

Forward

"Change" and "resistance," these are two words that do not sit well with established governments. As history can attest to, past leaders who were on course to bring about meaningful change in our own country were removed from position through assassination, sending a message to all that the real power lay outside them. It is the power to act without recourse, to take any action deemed necessary, legal or otherwise, and not be held accountable. It is the power to control the narrative and write history in your own terms. It is the power of interdependent relationships born of wealth, mutual needs and common goals that can decide who shall be elected and when it is time for them to leave office. It is the power to rewrite laws to conform to your own personal needs and to spend other people's money as if it were your own. It is the power to lie and be believed and the power that when caught, to be forgiven.

On May 4, 1970 Power met Resistance head on at Kent State University as the National Guard gunned down four students whose only mistake that day was walking to class. The guard knew what they were doing and were well prepared. To a man, they had taken measures to protect each individual's identity by removing all patches and nametags from their uniforms and hiding their faces behind gas masks. With the power of President Richard Nixon and Attorney General John Mitchell behind them, no one was held accountable and the nation turned it's anger on the four dead students. Remarkable, no?

Today, as police have extended the use of unnecessary, deadly force to include simple arrests like traffic stops, even while the evidence of their actions are collected on video, recorded on cell phones, body and dash-cams and publicly witnessed, the system is weighted in favor of the police who more often than not go unpunished.

And as the dark forces that have assumed political power now flourish, all in the name of "change," the only change we can truly expect is all that is wrong with our system will get worse. It's time for the resistance to rethink it's game.

"Nobody ever went
broke underestimating
the intelligence of the
American Public."

H.L.Mencken





Electoral Lunacy

November 15, 2016

The latest wisdom being put forth to treat our depression in the face of the election of the most divisive candidate in American history is to take it “day-by-day” and

realize that we have a system of checks and balances, as if to say “Just relax. You’ll get over it. It’s not as bad as you think. The system works” No! This is misdirection.

Currently the system is not working. We are being misdirected to complacency and resignation as a substitute for activism in all that we know to be true and right and

good. It may be a treatment for our collective PTSD but it is not a solution to finding the path that can resolve the many intricate problems we face and those to come in the best manner possible.

We are transitioning to a nation led by a man with no moral compass, a reality TV star with no ideology, and has, and will continue, to surround himself with the counsel of thugs and hypocrites. Let's recognize them for what they are. Paul Manafort is a thug. Rudi Giuliani is a thug. Steve Bannon is a thug. Corey Lewandowski is a thug. Chris Christy is a thug. Trump attorney Michael Cohen is a thug. Newt Gingrich, Paul Ryan, Mitch McConnell, Marco Rubio

and most republicans are hypocrites. Ben Carson is a politically feckless idiot by comparison. Ted Cruz may be an honorable man, clever and quite logical, but also a rabid obstructionist who laid the groundwork for our current dilemma. Jeffrey Lord is an opportunist leech, a parasite on the back of the political beast. Kellyanne Conway, Scottie Nell Hughes, Kayleigh McEnany and Katrina Pierson are witless political groupies who have more in common with the Manson Clan than with the American system of government.

I never thought I'd say this, but I have more respect for Anna Navarro and Jeb Bush for their positions than I do for the Democratic leaders

(excluding Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren of course.) They showed themselves to be people of integrity and principle, a rare commodity these days. And surprise... Megan Kelly showed herself to be more than a Fox propagandist lapdog, but a thoughtful and intelligent anchor who I have come to respect, however wrong her politics.

Does anyone really think that Donald Trump can "clear the swamp." Who will he work with? His GOP congress is the swamp and his loyal supporters, his inner circle, are far darker than any of the living swamp creatures we have known to date, with the exception of Dick Cheney.

Perhaps he will look to the example of a leader he admires, Kim Jong Un, of North Korea who knows how to effectively clear a swamp and relent that our laws prevent him from expediting the matter in that manner for the moment.

