

[return to updates](#)

A LOGICAL PROPOSAL

by Miles Mathis

I toyed with different titles: A Modest Proposal, an Immodest Proposal, and so on, but almost 300 years after Swift both are cliché. So I landed on a Logical Proposal. Those are rare enough these days. My logical proposal concerns how to solve the problem of voting. Several years ago I proposed a logical enough solution to the voting problem, called the [DIY vote](#). The do-it-yourself vote. If the vast majority of people weren't catatonic, that solution would have worked. But I now have to face reality.

Some thought that first solution was a bit “idealistic” or “naive” or at least “overly optimistic.” Maybe so. Contrary to my normal MO, I tried to give people some credit for native intelligence, gumption, or at least soberness. I find I was wrong on all accounts. So this current solution is not idealistic at all. It might be called realistic, as in realpolitik. It doesn't give people any credit for anything, unless they have clearly earned it.

Say we really wanted to solve the voting problem, so much so that we were willing to give full power to do so to some person or committee. The question is, what would that committee do? I propose that this is what that committee would do. That committee would use the hacked voting computers and machines that we already have to monitor the next Presidential election. They would secretly install some new police state software (assuming it isn't already installed), so that they could match each vote to its voter. In other words, the machines would know how you voted. Your vote would appear to you to be anonymous, but it wouldn't be. Some face-scanning software, or fingerprint software, or body odor software would match you to your vote and store that info in the NSA database, along with all the other data it is already storing on you.

The next thing the committee would do is this: **anyone who votes for Romney or Obama in this next election has his or her voter registration revoked.**

Yes, that is pretty much the whole solution. The only thing to add to that, as a nod to fairness, is that if you are under 40, your voting rights are only suspended for a few years. If you are 18 to 30, you have your voting rights suspended for eight years, to give you time to get your head out of your shorts. You can spend the next two cycles studying recent history. If you are 30 to 40, you have your voting rights suspended for 16 years. And if you are over 40, you have your voting rights revoked permanently. If you have hit forty and you are still being fooled by the newspapers and TV ads, you are beyond hope. If you have lived from 1972 to 2012 and you are still voting for one of the two scarecrows, we may assume you are permanently lost in the Land of OZ, and cannot see through a glass wall. If you lived through Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, Bush, and Obama, and still plan to vote Democrat or Republican, we may assume you are either too stupid to process information, or are too medicated to maintain full consciousness, or are too corrupt to deserve any say in the future.

I will be told that this solution is undemocratic, but it isn't. Democracy is about equal opportunity, and everyone had an equal opportunity to show some residual signs of intelligence. But if you vote for

Obama or Romney in November, you will have simply failed to do so. Democracy is also about responsibility, and you have to take responsibility for your cluelessness. You have been left to your own judgment your whole life, and now is the time to take responsibility for that judgment or lack of it.

Yes, this solution is a sort of poll test. It is like a lifelong poll test, one you have been taking since you were 18. But since it is not based on your race or sex or income level, it is not prejudicial. It is clearly post-judicial. You are being judged on your past actions, which is not undemocratic. It is called life, or what life used to be before the pods replaced us.

What about those who do not vote at all? How does the committee deal with them? Are they treated as superior beings, above the fray? No, they get what they appear to want: a permanent revoke. George Carlin argued before he died that non-voters don't have to take any responsibility for the mess we are in. I like Carlin, but he was dead wrong on this one. Non-voters are playing right into the hands of the corrupt, since the only thing the corrupt like better than voters who vote as they are told is voters who don't vote at all. Democracy is replaced by fascism either way.

You see, this solution actually is much more democratic than the fake democracy we have now. This solution is injecting democracy back into a corrupt system. How? By making it impossible for the corruption of democracy to continue. The neo-Nazi mobsters who now run this country have found they can control around 95% of the populace with their various brainwashing tricks, via TV, magazines, newspapers, the internet, and scripted debates. So this solution takes that 95% away from them temporarily. Without that 95%, the remaining 5% can use the vote as it was meant to be used: as a lever against corruption, fascism, and top-down control. That independent and educated 5% would vote out every member of Congress, install a third-party President, and do the same thing at the state and county levels. The world would be different overnight.

Once the government is changed, the veils will be taken from the eyes of the 95%, and some of them may return to sense. As they do, they will be given the (equal) opportunity to join the informed. Many will become voters again. The libraries and internet will remain open, and anyone who wants to can study history and all the other subjects necessary to maintain an independent political existence.

