through the inferno, the purgatory, and the paradise as a sweeping presentation of the structure and gradation of virtues and vices; I'm writing out my memoir of a journey through the International Court of Justice with a singular focus on one evil, the most unspeakable form of it, deception. When I talked earlier about how the neoconservatives have been playing you like a fool in order to lead you to want what they have wanted you to want, I have not mentioned how deception automatically constitutes a destruction of your path toward self-actualization. This is because, ultimately, self-actualization is a state of mind. Like all the philosophers in the past, I take the full development of a human being to be the full development of his

91 Thus does Silvia Nasar, in describing the way in which delusions took hold of the famous mathematician John Nash, quote James Glass; *A Beautiful Mind*, p. 278.

92 When looking at the matter from a reverse direction, perhaps you can then understand why so many schizophrenics and manic-depressives have felt themselves to be religious figures of great importance!

or her intellect, and the intellect reaches its full potential as it strives for beauty and truth, art and philosophy. A "revolution" which creates an equitable distribution of wealth and an guarantee of job security and health care is a mediocre revolution. If it aims at ensuring human dignity and the development of human potential, it has to in the end be focused on the mind's healthy relationship with reality. To be deceived as to what reality is about is to be arrested in intellectual development, and thus tantamount to experiencing impediment in self-actualization. This is why I hold the politics through deception to be an evil to contend with, even when you are not physically abused.

Enhancement of another's self-actualization lies at the core of Kant's categorical imperative: "So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end, never only as a means."⁹³ Deceiving another so as to manipulate him or her to your own end is precisely *not* treating him or her as an end in him- or herself, and this is why lying is wrong. The American government is a violation of Kant's categorical imperative.

My concern with the credibility of my foregoing and subsequent narratives turns on whether you believe I'm trying to do you good – aiding the development of your mind toward truth – or whether you believe I'm trying to deceive you by convincing you that something false is actually true. I certainly don't want to waste your time with something false. I have always held little interests for fiction: why tell a fictional story when we have barely finished telling true stories? So far you will have no one's admission but mine, and I thus at this point can only proclaim the sincerity of my intention – that I'm telling you a story the outline of which, despite a few errors in details, is overall true – and if you don't believe it, then it is *you* who have, unwillingly perhaps, put obstacles on the path of your intellectual development – on your path toward self-actualization; of course it should be noted that only those whose intellect is already well developed have the ability to distinguish between truth and falsehood.

The story of the trial at the International Court which I present to you here has this in common with Albert Camus' *L'Étranger*: the absurdity of justice as in fact injustice, the use of justice to harm people. In Camus' classic, our Meursault is really guilty of manslaughter; yet through ruse and deception the prosecutor is able to recast his nihilism – that nothing, at bottom, matters – as some sort of antisocial and sociopathic personality meriting no less than the death penalty. The victimization of the innocent through the justice system in my story is much worse. As the mechanism of justice has finally filled up our postmodern world to its brim, the most effective way to victimize someone is no longer simply to victimize him, but to pretend to be victimized by him in order to get the justice system to (falsely) prosecute him. One stone two birds: one not only gets to victimize one's opponent, but one is able to make it look as if one were good and one's victim were evil. This is the most essential manifestation of a world where, to use Nietzsche's words, the transvaluation of values has made it that the former way of Genghis Khan is no longer admirable: back in the days of "master morality", the original morality, the third party laughed at the victim who lamented his victimization by Genghis Khan or Attila the Hun; back in the days when nations were in a state of nature in regard to one another, pure force and

93 Durant, *Rousseau and Revolution*, p. 541. "Handle so, dass du die Menschheit, sowohl in deiner Person als in der Person eines jeden anderen, jederzeit zugleich als Zweck, niemals bloss als Mittel brauchst." See the entry "Imperativ" in Rudolf Eisler's Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe: <http://www.textlog.de/4021.html>.

