

LOCAL MAN HAS OPINION ABOUT DISMANTLING GOVERNMENT

Attorney General, "K" street,
DHS, Call for Incarceration

- WASHINGTON D.C.

There appears to be a movement in this country proclaiming benefits from a reduced role for government, and in an interesting twist for these people, nearly a celebration of Darwin.

The root of this idea may have been a reasonable reaction to the human predicament in which we all find ourselves, specifically those events in history that have led thinkers to the school of the tragic vision of human behavior. I have re-spoken in a number of places, of the dichotomy described eloquently by Steven Pinker and likely others - this notion of opposing schools in discussion of 'human nature', the *utopian* and *tragic* visionaries. Suffice it to say here briefly: The Utopians suggest the transcendence of war can be achieved by an equilibrium of opportunity and enlightened nurture, while the Tragicians suggest that intellectual capacity is not distributed equally in biology and propose that fate, greed and territorialism reign. It is my non-scientific predisposition here that 99.9% of those proclaiming that government should be dismantled are of this Tragic camp. This should strike most as a statement of the obvious.

I would assume that a number of prerequisite modules be installed in a person of this Tragic ilk: One believing in the cult of the individual, one with the tendency toward fear of the other, one who is not particularly concerned with evidence or of verifying facts, one with a certain picture of American history that proclaims an entitlement of the western reli-

gious non-intellectual and that suggests the wealth of the nation is a function of hard work and 'good ideas' rather than slavery, exploitation and imperialism. My attitude is likely now becoming clear. But such parties would strike me as a minor threat if they hadn't been adopted by an army of sharp lawyers and opportunists and an intense concentration of old and new world wealth.

A partial impetus for Pinker's exploration into human nature is the emergence of new science that describes what bleeding hearts and civil rights campaigners everywhere are damned to hear: That all are not created biologically equal and that the level playing fields for which they struggle will likely always require endless ramps of affirmative actions to scale. I would not suggest I understand much of the new or of the old genetics, nor would I suggest that the last 50 years of civil rights movements were in vain or were mostly fruitless, but it is evident that the world's problems go on.

I've come to realize that the common babble about reducing the size of government, and the activities of the elected called 'obstructionism' are procedures within autopsy for the corpse of a dismantled government. This is a political strategy because you can get what you want should it be nothing by advocating inaction, de-funding and abolishment. This tact by extension, of course deprives others of resources, thereby concentrating existing wealth and perpetuating poverty. Herein lies the pending endgame between ideologies, those suggesting that government should exist to serve an entire population, a general caretaker for all financed by all, and those who subscribe to a selfish fatalism, albeit with a simultaneous backup plan involving privatized profit and public risk - just in case the *fuck you* policy doesn't work out for them personally.

There are endless comments about efficiencies or inefficiencies in the public sector, the moti-

vations of private gain being the only way to manipulate the productivity of workers, the route to innovation, etc. Less heard is diatribe on the inefficiencies of people in general or the benefits of acting on principle. Not that it is likely to occur, but it might be interesting to see for a moment - a world in which the common attitude among peoples was one that assumed the fellow man was more likely to do the right thing rather than the current suspicion (born often of evidence) under which we now operate. This might be an example of a benefit that might not directly 'make' money for shareholders. But then that reminds a little too much of my annoying aunt who was convinced that the world would actually be a better place if everyone just forced smiles.

The Tragicians are righteous and stuck but are not really incorrect in their analysis of our opportunistic nature. Without a transcendence of the core brain, we likely will never shed the attributes that essentially validate the tragic vision of human behavior, backing the Right's case that if the common unlucky man isn't held down, he will inevitably rise to steal and rape again. Even the man with some 'moral sense' will always go too far, taking until there is friction between him and his neighbor, him and 'his' planet. My aunt would be disappointed in me for suggesting that our occasional altruism, our willingness to drive someone to the auto parts store should we find him on the side of the road, is dwarfed by a self-interested indifference at best, as we mostly speed by at clip. I'll leave this thought to be verified by a statistician.



If it could be agreed upon by all parties that people are *no damn good*, it becomes a matter of regulating behavior, 'governing' as it might also be called. The two sides then face off — those on the left who suggest that a government is required, to regulate exploits and control anarchy by providing for the less than successful. And then the Right, convinced that a bloated, inherently lazy bureaucracy straps down the smart and wealthy who are the engine of economics, parading their 'business' which supposedly rewards the deserving bright and driven, etc. And for the rest: We can either clean the toilets or be kept at bay by private security. Never mind that aside from literal theft, which was the M.O. of the wealthy until fairly recently (though some still no doubt dream), the rich owe everything to the society that is their 'market.' One can't skim off the top if there's no top from which to skim.

