



Jon Hellevig:

**All is Art:  
Democratic Competition**

Contacts:

Jon Hellevig  
[competition@hku.ru](mailto:competition@hku.ru)  
[www.hellevig.net](http://www.hellevig.net)

Book sales:

[www.ruslania.com](http://www.ruslania.com)

Publisher:

[www.russiaadvisorygroup.com](http://www.russiaadvisorygroup.com)

---

## Headings:

---

	page
This is the third way!	187
I want to tell Mr. Barroso that ‘democracy’ is not a thing	191
Foucault’s notion of power applied to democracy	199
Competition and democracy	213
Academic Anecdotal definitions of democracy	223
Athens was not a historic exception	227
The European traditions of democracy are of more recent origin than Mr. Barroso’s grandmother	230
This is Democratic Competition	232
Competitive Justice	236
Laissez-laissez-faire	240
Private Property and State Ownership	244
The State and Civil Society	248
The enemies of open society and democratic competition	249
Democratic traditions	260
This is the third way!	266

### DEMOCRATIC COMPETITION

Undulation ...a rising and falling in waves, wavelike motion to and fro in a fluid, elastic medium, propagated continuously among its particles but with little or no permanent translation of the particles in the direction of the propagation: vibration. - The pulsation caused by the vibrating together of two tones not quite in unison. A wavy appearance, outline, or form ...Power and Democracy.

*Ivan Svetovoin*

### **This is the third way!**

Living and working in Russia since 1992, the early years of post-Soviet reform, offered me laboratory-like conditions to perceive how all social activity and cognition is embedded in social practices. Russia was a country where during the life-time of three to five generation the country was under the rule of a totalitarian regime that had purposefully destroyed – or forced underground - most of the country's social practices, all the cultural heritage that in any country is the fundament of orderly life and social progress; all the social institutions on which freedom, democracy, justice and economic prosperity had been built on in other countries of Europe were devastated. And when the Russians ridded themselves (1990 – 1993) of the Marxist regime they had to start building society from scratch. I noticed that nothing functioned merely for the reason that people individually good were in power (and that in fact the more evil-minded men were more successful in grabbing important positions in politics and the economy when the social practices were in ruin); I noticed that nothing functioned merely because a well-intentioned law or other decision were passed; I noticed that nothing functioned until a critical mass of infinite variances of aspects on social life had been brought in the right relation to each other in the free practice of social life, in a process where the most important component was time. I understood that

there was no right or wrong way, that there was only the balanced way, where the balance was a function of freedom and time.

From here I developed my conception of viewing all being – human and social life - as manifestations and reflections of social practices, and even more fundamentally, I gained the insight that all is art. In the book *Expressions and Interpretations*<sup>1</sup> I stressed that behind the words by which we call the major perceptions of life, such as ‘law’, ‘economy’ and ‘religion’ there lay in fact bundles full of different forms, or rather aspects, of social practices. In this essay I wanted to focus on one of these perceptions: ‘democracy.’ My aim was to decipher the meaning of the word ‘democracy’; to make out the real meaning of all the phenomena we mentally collect under the term ‘democracy’; to penetrate this notion beneath the surface and try to reach some common denominators that based on our life experience could be seen as constituting democracy. This quest meant that I had to take a very critical attitude to the political sciences as propagated by the Academy. I understood that the conceptual method of academic science, the so-called scientific method (in the meaning that e.g. Karl Popper assigns to it) was useless in the endeavor. By the conceptual method I mean these academic traditions of launching new terminology, new words, and then to claim that these words

---

<sup>1</sup> Hellevig (2006). *Expressions and Interpretations. Our Perceptions in Competition. – A Russian Case.*

have an independent meaning, which is defined by yet other words and insinuations. In this perverted form of science ‘democracy’ is defined as whatever is perceived to be the political system of Western Europe and America, and whatever is different is more or less wrong – according to the Western European and American scientists themselves.