ruse in the art of war – Machiavelli's prince – required no artful disguise to shield the master of these from moral condemnation. Matter has become radically different in a world which is governed by international laws devised supposedly to uphold the universal values of justice – which has formalized “slave morality” even among nations, that is. Will Durant notes while concluding Machiavelli's contribution: “... that an interstate morality awaits the formation of an international organization dowered with the physical power and the public opinion to maintain an international law. Till then the nation will be as beasts in the jungle; and whatever principles their government may profess, their practice will be that of *The Prince*.”⁹⁴ What has in fact happened is that, even as nations have found themselves ever more constrained by the normal course of international relations to obey international laws, the Leader-state still trespasses interstate morality, but only clandestinely; that the art of looking like a victim of another's injustice while perpetrating injustice on that other has replaced the art and ruse in the employment of force which Machiavelli has so carefully laid out in *The Prince*. The goal has remained the same, as noted earlier: to prevail over another, but method has become so convoluted. Evil, as a consequence, has become more complex, and at the same time reaches its purest form. *For the true meaning of evil is certainly, not an evil that does not attempt to hide itself, but an evil that masquerades itself as good, a wolf in sheep's skin, and attributes its own evil to its victim and the innocence of its victim to itself.*

It is funny that, insofar as the mastery of this purest evil demands the maximal use of human intelligence, its practice is beautiful from the objective, detached perspective of the artist or the philosopher. A favorite TV show of mine is David Kelley's *The Practice* (1997- 2004); the ruse and tricks which the lawyers play, while immoral, weave out a certain beauty when you can expose them.

Like the purest form of evil, the greatest suffering in the world is not the suffering itself, but suffering that isn't even allowed to be told, that cannot even have witnesses. The most awful thing about my experience with the International Court is its bizarre nature and drawn-out length which make it unsuitable for ordinary conversation, difficult to verbalize, and barely possible to write it down in detail. This creates a deep chasm between me and ordinary person and, because of that, a great sense of alienation in my psyche. I have to subsist in a continual state of uneasiness because I know something which other people don't know, and which causes me to receive the news about world events differently than other people: that the CIA has suffered a radical break from late 2009 to early 2010, when it has almost died but then come out alive; that China has suffered a radical break for two years between 2008 and 2010; that Russia has suffered a radical break between 2009 and 2010; that, in short, the world has gone through a radical break between 2008 and 2010. For three years between 2008 and 2011, the Agency's number one priority is their lawsuit in the International Court of Justice, and the same for the Chinese and Russian governments. And yet I have to endure, throughout 2011, watching the news reporting as if no breaks had ever occurred in these years of the lawsuit about me at the International Court. I know then that there is an esoteric reality about our world which these exoteric news are meant to hide – and I have written the above in order to prepare you on a journey to discover the hidden reality. The “conspiracy theorists” have discovered an esoteric reality, a war over the world's oil, behind all the exoteric hype about terrorism; but I have had to discover that, because of the radical break, this

94 Durant, *The Renaissance*, p. 566.

“war over the world's oil” has itself become an exoteric reality; now no one but I know that this “war over the world's oil” has, quietly and secretly, come to an end. I have learned that what has happened to me is the greatest secret ever kept in world history – greatest, because of the magnitude of change, and because of the vast number of people, from the elites around the world to the local police officers in my environment, who have been privy to this secret. My entire perspective on the world of news outlets, as well as the taste of the word “secret” for me, has changed. I have learned that, *if something doesn't mention me, it is not a real secret*. The recent hype over WikiLeaks is an example which can illustrate my extreme sense of alienation, my difference in perceiving the reality coming to human beings from TV and computer screens and newspapers. I perceive WikiLeaks as having been greatly overrated in people's mind. What it has made public, though not worthless information, never contains any real secrets of any government, and in particular of the US government, the most secretive government in the world. And I say that nothing which WikiLeaks publishes is real secret because so far WikiLeaks has published nothing which mentions this case of mine at the International Court of Justice. I in fact perceive the danger that some of the information WikiLeaks has published may actually have been fed to it by the US government, in which case it risks being part of the US government's network of misinformation to hide true government secrets behind a veil of false news. US government's condemnation of WikiLeaks in such case would be another classic instance of “manufacture of dissent” – pretending to condemn the leakers so that the mindless crowd would believe what the leakers have leaked are hidden secrets, while you shelve away the real secrets which no one will then even suspect to exist. The best criterion to test the truthfulness and secrecy of a given “leak” is to consider whether it mostly confirms the “official story” (namely, the exoteric reality).⁹⁵ Put the entire “Cablegate” to this test. If it does, then it is either an unimportant fact about the US government or is telling the opposite of truth.⁹⁶