You see, our democracy is failing because those in power figured out how to use a perverted definition of democracy to undermine democracy. We have all been taught that a democracy is nothing if it isn't a full democracy. But historically that isn't true. There have been successful democracies that were limited. See ancient Athens as one example. See the early United States for a more recent example. But rather than stick to logic, sense, or any knowledge of history, our new controllers have forced down our throats from the cradle the idea that everyone over 18 should and must vote, or face censure for being unpatriotic and anti-Modern. Have you ever asked yourself why? I will tell you why. It is because if the voting pool is very large, any intelligence in the voting pool can be diluted. We see more and clearer evidence of that with each passing election, as we watch people who are completely uninformed about everything go to the polls and nullify the votes of those few who are informed. This is just as the controllers want it. They want 98% of the voters to be ignorant slobs who get all their information from the TV and other propagandized sources. They want 98% of voters to be so uneducated or otherwise gormless that when they are told that they are wasting their votes if they don't vote for one of the two propped up candidates, they actually believe it. They believe it although it is the inversion of the truth, as usual. The truth is, voting for either of the establishment candidates is a throw-away vote, because it renders you completely powerless. Voting for either the Republican or the Democratic candidate is nothing but a bow to authority. It is doing what you are told to do. The only vote that can empower you is a vote against the two parties and the corrupt status quo they represent.

The only way to vote for change or hope is vote against the two major parties.

But very few seem to understand this. I am asked all the time by those who should know better, "What's so bad about Obama? What has he done that makes you say this?" Whenever I hear that question, I wonder what rock on what dark side of what far icy planet this person has been living on for the past four years. Have they been reading nothing but the *CIA Daily* since 2008? It just proves how utterly out-of-touch the American populace is, even (or especially) the segment that thinks of itself as caring, up-to-date, and educated. These people should know by now that the mainstream media is a whore, a tall wall of lies, a pre-paid megaphone for the corrupt mobsters that have taken over the world, and yet—knowing this—they still get their limited information from the whore. They still read the *New York Times* and *Newsweek* and watch CNN and listen to NPR. If they are progressive they read *Harper's* or the *Nation*, thinking they are privy to the best information. But they aren't. They don't seem to understand that *all* the major sources of information are compromised. If it is big enough to be on the newsstands or on the TV or on the radio, it is most likely compromised. It has long since been visited by the CIA, and it is now pre-read and re-written by spooks from the White House, the Justice Department, the Department of Defense, and Homeland Security. This is all known. It isn't some dark conspiracy theory. The government has admitted in Congressional testimony* that it is doing these things, and the fact that isn't more widely known is just more proof of the levels of control.

Here is a short list of things Obama has done:

- 1) Started an illegal war in Libya, with no declaration by Congress, and against all the laws of international conduct spelled out in the United Nations, NATO, and other treaties. Besides overthrowing a sovereign nation, the US also took part in and encouraged the murder without trial of Gaddafi. For this alone Obama could be impeached and convicted of international war crimes.
- 2) Assassinated, without trial or any published proof of guilt, Osama bin Laden. Again, this is international lawlessness, and it was done only on Presidential authority. Unfortunately, neither the Constitution nor international law gives Obama this authority, and for this alone he could be impeached and convicted of war crimes. Even the top Nazis were tried at Nuremberg: they weren't assassinated in secret by Presidential authority.
- 3) Assassinated, without trial or any published proof of guilt, Anwar al-Awlaki, an American citizen. This not only breaks international law, it breaks the oldest and clearest US law, since American citizens are guaranteed due process, habeas corpus, a trial, and so on. This murder affects all US citizens, since if Obama can murder al-Awlaki based on Presidential whim, he can also murder you. Take note that the Obama administration did not even try to explain away this death as an accidental effect of trying to capture al-Awlaki and bring him to justice. No, the government now claims the authority to assassinate American citizens, if they are considered dangerous terrorists. But it is not any court that decides they are dangerous terrorists, based on published evidence. No, it is the President, and it is based on nothing you will ever see, nothing that can be discussed or argued. For this alone, Obama could be impeached and convicted of murder and international terrorism.
- 4) Signed the National Defense Authorizations of 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012, which have become progressively more dictatorial and unConstitutional. Not only has Obama not reversed the Patriot Acts and the Military Tribunals Act of Bush (2006), he has outdone Bush with the past two NDAA's, which, among other heinous things, give Obama the authority to indefinitely detain American citizens with no right to trial, no right to counsel, no right to be informed of their crime, and no right to sue. If the prisoner or his family complains, he can be whisked off to a foreign country (called rendition), where he can be tortured and assassinated with no witnesses. For this alone, Obama could be impeached and convicted of high crimes. Any

member of Congress who voted for these Acts could also be convicted of high crimes, and it is hoped they may yet be. Any judges who do not immediately nullify these Acts can also be convicted of high crimes. Any jailors who illegally detain these prisoners can also be convicted of high crimes against the Constitution. Any soldiers who use force to uphold these Acts can be convicted of acting unConstitutionally and illegally, against their oaths. This was proven at Nuremberg, where soldiers were convicted of this, and where “taking orders” was not considered to be a defense.