I understood that instead of this conceptual scientific method I needed to refer to a real scientific method, the one I call the competitive method<sup>1</sup>, instead of trying to satisfy the ritual formulae of our universities and loyalty to the historic significance of the word ‘democracy’ I need to approach my task armed with the understanding that all in science is but perceptions in competition, that there was nothing firm but only different possibilities – infinitely many – to view life, and that true science meant an attempt to reproduce a truthful narrative of all the aspects that affect the phenomena under observation. I understood that I had to anchor ‘science’ firmly within the proven reality, firmly within art. And in order to pursue this aim I had to avail myself of something new, new standards to replace the fictive scientific method. For this purpose I had developed in *Expressions and Interpretations* my own competitive method, and all I needed was to find support for it, to find like-minded authors that I could refer to; this is how I

---

<sup>1</sup> Regarding the competitive method I refer to *Expressions and Interpretations*, chapter 10

discovered the scientific value of the works of Marcel Proust, and this is how I came to fully embrace his conception of science the way he explained it in his treatise of human nature: *In Search of Lost Time*. – The Search has to be read from cover to cover, it is there that the meaning of the search can be found and from there that it can be understood. And so in this connection I can only give a taste of Proust's thinking, of his method, by referring to a section I consider especially illustrative of this,<sup>1</sup> this is where he advises the scientist to “struggle to discern beneath the matter, beneath experience, beneath words, something that is different from them”, and this can according to Proust be undertaken – as a remedy – when “our true impressions...are entirely” concealed from us “beneath a whole heap of verbal concepts and practical goals which we falsely call life”. Proust chose the word ‘life’ but by it he means all the surface notions of life that people in their hallucinatory concepts create for themselves, this ‘life’ that in the Academy and the Wikipedia is called ‘science’.

This is, as Proust said, what “alone expresses for others and renders visible to ourselves that life of ours which cannot effectually observe itself and of which the observable manifestations need to be translated and, often, to be read backwards and laboriously deciphered”. And this is precisely what I herewith intend to do.

---

<sup>1</sup> The citations are taken from *In Search of Lost Time*, Volume 6, *Time Regained*, pp. 299 and 300.

## **I want to tell Mr. Barroso that ‘democracy’ is not a thing**

In the first section of this book I laid the conceptual framework of the philosophy of social practices telling that social practices are carried in language which in turn stems from the efforts of each individual human being – from the beginning of time – to give an expression to an inner interpretation of feelings; the collective practice of language that thus emerged in turn affects the individual interpretations of feelings which again affect cognition in a process which is best seen as an eternal interplay between the collective (social) and the individual. So I claim that human cognition – in good and bad – stems from the interplay of expressions and interpretations, interpretation of feelings of one and many in infinite variances. This second section of the present book can therefore be seen as an example of the application of this philosophy of social practices on one of the major areas of social life, or one of the major perceptions on life, i.e. democracy. – Democracy, democratic competition, is also an issue I wanted to bring up for discussion in view of the heightened role this word has been assigned in the information war that the Western powers, or the ruling forces behind them, direct against the rest of the world. It seems that the democratic rhetoric is being employed as covert weapons to launch preemptive strikes on countries that pose a threat to – or serve as targets

for the expansion of - the hegemony of the present leading powers, or which perhaps possess riches that the ruling forces want to put under their realm.

As a measure of disarmament we need to demystify the concept democracy and demonstrate the real life processes that hide behind this beautiful word. To achieve this it is about time that we refuse to accept the hollow superstitious symbolism of concepts in favor of a sincere quest to carefully examine and analyze the underlying human behavior - individual and collective – which gives rise to the phenomena and processes amounting to what can be seen as the social practices that we term ‘democracy’ – phenomena and processes which we can never capture in the definition of a concept, of which we can never reach more than an intermittent idea, but which we can describe in the narratives the way an author tells a story or an artist paints a picture; thus we may hope to form an experimental interpretation of the phenomena, an interpretation that helps us to form an idea of what are the specific features or characteristics of the issue at question. Words like ‘democracy’ function like mental shortcuts by which we try to avoid the trouble of thinking twice, avoid contemplating the underlying phenomena, but the danger is that when we don’t do the contemplation ourselves then, for sure, somebody will try to do it for us. This is how the propagandists seize the opportunity for manipulation, grabbing a sacred word,

filling it with their favored content and using it in and out of context, whatever way fits their needs in the information war they wage on the rest of society, and the rest of the world. – To understand ‘democracy’ we have to keep in mind the basic postulate of true science as expressed by Marcel Proust: “The reality that we have to express resides not in the superficial appearance of the subject but at depth at which that appearance matters little”.<sup>1</sup>