Making known my strangest suffering is the hardest part of my project to tell my true story. I've suffered not physical harm, but slander and, most importantly, the status of a dupe. I was Truman in a Truman show in which every single person I met was duping me and hiding secrets from me. In the story I have framed my suffering as *the greatest dupe in the history of humankind* in terms of the breakdown in intersubjectivity which we all need to be fully human. Here I can speak of it in terms of impediment to my self-actualization. I continue today my status as a dupe. Not one of the characters who have appeared in my story will ever admit that she or he has done to me what I claim here she or he has done to me. For, when they have been recruited as operative against me, the gag order is binding lifelong. I'm still waiting for my day of truth; I often feel like that Alfred Dreyfus from the scandal that bears his name: not having found innocence even after being pardoned.⁹⁷

An allegory I have conceived to convey my strangest suffering is this. Imagine us still living in the time when everyone believed the sun revolved around the earth just as how it has always *appeared*, and imagine the government which knew the truth telling everyone around someone that it was in fact the

95 Ann Wright in an interview with Laura Flanders of GritTV has noted that no cables classified at the levels beyond “Secret” were included in the leaks: <http://wikileaksmirrorlist.blogspot.com/2010/12/support-wikileaks.html>.

96 A short history of WikiLeaks is presented in the Swedish documentary “WikiRebels”.

97 See Ruth Harris' introduction to her *Dreyfus: Politics, Emotions, and the Scandal of the Century*.

earth which was revolving around the sun; now imagine that someone discovering that the appearance of sunrise and sunset hid an opposite reality, that it was the earth which revolved around the sun, and that everyone around him in fact knew this. But everyone around him denied it, both the truth and their knowledge of the truth, calling him insane: "Look at how the sun rises and sets while our ground is stationary!" Everyone laughed, walked away, and was hostile to him because everyone deemed him unworthy to share in truth – even though he was a lot smarter, discovering the truth all by himself. And now he wanted to tell this story of his discovery to strangers who were still blinded by appearance. Think about the appearance of sunrise and sunset when you read the following appearance of normal events behind which I insist are secret operations referring to a secret trial.

While I'm compelled to put into words the most unspeakable, and thus the purest, form of evil and the strangest, and thus most incomprehensible, suffering, I tag along a study of my psychopathology. This memoir shall melt several genres into one narrative. It is at once a history of a trial of massive import in the International Court of Justice through which the war over the world's oil has quietly and secretly ended; an exposé of the intelligence system of various nations; a philosophical reflection on good, evil, and neoconservatives' love of deception; and a Borderline Personality Disorder sufferer's account of his illness. The autobiographical, detailed analysis of the negative thoughts and sentiments which have composed the Borderline obsession with the central figure is not in vain, for this Borderline obsession has vast ramifications in international relations – however bizarre it may sound. Besides, the structure of the tale seems to demand all the psychological descriptions. Insofar as our Secretary of Homeland Security at the time devised the trial at the International Court in the same manner in which Camus' Meursault is tried after his homicide of an Arab man, namely, his entire character is submitted for review, and insofar as Mr Secretary has reviewed me as an imaginary twin brother of myself whom he has invented rather than as myself per se, it does not seem irrelevant to review my own character while narrating Mr Secretary's invention of me.