- 5) Broken his promise to close Guantanamo and quit torturing. Illegal detentions and torture have actually increased under Obama, and his Justice Department has continued to publish ridiculous and illegal papers to justify this. Not only has Obama not reversed the policies of Bush, he has extended them and accelerated them. Again, for this alone, Obama could be impeached and tried for war crimes.
- 6) Broken his promise to stop using signing statements. He has used them not to “address Constitutional issues,” but to ignore Congress whenever it tries to limit his authority in any way. In this way, he has continued to act like a sovereign, in exactly the way George Bush did.
- 7) Broken his promise not to hire lobbyists. He has hired almost no one but lobbyists and business insiders, most of whom have obvious conflicts of interest. This is especially true at Treasury, which Obama has loaded with Goldman-Sachs executives. But it is also true at all other departments, including the FDA and USDA, which have been completely sold to Monsanto and the big drug companies. When campaigning, Obama said GMO's should be labeled, but his long list of federal appointees from Monsanto and other huge companies have done everything they can to prevent labeling and testing.
- 8) Ok'ed the use of drones, which have killed, accidentally or on purpose, many innocent civilians, including women and children. This is also against the rules of international warfare, and opens Obama to impeachment and conviction for war crimes. These same drones are now being prepared for domestic use by the military and police, violating the Constitution in several ways. If Obama decides to assassinate you or someone you know, he may do it with a drone.
- 9) Continued to bail out the banks, via the continued thefts from treasury and from so-called quantitative easing—which is just more month-to-month looting of the treasury by the Federal Reserve. The major financial institutions and the wealthy have now stolen numberless trillions from the treasury, with no accounting and no signs of stopping. Obama requested and received a large increase in the debt ceiling, which just gives the bankers permission to steal more. Here's a little known fact: in raising the debt ceiling in the summer of 2011, not one Democrat in the House voted for the raise. Although Obama requested the raise, not one person in his own party bowed to his request. The ceiling was raised by a Republican House. This was unprecedented. Never before in history had a Democratic President failed to get one vote from his own party. You may ask yourself: is Obama really blue or red?
- 10) Has broken his promise to re-regulate the banks, instead giving them more power to regulate themselves and avoid any scrutiny. Obama has not asked for a re-authorizing of the Glass-Steagall Act, which was gutted under Clinton. Nor has he supported an auditing of the Fed, much less its necessary dissolution.
- 11) Increased the war in Afghanistan. Although the Afghani war had wound down with Bush, Obama re-accelerated it to give our soldiers something to do as they exited Iraq. The war has also spilled over into Pakistan, which is no longer an ally. Obama has spent hundreds of billions of dollars in Afghanistan in the past four years, for what? If we originally went there to get bin Laden, shouldn't his death have ended it? And do you think it was worth a trillion dollars over a decade to find and kill one man? That isn't a very efficient military, is it?
- 12) Instructed or OK'ed the CIA to foment new wars in Syria and Iran. Seeing the banks continue to loot the treasury unobstructed, the Department of Defense wants to continue its looting, and

they appear to be in some sort of race to see who can loot the most trillions in the least amount of time.