Yet there will always be millions who will take a wage to build the armies of the rich, albeit armies of walgreens greeters eager to be the indebted consumers which make this market from which to skim. We have arranged a perfect slavery — by essentially eliminating the possibility of feeding ourselves without participating in modern society, the majority exist solely to stock shelves and then to buy from them. And yet we somehow continue to celebrate our 'freedoms'. I would be willing to wager that without invoking the noble savage, there exists the same degree of suffering in our age of wonders as existed in the previous ages of toil. The key to this endless dynamic is the sophistication of the bone that is thrown to working dogs. And the details of the plans are intricate indeed, perfect distractions must be arranged, from 'sport' and television to alcohol and pornography, the wealthy have a vast toolbox to keep people from thinking about injustice and wage disparities. But I digress — with such a tuned system of perpetuating their wealth, why now a new effort to reduce government to solely a war machine of 'national security'?

I might like to say that ever so gradually, people are evolving and shedding stupidity, and therefore the existence of the Right is in doubt. I'm not such an optimist. It seems more likely to be a reconstitution of their usual efforts, to counteract any gradual erosion of the historical dominance, seen as a fight to the death. The Right is skilled in its ability to generate fear. The followers are told something sacred is in jeopardy, something their fathers held dear, and they did what their fathers told them to do. If this was described in greater detail could the cause hold? If they were actually told that we must continue to march around the globe killing people and stealing their stuff, retain the right to abuse women, or conspire to jail every man of darker skin, perhaps some would indeed admit they were comfortable with these aims. But the construction of enemies is so tried and true, so effective and this is the Makita (screwgun) of the Right. And the whole spectrum of peoples are susceptible to rise to apply an unfettered cruelty should the proclaimed adversary be described just so, as the *buck-toothed jap*, or the *towel-headed sandworm*, etc.

But is the Left really requesting that all that has come before, all that is tradition, all that is sacred be washed away? The Left can appreciate the difference between an aged and a young wine, Stonehenge and the Redhook, Brooklyn Ikea, Yosemite and Disneyland. Some speak of the transformation of the GOP when thinking of Teddy Roosevelt and his interest in wilderness. It seems logical that someone going on about traditional 'values', a conservative let's say, would have an interest in 'conserving' things of (ancient) value, like the planet for example. But like Yosemite, the Right resists even 'setting land aside' as a playground for blood sport, unless it were to include a luxury hotel. According to the common behavior of men on the Right (or the Left), *taking a mistress* seems as traditional for most fathers as reviewing their children's math homework by the fireplace. But

the Tragicians view the planet as 'territory' or 'resources' that should and will be used by man — and it may as well be us, *god's chosen* or the *greatest nation on earth*, etc.

The Right talks of 'values', but of course the activities they fight to sustain suggest their interest is mostly related to perpetuating a patriarchy. They want control of the land, to meet with men that look and talk like them to make executive decisions about civic and financial matters, their birthing women in the 'home' dealing with the spawn and preparing food, the entertaining women discreet but accessible, the people on the street or in the mall to look and talk like them, everyone else can constitute an underclass expected to be quiet and hidden away, busy with the dirty details of cleaning, digging, picking or... ..well I guess they just want the world to conform to their whim. Somehow this is not a surprising aim for man, nor is surprising that man might remain unmoved by a notion that this is not really 'fair.' Of course, if you add to the list an intellectual interest in diversity and insist that the wife have an interesting career of her own, you have a picture of a 'elite' university.

The Tragicians of course don't care much for 'fairness' because this leads to equality, and sediment and cream are differing elements of the crop. Similar clinging is found in discussions of other supposed traditions, often involving technologies relatively recently adopted: Hunting with a laser scope, coal-mining as a 'way of life', or 'I need this monster truck; sometimes I need to drive over stuff.' One could say that an obsidian arrow-headed spear would still bias the hunt to the advantage of man — but I don't want to bog down my argument celebrating the wild child.