The essence of Borderline obsession is the "deification of love", *amor dei* transferred unto an actual person, that confusion between passion and philosophy which was once the great genie of Western literature. Petrarch has his Laura, Boccaccio his Fiammetta,⁹⁸ Dante his Beatrice;⁹⁹ then consider Goethe's many and the young Voltaire's Olympe Dunoyer.¹⁰⁰ In contrast to the *triumviri* of Italian poetry, I have adopted a clinical point of view in approaching the deifying love. The young Rousseau's example is particularly fascinating because his personality and mood structure so resemble mine, particularly in the way in which he once enjoys a sort of masochistic admiration, that is idealization, of pretty womankind.¹⁰¹ Finally, at seventeen, he finds a beautiful mother figure to idealize, Madam de Warens,¹⁰² aged thirty, who adopts him into her domicile. A Borderline Personality, perpetually arrested in the search of his or her idealized parental figures, is in the male case always attracted to an older, beautiful, female whom he may worship and idealize and, derives an ultimate satisfaction from the

98 Durant, *The Renaissance*, ch. 1, "The Age of Petrarch and Boccaccio".

99 Durant, *The Age of Faith*, p. 1058 – 1061.

100 Durant, *The Age of Voltaire*, p. 5.

101 The teenager Rousseau, fascinated with the beautiful women around him but unable to bring himself to socialize with them, chose instead to hide in dark alleys and expose in a distance his buttocks to them, wishing for a spanking.

102 Françoise-Louise de La Tour, Baronne de Warens.

subjection of himself to her authority. The difference between the following episode and Rousseau's is that Mme de Warens accepts Rousseau's worship. "He furtively kissed the bed on which she had slept, the chair she had sat on... She let him purr, and called him *petit chat* (little cat) and *enfant*; gradually he resigned himself to calling her *Maman*."¹⁰³ To be sure, Rousseau does not suffer from Borderline Personality Disorder, but the parallel between his case and the following episode is quite striking. His description of himself, "at once haughty and tender... effeminate and yet invincible... fluctuating between weakness and courage, luxury and virtue", can very well apply to the Lawrence in the following, no less than the image of Rousseau as an emotionally unstable genius, somewhat prone to persecution delusion.

I have tried to make this work a classic, so comprehensive in the human experience invoked as to parallel Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Dante's *The Divine Comedy*, Goethe's *Faust*, Eschenbach's *Parzival*.¹⁰⁴ At the same time I have aimed at utter realism, so as to prove wrong Rousseau's opening lines in his *Confessions*, that his portrait of himself, "peint exactement d'après nature et dans toute sa vérité," is the only one which will probably ever exist, while claiming with him:

"Je forme une entreprise qui n'eut jamais d'exemple et dont l'exécution n'aura point d'imitateur. Je veux montrer à mes semblables un homme dans toute la vérité de la nature, et cet homme ce sera moi..."

103 *Rousseau and Revolution*, p. 9 -10.

104 The comprehensiveness of human experience, from great joy to the deepest sadness, is what distinguishes these sorts of classics from ordinary story telling. As Faust expresses, in his desire to be God-like:

"Und was der ganzen Menschheit zugeteilt ist,
Will ich in meinem innern Selbst geniessen,
Mit meinem Geist das Höchste und Tiefste greifen,
Ihr Wohl und Weh auf meinen Busen häufen
Und so mein eigen Selbst zu ihrem Selbst erweitern,
Und, wie sie selbst, am End' auch ich zerscheitern!"

"And all that all mankind has to endure,
I will enjoy within my inner self,
the highest and deepest will I grasp in my spirit,
heap on my bosom all their weal and woe,
and thus extend myself to all their selves and then,
like them, be wrecked."

As my story moves from world affairs through intelligence agencies to myself, it exhibits the same course as seen in *Parzival*: "Parzival's search for the Grail is the journey of a man who moves from ignorance to wisdom and redemption. The Parzival of the early Books is seen as an ignorant young fool, well-meaning yet inexperienced, who does not fully comprehend the counsel given to him, who pursues his goal with a touching singlemindedness, repeatedly confusing form with substance. Here precisely would seem to be a significant moment in that black-and-white world. Parzival sins, yet ignorance and inexperience are seen as mitigating factors. Wolfram depicts a situation in which good will is posited and even emphasized, but in which, nevertheless, guilt is inevitable, and – paradoxically – personal. Man's heart is speckled like magpie plumages. There are no clear lines delineating Wolfram's answer to the ultimate question of guilt and redemption." James F. Poag, *Wolfram von Eschenbach*, p. 81.