- 13) Continued to increase the budget and power of the NSA and DHS, accelerating the buildup of the new police state. NSA is now illegally gathering information on everyone and everything, in supercomputers in gigantic new buildings all over the country. Although this is unConstitutional, it isn't stopping Obama and his administration at all. They are installing the New World Order of the Bushes, a NWO where you have no rights and they have the self-declared authority to do anything they want.
- 14) Allowed British Petroleum to destroy the entire ecosystem in the Gulf of Mexico, with almost no consequences. The Obama administration has sided with big oil against the citizens of the US, refusing to hold them to environmental protection laws, refusing to indict them for an array of crimes, and refusing even to demand compensation for admitted losses. This is just part of an overall plan to allow general rapine by large corporations, over the interest of the society as a whole. The latest example of this is fracking, which is being allowed to proceed despite huge risks and despite the high probability that the costs will far exceed the benefits.
- 15) Pushed through Obamacare, which is just an invitation for insurance companies to loot the treasury. Kucinich, one of two or three honest members of Congress, called the health care bill a bailout for insurance companies. Ask yourself this: why is insurance involved in health care *at all*? All they do is paperwork. They are an unnecessary middleman, since doctors used to hire bookkeepers. Do you think the solution to the healthcare crisis is to create another middleman? Getting the federal government involved just creates a second middleman in the equation, and that must drive prices up, as we are already seeing. This was the goal.
- 16) Continued to stonewall any investigation of 911, of the manufacturing of the Iraq War (weapons of mass destruction), and all the other crimes of the Bush administration.
- 17) Oversaw the debacle in Haiti, where our own military tied up the airports, preventing aid from landing. Curiously, the military was already on the shores of Haiti *before* the earthquake hit, which, as with 911, should cause you to ask about prior knowledge. [The Russian Navy has even reported](#) that the US Navy caused the earthquake by producing instability on the faultline. Regardless, not only did the US *not* prevent millions in aid from being misdirected and stolen, it appears the Obama government was involved in this misdirection and theft. Obama, Bush, and Clinton went on TV together to beg for aid for Haiti, then stole that aid from both you and the Haitians. No doubt they used it to bail out the banks.
- 18) Refused to release any of his records, except his birth certificate on the White House webpage, which turned out to be a terrible fake. He has not released his records from Harvard or Columbia or Occidental, and we have no documentation from him of his childhood. All we have is his word, which has turned out to be worth nothing. If we base our judgment on the only real evidence we have—documentation from independent researchers—it would appear our sitting President was groomed from birth by the black agencies (no pun intended) to misdirect the African American and Progressive vote.

None of this is to say I prefer Romney. But I don't feel I even need to list Romney's shortcomings, they are so glaringly obvious. Like Obama, he is a transparent shill for the status quo, and will say anything he is directed to say from behind the curtain. But he doesn't read from the Teleprompter with the quite the faux-earnestness and charm of Obama. Except for Ron Paul, the Republican primaries were a sad joke, so devoid of content, honesty, and anything human, they existed only provisionally, like a dizzy nightmare in the head of a succubus. I have already shown [in recent papers](#) how far the Republican establishment had to stoop to steal the primaries from Paul: manufacturing totals, reporting fake numbers, “losing” entire precincts, making up new rules in caucus, beating and arresting caucusers,

ignoring caucus votes, and then, at the National convention, disenfranchising entire State delegations. One would be at a loss to explain how they think to compete in an election when they have disenfranchised a majority of their own voters, except that one remembers they own the voting machines. Who needs real voters when you can make them up with software? The election in November will be the first wholly virtual election in history.

My reader will say there are at least two major holes in my proposal. It may be logical, but it is not feasible, since it relies on a sort of *deus ex machina* to get it started. The current government, being corrupt, has no interest in ending its own corruption, so who or what is going to install my committee? Aliens would have to land and install this committee, over the threats of the sitting governors. If aliens are going to solve our problems, they could do it in any number of other ways, including governing benevolently themselves or by atomizing all our corrupt governors. So why install this committee? True, but I am seeking a solution that requires the least intervention. The aliens could set up and protect my small committee of conscientious humans and almost claim they hadn't broken any non-interference laws.

The other problem is contained in that word “protect.” Suppose this solution got started—by the help of aliens, gods, or a Superman—and the 5% began actually doing something. At that point we all know the sitting government would send in the National Guard. Without protection, that 5% would find itself breaking in the new FEMA camps.

So what is my logical proposal to fill those gaps? Let's consider the first gap. Using round numbers, let us say there are about 100 million voters in the US. Five percent of that is 5 million. So there may be 5 million voters who know enough not to vote red or blue. There may be even more than that, given the number of people who voted for Ron Paul. Paul was neither red nor blue, and a vote for Paul was definitely a vote against the status quo. Counting up all the votes actually cast for Paul in the primaries, we might find more than 10 million. That is a sign of hope, because it means we have a considerable minority of voters who are catching on. The polls for anti-GMO proposition 37 in California are also a sign of hope, since we see around 90% of voters voting against Monsanto and FDA propaganda. They have not been fooled by their TV's.

Since all of these 5-10 million people have shown positive signs of intelligence and gumption, we may hope that all is not lost. Being intelligent, many of them will already be teachers or leaders of some sort, and the rest will have influence on those around them.