And what about the loyal opposition? The failure of the Democrats was thinking that the path to an election win was centrist, moderate, middle-of-the-road. They did not have the conviction of their beliefs to act as needed and resigned themselves to the delusion that progressive, democratic-socialist ideas were too radical for the American people to accept. That the ideas and policies of Bernie Sanders were

impossible to implement. They ceased to be dreamers. They chose to live in the past and that is what they will get with Trump. Not a socialist future but a fascist past. Ignorance and arrogance have partnered and we are their clients.

A minority of American voters just elected a man with no clear or firm policies, whose main arguments for supporting his candidacy consisted of bar room and locker room bluster, unsupported bragging and childish name-calling, false promises and yes, the very thing the Democrats felt they could never sell, ideas with no possible solution.

And we are to believe that

our system has the checks and balances that can remediate the problem? Everyone admits the system needs an overhaul, but no one is able to take the bull by the horns and castrate it without fear of being crushed.

What are the problems and what do we need to do? Really, do I have to ask? We all know what they are.

Lobbyists

Lobbyists are the voice of those who can afford them. They represent and support the singular goal of one client to the detriment of the American people as a whole. We need laws that define the role of lobbyists in such a way that makes it illegal for a lobbyist and lobbying organizations to be paid for

their services. We need to stop lobbying as a business and restore it as an altruistic means of communicating with our legislators.

Corporate Money and SuperPacs

We need to end the influence of big money in our elections. There should be limits on campaign donations regardless of the source, be they corporate, private, or the candidates themselves. SuperPacs were a work-around invention designed to render useless the campaign finance laws. SuperPacs cannot operate without money and should be governed by the same finance rules as the candidates if we are truly equal as citizens in a democracy—small donors

only.

The Media

We need solid laws that govern news media. If America needs to be made “great again” it is because the media has mutated into a shadow of its former self. This is where we must begin, as it is currently a fountain of knowledge polluted with disinformation. We all recognize that the news media has become a form of entertainment in search of income-producing ratings. It is the foundation of screenwriting that to write an entertaining story, the story must be based on conflict. The more conflict, the better the story. Conflict produces suspense and the many ups and downs, turn-

arounds and plot twists that engage an audience. Do we honestly think that the people in charge of our news programming are unaware of this key principle. They not only foster but create conflict and like any good serialized program, leave its audience hanging to wait for the next conflict event. The many panels of pundits and surrogates do not serve to present a fair and balance reportage, but rather to drive ratings through conflict. Surrogates are lapdogs to their masters who benefit from the free propaganda. Pundits speculate on the unknown based on the non-answers of the surrogates who always predictably deflect to their opponents shortcomings rather than answer a question directly.

Do I get any news benefit from that?

It should be illegal for surrogates to be paid by news organizations.

Surrogates who “spin,” refusing to answer a question directly and whose answers fall into that category of deflection known as “but what about them?” should not be asked back in any news program by that network. They are not news at that point.

Pundits should be paid by their own respective firms, not by the media hosting their panels. Pundits offer opinions not news. Let’s stop taking funds needed for news and applying them to pay pundits. Let them support their own opinions. We need to diminish and

limit news by surrogates and pundits to a percentage of the total news output or to certain times of day or the week and to pundit specific shows like “meet the press.”

Let’s bring back editorializing and not disguise it or be ashamed of it. Newspapers editorialize. Why can’t the television media? Even in the best days of CBS, Eric Severied had an editorial segment. CNN is afraid of editorializing because it would lose half it’s audience. As it is, it has lost it’s moral responsibility to report the truth by taking a position, instead replicating its own variant of media-stalemating, hosting “The War of the surrogates,” promoting elections like

fight nights on HBO. They are no better than Congress in that regard. FOX is only slightly better in a perverse way. They are unapologetic in their dishonesty and while they have a transparent ideology, they masquerade as news when in fact they are for the most part just old-fashioned liars.