The war in Iraq and the preceding information war are striking illustrations of the means and effects of this information war, of this kind of modern warfare, where it does not make a lot of sense to try to differentiate between the words and the missiles – they are both designed to kill. In regards to the war in Iraq most honest people will agree – at hindsight, knowing today what we did not know then - that the decisive support for the war was mustered through carefully prepared and cunningly implemented propaganda maneuvers, but few come to think that there are many more fronts in this information war, few know that the very same perpetrators are engaged in a most dangerous assault on Russia; on this front the stakes are even higher, not for the individuals on ground for whom war and death are always equally horrendous and final, but in this war the stakes are higher for the whole of mankind, and thus even for

---

<sup>1</sup> In Search of Lost Time, Volume 6, Time Regained, p. 279

the people whom these plotters claim to represent. On the Russian front the propaganda plotters may not yet possess a final assault plan, but it seems that they are engaged in a long-term investment in creating the bad will, putting in place the image of an enemy, a threat to security and a threat to perceived values; thinking that once these scares are firmly installed in the European mind – and they have indeed been mighty successful so far – they can strike whenever occasion offers, for which occasion they are itching for in the fashion of an unloving aspiring heir who is restlessly waiting for his sickly uncle to die while not being able to resist the temptation by all means possible to hasten the death.

It seems that nothing has been learnt, not from Iraq and not from any other of the endlessly many wars and sorrows of human history; the evil forces are never satiated, never beaten, they never disappear, they just take cover under the air of normality and wait for their chance to reemerge – and human society sure abounds in these chances - to strike again.

The European Union is the story of the biggest reversal of democracy in world history, and yet it is precisely the EU institutions that serve as the European center for missionary democracy; it is like with the faith of religious fanatics: they know nothing of the true values of humanity and yet are prepared to go to any lengths to make others accept theirs. The

eurodeputies define ‘democracy’ as “our common democratic values and traditions”. But I ask them to spell out these values, what are they in reality; what do they consist of; where did they come from; where are they heading; has Europe seen the peak of these values and democracy ...? - And why do all values in the European Union have to be common for 500 million people? What a totalitarian idea. - What are these values, what is democracy when one attempts to scratch just a bit under the surface of this lofty word which Mr. José Manuel Durro Barroso, the President of the European Commission, so generously at any occasion allows to crawl out from between the fluffy lips of his mouths where it emerges together with the saliva, the frothy liquid secreted by the salivary glands, as a product of the hyperactive - and not fully satisfactory, as his countenance displays - processes of regulating the bodily functions. For sure there has to be more to the word than this, the spit. – And in fact there is, even for our dear José Manuel, or that is to say especially for him, for he used to be in the habit of employing this word democracy in a completely different sense – at least to the external it seemed so – back then when he exalted violence in his capacity of the revolutionary leader for the Portuguese underground Maoist organization, the MRPP, or the so-called Reorganizing Movement of the Proletariat Party (later the Communist Party of the Portuguese Workers and Revolutionary Movement of the Portuguese Proletariat). It was only when new and better carrier prospects turned up that José Manuel

decided to substitute the contents of this pretty word, democracy, throwing out the revolutionary rhetoric and replacing it with something that better suited his new neoconservative patrons whom he was now committed to serve. – This is also the explanation for the chronic political Oedipus complex that this José Manuel suffers from. He tries to hide the duality – or rather multiplicity – of his personality by attempting to command his puffed up countenance into a stern statesmanlike look, but instead the disorder of mind pushes his face into a frantic anxiety-driven activity which take expression in fast and nervous tumultuous movements, movements which lasting only fractions of seconds are separately movement by movement barely perceptible and thus converting the face into a pulping surface of a shivering jellyfish – a perfect match for the political backbone he utterly lacks. Unable to control his facial framework he thrusts the efforts where he thinks he can make a conscious difference, on the mouth. But this is where he runs from bad to worse for all he can manage with the mouth is to twist it into the most imbecile and meaningful smile of the political history of the European Union, a smile oscillating between a ghastly grin and an expression of resigning idiocy – a failed merger between the American external confidence of his patrons and the inferiority complex of an ex-communist from a country of the periphery of world politics suddenly at the helm of a conglomerate aspiring to become the resurrected Holy Roman Empire. - But the jellyfish countenance set in motion