Mocking the *good ole boy* is too easy. Let's stick to something more complicated, like 'family values.' It's never been particularly clear to me what happens or doesn't happen in a home that

contains or is governed by such a thing. If I grew up in a home with 'family values', what exactly were the attributes? In the home with children, one would like to have what exactly... enough nutrition, a place free from violence, an environment of intellectual opportunity? Is there some question as to whether any parent anywhere, with or without gods or 'values', wouldn't want to arrange these things for their children? And it's of course the hypocrisy that brings down the home of cards built with 'family values' in mind; how many such homes offer '1/4-pounder and shake', belligerent or missing father figure and television as its parental tools. And then when things don't work out so well, as they don't always, perhaps the *good book* and a *good talking* to will set the little ones on the straight and narrow.

What I mean to address is the notion that a government is *meddling* in the perfect lives of those who have been instructed by the human messengers of god as to how to live in their perfect American dream home, built on 'values', with their boys will be boys sin - for which they will present their reluctant male protestant apologies at church on Sunday. And then occasionally the devil rears in the cul-de-sacs, producing an offspring of the serial killer or the homosexual type; but this happens everywhere. Or does it really? Well, the television says it does. It is somehow an insult to refer an American disease, for that implies we haven't all the *good ideas* implemented by all that *hard work*.

So the Right continues to suggest that the escapades of the wealthy, commonly known as 'business', are the sole mechanism society needs to function and prosper. The DMV will serve people faster with numerous smiling employees who will explain the rules of driving to 'customers' in such a way as to reduce tension. A for-profit agency wouldn't increase the cost of driving for the competition of the market will drive down the price of vehicle registration. Now you have a choice in motor vehicle

administration, Microsoft, Bechtel or Procter & Gamble. The amazing efficiency of the private sector with its glowing non-union associates, joyous over their stock options in lieu of pension, contributing to their healthcare costs - will always explain all the details with such bravado as to quell any and all complaints. Gone are the days of taking breaks or complaining about your supervisor. And you can get your 'twits' while you lounge in a nearby café, your 'smart' phone sorting the algorithms necessary for you to know when the person in line ahead of you is 30 seconds away from concluding their transaction. You'll never wait in line again. Is it science or science fiction?

Speaking of healthcare, we have a less than hypothetical situation to discuss here: Although the Right seems to be comfortable subsidizing some citizens involved in 'security' or oil (but cannot admit that medicare is government-run healthcare), they appear to be serious in suggesting that in the most intense realm of human life, facing declining health and death, a moral imperative needn't guide us, the profit motive should, and that quality is only achieved by corporate greed, I mean 'efficiency.' If you find yourself unable to pay what the market decides fair, you obviously didn't pull yourself up by your bootstraps and work hard enough during your standing years.

It is a relatively recent development that designers imagine government to provide for all its citizens. Do the Tragicians consider a return to a laissez-faire feudalism a return to tradition? Since the victor's history is essentially the only record, perhaps the Right doesn't know about the suffering of most mere mortals throughout the ages. It seems more likely that they don't care. Comfort in life and death is the just reward for those who are superior, the mantra of the Nazis and the 'family values' Right alike.

When the Right takes measure of man, they cite attributes that lead to righteousness, as those

with the time, interest or capacity to entertain such analysis, want to find virtue in terms of the image they wish to view in the mirror. Those with any actual self-reflection will encounter self-doubt, and this is a death-knock for a preacher. The Left bases its arguments largely on a moral imperative - that to transcend war, the entire population must be free from want and this hinges on an equilibrium of opportunity, of resources. And further we must then find in science reasons to believe that all members are of equal capacity to succeed within a system, a historical inheritance filled with messy details, a society with which not all are prepared to deal. This science is not forthcoming. Therefore, the Left must present the Tragicians with a notion of 'enough.' This is one of the highest hurdles man has ever thought to face. The Right and I suspect the Left as well if they were to really look, will always proclaim that even if 'freedom' was ever to be seen for the half-myth that it is, seldom is anyone willing to make the self-sacrifice necessary to limit oneself to an 'enough,' should anyone ever agree as to what that amount would be.

The Left will rebut - that one then must hold one's nose and bring out the bandage kit and face the world of contingencies head on and with full effort, to do *the best we can do*, and that this will still go a long way; and that every person dragged from suffering makes it worth the unsatisfying, muddy pit of a 'playing field.' And they may consider this acceptance of constant negotiation, a constant appealing to the passionate and the violent as a practical approach, since screaming at people who are quick to arms may be self-defeating. It is for idealists to wallow in the sadness of incomplete solutions... ..and I do.

gibbs chapman May 2011
www.misteranthrope.com