The Pivot

Good God!! Who in this fucking insane asylum invented the pivot? The media have made it a legitimate tool of the politician, reinforcing it daily. Are we to believe that candidates can say anything to get elected and then do the opposite once in office? Why not? They pivot back and forth effortlessly while stumping, moving with the

polls and the perceived emotional temperature of the electorate.

Gerry mandering

Gerry-mandering (redistricting) should be abolished and voting tallies should be made according to county boundaries.

The Electoral College

The Electoral College is an antiquated system and should be abolished. Elections should be determined by the popular vote totals.

The Economy and Transparency

Let's start by revealing who the 300 stockholders in the Fed are. Perhaps then we will know who really runs the country.

Obama

President Obama continually brings joy to my heart. He is the best example of a gentleman in my lifetime. He conducted honorable and respectful campaigns. He is logical, thoughtful and moral. He is kind, generous and smart, oh so very smart. We will be lucky to ever see his equal in our lifetime, although there may be hope for a Michelle candidacy and I'm not forgetting Bernie's or Elizabeth's unrealized potential.

Hillary.

Hillary was brilliant in defeat. She said what was needed and yet did not abandon her principles. I have grown to respect her and I feel deep sorrow for her loss. Nevertheless, she

chose wrong. She listened to her advisors and timidly shied away from "what she was told was impossible. She was killed by her own pragmatism and an opponent who doesn't know the word. So now I'm back to the original idea that started this rant, that no one man can do so much damage in our system of checks and balances. Bullshit. Just look at Nixon and his staff of Watergate criminals; the many war crimes committed in Viet Nam under LBJ and later Nixon; Reagan and Bush senior's impact on banking, and the Darth Vader of our time, W's puppetmaster of American government, Dick Cheney and you may get some idea of the limitless possibilities of this faulty thinking.



I will not unite behind a leader who is a racist.
I will not unite behind a man who is a sexual predator.
I will not unite behind a billionaire who does not pay his fair share of taxes.
I will not unite behind a businessman who is a cheat.
I will not unite behind a man who is a serial liar.
I will not unite behind a candidate whose platform was hatred based
I will not unite behind a man who is a rapist.
I will not unite behind a man who supports torture
I will not unite behind a narcissist.
I will not unite behind a bully.
I will not unite behind an undignified trash-mouth.
I will not unite behind a fraud.

There is however a solution, however unlikely.

The delegates chosen for the electoral college are only bound in 29 of the 50 states to vote for the candidate selected by the voters of that state. If even the delegates to the college of one swing state could be influenced to vote their conscience, then perhaps the people of this country could win by popular vote rather than through the distortions of the electoral college. But who is bold enough to save us from ourselves?



The Price of Silence November 16, 2016

A few nights ago I visited one of my daughters who resides in the city where I live. We had some very minor business to conduct that afforded us the opportunity to be in the same room for a short period

of time in our otherwise busy lives, to share our thoughts, emotions and stories, as all families should do. As the election had only been two days previous, it had been the natural subject of much of our discussion.

I had been shocked to learn that my daughter had not voted. Neither had her husband, or so she claimed. In principle she supported neither Hillary nor Trump, but her husband claimed to support Trump. Unable to

support either candidate just didn't bother to vote, but her husband had an even more troubling excuse. He claimed that the township that he worked for had some means to learn the ballot choices of it's employees, and that unfavorable choices would reflect limited advancement, and compensatory value. Consequently he chose not to register to vote after they moved to a new home within the township boundaries about a year ago. My daughter bought into this explanation.

However on the car ride home from a ballgame that night he told his son something quite different, that he voted for Trump.

So it was that when my eleven-year-old grandson entered the kitchen from the garage he was bouncing with all the enthusiasm of a rowdy stadium sports fan, dancing in circles, jumping up and down, pumping his fist in the air and shouting repeatedly, TRUMP! TRUMP! TRUMP! with a chorus of repeated "TRUMP NATION, TRUMP NATION, TRUMP NATION!" displaying the corrupted joy of ignorant youth supporting the ideology of winning at any cost.