Against them are arrayed the all the government agencies, including a bloated CIA, military, banking establishment, and federal bureaucracy. To this we must add the corrupt corporations, or at least those running them. And we must add those running the propaganda machine, including the top positions in the media. We must include a large part of academia, which has been bought out by these interests. That adds up to millions of people actively working to maintain the corruption. As a matter of numbers, it may be a toss-up.

The reason corruption is currently on the rise is that the corrupt are working harder to promote their world than we are. It is really that simple. Good people have been far too quiet for far too long. We have been taught that quietude is superior, and we have accepted that, since it is easy to be quiet. It is always easier to do nothing. The perfect example of that is Eckhart Tolle, who is currently re-teaching the old Christian and Buddhist tenets of acceptance and resignation. Christianity has been used by the governing powers to keep people quiet and politically inactive for centuries, and Tolle is conveniently selling the masses the same old elixir. “Go within and study yourself watching yourself!” Obviously,

our corrupt leaders are quite happy if you do that, because if are doing that, you are not resisting their New World Order. If you are willing to develop your own slave mentality, they will not have to force it upon you. You may ask yourself why Tolle and Chopra and Oprah and the rest are selling you this old religion of internalism, and at whose behest they are doing so. I will give you a clue: the CIA has admitted to controlling the media since the late 1950's,* and Tolle and Chopra and Oprah are part of the media.

The real spiritual leaders like Gandhi and MLK did not teach this sort of resignation. They taught resistance, remember? You may ask yourself why Oprah, a black lady after all, seems more interested in promoting Tolle and Chopra than in promoting MLK and resistance. Oprah, like Obama, is not a black leader, representing her people; she is a painted tool of the white mobster status-quo, which is enslaving in slow motion people of all colors.

To resist the mobsters and their tools, you have to embrace your role as teacher, and you have to be very careful what you teach. For instance, most intelligent people have never questioned the idea that all people of voting age should vote. But we see it isn't true. It is inverted logic. The uninformed should be encouraged *not* to vote. Those brainwashed by TV advertisements should not vote, because in voting as they are told they are simply allies of the corrupt.

On the other hand, those who are truly informed *must* vote. They must be politically active. As it is, this logic is inverted. Currently, the ones most likely to abstain from voting are the most informed. They abstain from disgust, because they know how things are. I understand this reaction, but it is the wrong reaction. These people seem to think that the system will collapse under its own weight, and they have decided to wait it out. But that isn't the way revolutions work. History has not proceeded that way. Good people have been waiting for the various corrupt American systems and sub-systems to collapse for more than a century (including Modern art), but they haven't. These systems have only become more and more entrenched and pernicious, precisely because the good people have kept quiet.

These good people who are planning to abstain are also proceeding under another contradiction. Do they think that after a lifetime of doing nothing they will suddenly become active when the system collapses? I am thinking of John Mayer's song "Waiting for the World to Change." Good people don't wait for the world to change, they change it. This is how change really happens. Not through hope and waiting and quietude, but through action.

What that means for my proposal here is that although no immediate disenfranchisement of the ill-informed is likely to occur, a gradual disenfranchisement of voters *is* happening. As more and more drop out of the voting pool due to resignation or disinterest, a chink in the armor of the corrupt appears. The present government needs a large voting pool, but that pool is evaporating. Instead of encouraging the informed to abstain, we should be encouraging the ill-informed to abstain, while encouraging the informed to become exponentially more active. And if we, the natural leaders and teachers, begin to teach more and lead more, the masses will not have to get their information from corrupt government sources. By being polite and quiet, we have given over the education of society to government fakers. Not only have we let our children be educated by the corrupt State, we have let our friends and neighbors be educated by the corrupt State. We have assumed they would rather be educated like that, since we have preferred to be modest, but it may not be so. It may be that our children and neighbors have been educated by the corrupt mainly because we have been too humble to teach them ourselves. We no longer believe in our own worth. Attacked by the corrupt for over a century, we have come to accept their judgment of us. They have told us that all are equal, that there are no natural leaders, and that we should all be brought up on State propaganda instead. But of course that isn't true.

That is another of the inversions of modern life. Go back several paragraphs to where I am counting up sides. Five to ten million natural leaders versus the same number of corrupt leaders. In a proper society the natural leaders would be leading. In our society, those leaders have been suppressed and replaced by a mob of corporate sponsors.

You will say, “Well, if these 'natural leaders' were really superior, they couldn't be suppressed. How do the inferior suppress the superior? Isn't that a contradiction?”