“Que la trompette du Jugement dernier sonne quand elle voudra, je viendrai, ce livre à la main, me présenter devant le souverain juge. Je dirai hautement: voilà ce que j'ai fait, ce que j'ai pensé, ce que je fus. J'ai dit le bien et le mal avec le même franchise. Je n'ai rien tu de mauvais, rien ajouté de bon... Je me suis montré tel que je fus, méprisable et vil quand je l'ai été, bon, généreux, sublime quand je l'ai été. J'ai dévoilé mon intérieur tel que tu l'as vu toi-même...”

“I am forming an enterprise which has had no example, and whose execution will have no imitator. I wish to show my fellow men a man in all the truth of nature, and this man shall be myself...”

“Let the trumpet of the Last Judgment sound when it will, I shall come, this book in hand, to present myself before the Sovereign Judge. I shall say loudly: 'This is how I have acted, how I have thought, what I have been. I have told the good and the bad with the same candor. I have concealed nothing of evil, added nothing of good... I have shown myself as I was: despicable and vile when I was so, good, generous, sublime, when I was these; and I have unveiled my inmost soul...’”¹⁰⁵

My real life, in contrast

The following pages will add up to a life which Mr Secretary of Homeland Security has made up about me for his international audience, a story of twin brothers and jealousy between twin brothers which would remind you of the myth of Romulus and Remus, one of whom too was jealous of the other.¹⁰⁶ A thorough review of my life might be too boring to constitute good literature, but the exotic nature of the made-up life could not be appreciated without contrast with my real, “boring” life. I have spoken here and there of my life before this episode, as well as my family, in “Feefee and Valerie”, in the Preface to Volume One, and in “My experience with the FBI, the CIA, and the Department of Homeland Security”. My brother David Chin and I were born in Taiwan, on May 6 1968 and on November 16 1969, respectively. We were raised by our grand parents, with our parents departing to America to dig the gold there when we were mere toddlers. Our grandfather was a three-star general in the Taiwanese military, once took up the post of the principal of the Chinese Military Academy in Taiwan, and, after retirement, served as the general manager of the Shimeng Dam and as a representative in the provincial government. My grand parents sent my brother and me to the U.S. in 1982 to reunite with our father – by then my mother had already divorced him. My brother and I became US citizens in 1985. We have always been residing in California, and neither of us got along with our father, a rather brutish man. I went through junior high and high school in Irvine, California (Woodbridge and Irvine High School), and, after attending community colleges (Irvine Valley College and Orange Coast College), graduated from California State University at Long Beach in 1997 (BA in philosophy). I have always been very talented in drawing and academic learning, although I have never made money with these. My brother, after graduating from Woodbridge High School, went first to UC Riverside, and then to Cal Poly San

¹⁰⁵ Cited in *Rousseau and Revolution*, p. 4.

¹⁰⁶ See Timothy Peter Wiseman, *Remus: A Roman Myth* (1995).

Luis Obispo, and obtained his BS in computer engineering around 1992 or so. His first job was at Sunkis, Riverside. In terms of personality my brother has always been my opposite. He had a lot of pride, thought himself superior to me and deserving better treatment at my expense. He ripped me off several times in order to finance his college life, although, eventually, in 2001, he paid me back everything by giving me his old car. We were alternately close and distant throughout our childhood and teenagehood. He looked down upon me, just as all my family members did, for being the black sheep who did not pursue like others in my family either computer studies, engineering, or business, but who chose the impractical philosophy, art, and humanities. By the time I was in college, my brother had already found better jobs in the San Jose area and moved there. He would stay there for the rest of the time. He married a woman from China, was hated by her, and divorced her. He then met another woman and was living with her. Thanksgiving 2006 was the last time I saw him, and the first time I saw his girlfriend. Perhaps because of governmental intervention, I would never find him again. Meanwhile I have thrice tried to pursue a master degree but always gave up in the middle of it, first at the Catholic University of Louvain in Belgium (Louvain-la-Neuve) in 1997, then at California State University at Hayward in 1999 and 2000, and finally at the University of Quebec at Montreal in 2005. My brother and I have never had between us anything like that between Remus and Romulus.