Once again the lessons of history fail us.

I am reminded of a nation whose politics were that of a nationalism born of a belief in the superiority of their race, fueled by a charismatic leader who permeated their culture so thoroughly as to establish a brown-shirted youth corp of militant disciples stabbing the air in long armed salutes to their Fuhrer.

Comparisons to Hitler have become cliché and so common as to become meaningless. For example Obama has been compared to Hitler by the extreme right lunatics who manage to get photo coverage for their ridiculous assertions. But Hitler was real. His message was real, and it's important that we take a long objective look at the

pre-holocaust Hitler and his National supremacist ideology to understand its consequences.

For Trump, the election was a game to be won, nothing more. For his supporters it was the same. It was never about principles, values or ethics, but simply about winning. It was a cage fight between two Titans, with no referee and no rules. It was extreme wrestling with razor blades, broken glass, tables and chairs and ladders, all show, all fake, the most vile form of entertainment. But it was just that, a game to be won.

Baby-boomers can remember that some time ago the Beatles suffered financially due to John

Lennon's observation that they were more popular than Jesus. The truth of the observation was never doubted, but his observation was forcefully denounced for the audacity of making it.

In more recent times the Texas-based, "Dixie Chicks," were boycotted for a statement made in concert in Shepherd's Bush Empire theater in London. "Just so you know, we're on the good side with y'all. We do not want this war, this violence, and we're ashamed that the President of the United States is from Texas." And for that simple political statement they were financially pummeled and denounced by the good-ole-boy empire.

Free speech is not free. There is always a cost imposed.

However, the cost of silence is far greater.





How To Lie In The Age of Trump

November 17, 2016

Lying is the misrepresentation of a falsehood as a fact, or a fact as a falsehood, committed through word or action, or lack of action, with the intent to affect an outcome. Facts and truths are very different. There are a great many truths that can never be verified as fact. There are mysteries and ideas that can never be verified, yet might possibly be true. Such ideas fall into the category of theories, religious beliefs and medical as well as historical opinion. In many such cases the truth can never be known and therefore merely speculated on and considered. But let's not call it fact.

General Rules & Methods:

We find ourselves in an age where falsehoods have become more influential than fact and we need to take a closer look at intent and the methodology of lying to differentiate the truth and make good judgments, especially as we are asked to do so as citizens of a democracy.

There are many principles that make for good lies. Here are some leading to the practice of successful lying:

Create a need and fill it. The need can be real, but if you create the need first, the lie will stick.

Lies work best if there is an audience ready to believe them.

Repeat it over and over until it becomes the truth. The more it is heard, the more it is believed. An old advertising principle is “tell them once, tell them again and tell them again.” Advertising has never had a close relationship with the truth. Repetition is the key to lying success.

That said, mix in a dollop of truth to your lie. It's the best way to sell it, a recipe for success. Blending makes it harder to distinguish a lie from a truth.

Realize that a lie is not bait. It's a lure. Bait is something real, like a worm or a minnow, or a quid-pro quo.

A lure is something false, painted plastic and metal, faux bait. In political terms, it's a false promise.

Know what button to push. Understand the weak spot of the audience. This is an innate instinct in human nature. You're not going to get laid by telling an ugly person that they are physically unattractive.

Rather tell them that they are beautiful or sexy. Tell dumb people they are smart. Tell fat people it doesn't matter. Tell yourself that smoking doesn't harm others. Tell the nation that global warming is desirable because it yields milder winters.

Use spin whenever possible. Tell your audience that it's

not what they think it is, but the very opposite of what they believe or think. If it's what they want to hear, they will believe it.

Perception is reality. You are creating a perception. Forget about reality. Speak to their perceptions. Lying is emotional manipulation. Apply it to the area required.