As I said, the natural leaders have allowed themselves to be suppressed. They have bent to the clever psychological warfare of the inferior. They have allowed themselves to be convinced that there are no natural leaders. The constant cries of equality that we have all been brought up on from birth have convinced the natural leaders that their innate qualities are somehow false, and that their abilities are nothing but ego. Once the leaders are diverted in this way—taught to sit on their “egos” and be resigned—the ambitious second tier takes their place, installing a corrupt New World Order in the place of natural world order. For more on this, I recommend Nietzsche, whose greatest achievement was the uncovering of this inversion.

I will be answered, “When have these natural leaders ever led? Wasn't Nietzsche's critique mainly another pie in the sky?” No, it wasn't. The founding fathers of the United States were natural leaders in most ways, and were not in any way like the second-tier fakes we now see, such as Rumsfeld and Cheney. As for George Bush, he doesn't even qualify as second-tier. Even Reagan, who was no brain himself, called Georgie “the idiot son.” Which is to say that the inversion has taken place in the past 200 years. Most of it has occurred in the past century, and the greater part has occurred since 1945.

But what can be inverted can be reverted. If the second-tier can steal history from us, we can take it back. The first tier will always beat the second tier, *provided they make an effort*. Even with lesser numbers, the first tier will always win. The first tier has always had lesser numbers. The exceptional are outnumbered by definition. But it doesn't matter. Hierarchies like this aren't decided by numbers, they are decided by nature.

Which brings us to the second hole in my proposal. If we begin to have any political success, the second-tier will attack us. We have been left alone so far because the corrupt can always ignore 1% voting for Nader or someone. Nader's 1% or Chomsky's 1% don't threaten them. An active 5 or 10% not diluted by the uninformed 90% *would* threaten them. This is why the intelligentsia were attacked by the Nazis. The intellectuals are purged for a reason.

But again, an active class of natural leaders can counter this attack, no matter how sophisticated it becomes. To start with, the second tier have bribed and threatened many in the first tier to join them. These scientists and thinkers, seeing no active resistance, may make any temporary alliance that benefits them. But when the battle begins, the natural alliances tend to take over. This is what we learn if we study history. The fortresses of the corrupt always turn out to be of paper and straw, because they rely on bribes and threats. They don't stand up to any pressure. The same can be said for the military, which has historically been prone to split or switch sides at the crucial moment. The corrupt now control the military, but only in the sense that the military is a government body, and the government is corrupt. We may assume that the top brass is also corrupt, but this does not apply to the soldiers themselves, who have never been prone to attack their own people. Due to natural laws, most people would rather follow the first tier than the second. Humans, like all other animals, have an innate sense of which is which, especially in times of crisis. There is a lot of unrest in the military right now, and it

is caused by precisely this. The soldiers understand that they are being led by people not fit to lead.

This is the thing that Joan of Arc understood more than anyone else in history: issues aren't decided by numbers, they are determined by the *determination* of natural leaders. When an exceptional person decides to do something that is right, all of nature tends to array itself in his or her favor. She saw this as a sign of God's will, but it is a natural law that operates even among people who don't believe in a Christian god, or any gods. It operates among chimpanzees and mountain goats and wolves. It is the first law of all hierarchies, and human nature is fundamentally hierarchical.

This is not an argument against democracy. A successful politics can and should be both democratic and hierarchical. Democracy describes things like equal opportunity and equal rights. Hierarchy describes the role of natural leaders in any politics or government. Both democracy and hierarchy are checks against tyranny, because tyranny is never a tyranny by a natural leader. Natural leaders have no desire to be tyrants. Tyrants don't come out of the first tier, they come out of the second. All corruption in government comes from the second tier usurping the natural order, from ambition, greed, or self-glorification. Natural leaders have no need to pervert the natural order. They have no need to squash the lower orders or prey upon them. Only the second tier has this need, since only by perverting the natural order can the second tier lead. The second-tier person in a position of leadership is always out of place, and is in a corrupt position no matter what he or she does. Knowing this, such a person invariably self-destructs, taking whatever organization he is at the head of down with him.

Since the current inept leaders come from the second and third tiers—the scions of depleted families—they are ripe for destruction. All the first tier has to do is awaken and assert its natural position. The rest will take care of itself. I am not a fan of Ayn Rand, but it might said that Atlas must stop shrugging.

*See the Church Committee hearings from the 1970's, which you can read about at Wikipedia or a thousand other places.