A last note

At last, what is a self-actualized person? I want to answer this question in a manner relevant to the following story. It is a person, through art or philosophy, who has disentangled himself or herself from the preconditioning of his social environment and come into his or her self on his or her own, finding the truth about and beauty in reality which the oppressive power that society represents has hidden away from him or her. This person is either himself or herself a “true” philosopher or artist, or has come into his or her self through the guidance of another philosopher or artist. Let me concentrate on the philosopher here, since this work, dealing with the problem of truth primarily, is better regarded as a work of philosophy.

Will Durant has defined the philosopher as the one “who tries to arrive at reasoned opinions on any subject whatever as seen in a large perspective”.¹⁰⁷ This is ultimately an imprecise way to think of a philosopher. My precise definition of a philosopher is someone who is “enlightened”. What does this mean? The clarification of the meaning of enlightenment is the whole purpose of my *Scientific Enlightenment*. Since Spinoza's enlightenment is strikingly similar to mine – to my “scientific enlightenment” – I shall use him as an illustrative instance.

A personality is but a perpetual battle between mutually conflicting emotions. Enlightenment is but a special emotion, *amor intellectualis Dei*. God is the sum total of all things in the universe plus the laws of nature which emanate from them just as the properties of a triangle emanates naturally from it. God is that underlying substrate or materiality – *substantia* – to which all things are in the end reducible – the equivalent of modern physics' “energy”. This *substantia* – and this is the law of conservation – is eternal, can neither be generated nor destroyed, but only changes in forms, into this thing you see here

107 *The Age of Voltaire*, p. 605.

and that thing you see there. As I have argued, the first law of thermodynamics is the grain of all philosophical insight throughout the history of human philosophy. The *thaumazein* – fascination – with the mere fact of *substantia* and with the order emanating from it, this *amor intellectualis Dei*, allows you to see things as God sees things, “under certain species of eternity”. To see the world as God sees the world, *that* is enlightenment. In this way of seeing everything, ugliness and beauty, right and wrong, all disappear – my “scientific Daoism”. Here you see only causes and effects, the inexorable working of cause and effect; there is no free will, as all desires are caused.¹⁰⁸ Total control of emotion, total power over the self, without any judgment:

“He who rightly knows that all things follow from the necessity of divine nature, and come to pass according to eternal, natural, and regular laws, will find nothing at all that is worthy of hatred, laughter, or contempt, nor will he deplore anyone... Those who cavil at men, and prefer rather to reprobate vices than to inculcate virtues... are a nuisance both to themselves and to others.... A strong man hates no one, is enraged with no one, envies no one, is indignant with no one, and is in no wise proud... He who wishes to avenge injuries by reciprocal hatred will live in misery... Men under the guidance of reason... desire nothing for themselves which they do not also desire for the rest of mankind.”¹⁰⁹

This God's way of seeing reality is the objective view of everything. You see the world in its unity, in its consubstantiality, rather than as a collection of disparate and separate things. For a human being to do this, he has to practice hermeneutics, seeing the unity of things *behind the appearance* of their separation and individuation one from another. For things do present themselves to us as separate, and society requires you to see them as separate, this as useful and that as harmful, this person as your friend and that person as your enemy. Society is thus always oppressive. As if it were not difficult enough to see through this natural deceitfulness of appearance and to discover the true nature of reality, the fascists come along to present to you your enemy as your friend and your friend as your enemy, setting you backward on your path toward an objective view. Only a philosopher who has been used to the art of hermeneutics can escape, and defeat, the fascists' inversion and scrambling of reality. This is my story, in the third and the fourth volume. But before defeating the fascist, the philosopher has difficulty in putting away his passions – the ordinary sorts. This is this volume.

108 Spinoza considers “free will” to be merely the consciousness of desire and the acting upon it.

109 *The Age of Louis XIV*, p. 649.