When all else fails, when reality is all too obvious for perception to be influential, bring up the insider track argument—"If only you could see him as I do." To thwart this approach, opponents have to deny your testimony, challenge you as a witness. They cannot refute that which they have not experienced. They will not call you a liar. That's too

confrontational.

Spread disinformation, conflicting stories create confusion. Anything can be mistaken for the truth in such an environment,

Try deflection to answer questions where the truth cannot be denied. —What about them?

If all else fails just change the subject. Lie by omission. Change the dialogue. Answer a different question. Raise a different issue.

Presenting alternatives creates uncertainty, fertile ground for lies. What about this? What about that? Maybe it's really this? Could be that. "Let's give him time. Let's wait and see.

Anything can happen.”

Fabricate your lie with the element of plausible deniability. It will save you when you are caught.

The Finer Points

Hold up a mirror. If people see themselves in the mirror, they will mistake their reflection for reality. Alice went through the looking glass and look what she found. It wasn't reality.

Quote other sources to create approval, however fictitious they may be. If they don't really exist you can't be blamed. It's just what you heard. Cite others to create a consensus of belief.

Create an organization and give it a name, like say “The Foundation For Truth in Politics”, or “The Alliance for Democracy” then distribute your lie through the organization. Who wouldn't believe “The Foundation for Truth in Politics?”

Introduce a lie as being authorized by the populace... “Some are saying...” or “It's been said...”

The outrageous and implausible lie is more believable than the probable. If you're going to lie, lie big. Who could be so bold? Therefore it must be true.

Parse the language. What does “is” mean? Is oral sex,

sex? Or is just vaginal sex, sex? Thank you Bill Clinton for all your contributions in this regard.

Flavor it with emotion. Lies are sold emotionally not logically.

Polish it into a shiny lie. No one responds to a dull lie. Make it appealing.

Also make it memorable.

Give it a name. Names have meaning. You can rally around a name. Names work, like “Lying Ted” or “Lying Hillary.” Is Reality TV really “real” as the name implies? I hate to bust your bubble, but there is nothing real about reality TV. It is all scripted and managed to create false conflict and

conclusions. And what about religious movements? Scientology, that's a great name. It implies a belief in Science. However, it's disciples believe the story of Xenu, the tyrant ruler of the Galactic Confederacy. That 75 million years ago Xenu brought billions of people to Earth in spacecraft resembling Douglas DC-8 airliners, stacked them around volcanoes and detonated hydrogen bombs in the volcanoes. The Thetans then clustered together, stuck to the bodies of the living, and continue to do this today. What about Christian Fundamentalists? Another great name. They hold fundamental many beliefs that are contrary to proven science. Yet they command a great presence

and undue influence in our democracy. Look at the lies of other cultures, Isis, The Taliban and other religious terrorist organizations who enlist teen-aged suicide bombers with the promise of 72 virgins in heaven and you can see that the world is largely manipulated by belief systems in the fantasies, myths and unverifiable concoctions of the leaders of political theologies. I'm not going into the beliefs of Mormons, Catholics, Christians and Jews. However you identify, you know the dogma you must believe to enter heaven—like the arc with two of every species, the virgin birth, etc. etc.

Create confusion—reverse, reverse, reverse. Say one

thing today and another tomorrow, and reverse again. Deny what you said, then say it again and deny it again. No one will know the real truth and you can trot out surrogates to tell us what they think you meant. Anyone is free to decide on what is the truth and half will gravitate towards the first statement and half will gravitate to the other and you will win many more believers than telling just the one lie.

**Spreading The Lie:
Get Somebody Else
To Do Your Dirty
Work**

Use a forum with no checks and no rules..social media. You can create a pile on.

Get many surrogates to say it for you. Create a

pyramid scheme of lies. One tells two. Two tells four and so on and so on. Pretty soon the lie goes viral and becomes reality.

Well that's about it. Now

you can start your own movement and maybe someday be President, too.





The Glass Slipper November 21, 2016

In today's political environment a great deal of slurs are being launched into public debate without thoughtful consideration, hair-triggered, knee-jerk reactions. As any survey of the internet will quickly attest to, a lot of name-calling is going on and it was started at the top. The meaning of words like "liar" is not in question, but before we start tossing out other names let's be sure we all understand their meaning fully.

Here are three words that are currently being used in our political discourse that may be either confusing or misunderstood by some. You be the judge if they re being used improperly or not.

mi·sog·y·nist

mə'säjənəst/

noun

noun: misogynist; plural noun: misogynists

a person who dislikes, despises, or is strongly prejudiced against women.

synonyms: woman-hater; More antifeminist, (male) chauvinist, sexist,

informal: male chauvinist pig

fas·cism

'faʃ,izəm/

noun

noun: fascism; noun: Fascism; plural noun: Fascisms

an authoritarian and nationalistic right-wing system of government and social organization.

synonyms: authoritarianism, totalitarianism, dictatorship, despotism,

autocracy;

More: Nazism, rightism;

nationalism, xenophobia, racism, anti-Semitism;

jingoism, isolationism;

neofascism, neo-Nazism

(in general use) extreme right-wing, authoritarian, or intolerant views or practice.

Nazi

1: a member of a German fascist party controlling Germany from 1933 to 1945 under Adolf Hitler

2 *often not capitalized*

a : one who espouses the beliefs and policies of the German Nazis : fascist

b : one who is likened to a German Nazi : a harshly domineering, dictatorial, or intolerant person

Read the complete article at...

<https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007519>

The Lessons of History

“National Socialism represented much more than a political movement. The Nazi leaders who came to power in January 1933 desired more than to gain political authority, to revise the Versailles Treaty, and to regain and expand upon those lands lost after a humiliating defeat in World War I.

They also wanted to change the cultural landscape: to return the country to traditional “German” and “Nordic” values, to excise or circumscribe Jewish, “foreign,” and “degenerate” influences, and to shape a racial community (*Volksgemeinschaft*) which aligned with Nazi ideals.

These ideals were at times contradictory: National Socialism was at once modern and anti-modern; it was dynamic and utopian, and yet often harkened back to an idyllic and romanticized German past. In certain elements, Nazi cultural principles were consistent: they stressed family, race,

and *Volk* as the highest representations of German values. They rejected materialism, cosmopolitanism, and “bourgeois intellectualism,” instead promoting the “German” virtues of loyalty, struggle, self-sacrifice, and discipline. Nazi cultural values also placed great importance on Germans' harmony with their native soil (*Heimat*) and with nature, and emphasized the elevation of the *Volk* and nation above its individual members.”

Does this sound familiar to you? Is not Nationalism always a plea to make a country “great again?” What methods are ethical and what goes too far? we

cannot even discuss it, if the terms we use mean different things to different people. If we call someone a fascist or a Nazi, what does that really mean? Is it an all or nothing proposition, or is it the entrée to the slippery mudslide of values lost in name calling? Or on the other hand is it the glass slipper, the transparent shoe that fits?





14 hours

The Cheerleaders

November 22, 2016

Every action, every word, every expression made by a person in the public spotlight will have consequences, both predictable and unintended. A leader of a nation, candidates for leadership and their surrogates must all reflect carefully on what they say before issuing statements influencing policy that may mutate to take on a life of its own.

Whether Trump actually supports such ideas, whether Bannon is a closet Nazi or whether their team relishes the support of fringe alt-right groups or not, it must be realized **that** the rhetoric of their campaign and the management of the transition cannot be pivoted into a unifying message of hope, absent of fear. Rather it has given rise to other

voices previously silent in the chains of political correctness, but now unashamedly public. It has changed the climate and like hateful things said in an argument, they cannot be retracted once spoken, especially in this age of electronic media where everything is recorded for posterity. It is arrogant to think otherwise.