by his shoulders - which are continuously shaking as a result of the dilemma of being conspicuously aware of his surroundings but equally unable to know what to make of them, while thinking it is his duty - or rather what he was passively experiencing as his duty (for in this case thinking is far too elevated a term) - to try to perceive each impression at once, and even the pouting lips, twisted in the idiotic smile, would not catch our attention were it not for his eyes. Because his eyes retain something of the honesty from his Maoist youth, it is there that we can find the true expression of his anger, or the impression of that unjust and unworthy, the mean something, that is the cause of his anger, this sacred hatred. It is precisely from the anxious look which flickered in the depths of his eyes that I got the impression that there was something more than the ordinary political bluff – there was a more personal and deeply-nested primitive anger that his other bodily functions had tried to conceal; something about the disproportion between the number of different points which his body successively and at once occupied, the shiver of the shoulders, the tremor of the voice, the jelly-beat of the face, the meaningfully idiotic smile – they somehow adverted to the anger glimmering from the depths of his eyes.

But this chameleon, Mr. Barroso, is a good choice to lead Europe, for he personally, in one man, covers the whole ideological specter of Europe, which is the same as concluding that he does not have any

ideology at all, or that is, that he has the European ideology. In him the Global Elite found the best European politician that money can buy. – And dumbfounded to even contemplate the fact that he had become the President, he has learnt one lesson in life: to be grateful and loyal to his master's voice.

Now this is the Barroso that I want to tell that democracy is not a thing.

## **Foucault's notion of power applied to democracy**

Democracy is the name for a system – (I use the word system but I need to alert to the misconceptions this word might cause as it points to the wrong analogy of thingly processes, and therefore I stress that in this context, in social sciences, we should understand the word system as meaning ‘the complex interactions between people’) – of deliberate attempts to affect power relations, hence democracy could be defined, or rather understood, only in terms relating to the underlying power. - Again I note that I characterized the system of consisting of ‘deliberate attempts’ but this, in fact, points to another problem: the idea of conceiving all from the perspective of deliberate actions, while in reality most of what affects democracy is a result of complex interrelations in all spheres of social life, and it is to a large degree only the overall conditions of life in society that gives rise to – or prevents – democratic competition, while the quality of democracy (good or bad democracy) is a function of all these conditions in their infinite variances.

I would say that democracy is an aspect of the same phenomena that we call power, in a way they are mirror images of one another, from one point of view we describe what we see as power and from the another point of view we describe it with the

notion democracy, the processes which affect power. But when we really try to contemplate the issue with an aim of getting to the finest analytical details, then we are drawn into a most veritable hermeneutical circle, continuously peeling off layers of surface notions, seeing how one aspect of democracy refers to another aspect of power and so on, until we really understand that democracy and power are only names for two different perspectives on the same issue, perspectives on the same social practices, and we will understand that each new aspect of democracy which we consider can only be understood in relation to another aspect of power, and so on in endless details on all aspects of democracy and power, from the minute considerations up to these grand notions themselves.

But this is not how learned men understand democracy – they do not relate it to the notion power, they do not relate it to anything else either; in fact they do not relate, because in their thingly worldview there are no relations they just claim like in any language-game what is their superficial artistic vision on the word democracy - and this artistic vision they call science (while a more precise investigation and analysis of the nature of this vision would yield the diagnosis scientific hallucination). And all they achieve in terms of analysis is to muddle into the academic history of the concept ‘democracy’ – mandatory references to Ancient

Greece and Athens, Machiavelli (regarding him even with more complete misunderstanding than what is the customary in science), Montesquieu (the icon for all those that lack any capacity to think clear, for no fault of the baron Montesquieu himself, the fault is with the reader – reader? – No there are no readers, they do not read his work, they have an impression of what Montesquieu is from the two paragraph notes from secondary school history text books, and endless references in the Academy to the name Montesquieu, but they do not bother to study what he in fact said, and in connection with what, in which circumstances); Rousseau and the Social Contract get high rankings in academic jargon (although nobody cares to consider that the “social contract” is only a fiction, a figure of speech, and greatly deformed at that). –As other milestones of democracy they quote the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the US Constitution and the Fifth Amendment and other such anecdotal evidence that find their way to the trivial pursuits of science. And all these terms are to be crowned by ‘Parliamentarism’ which sounds, for them, like the ultimate synonym for ‘Democracy’.

I claim that democracy is more than these anecdotal references to documents and men we know from history, much-much more, and what it is can only be understood against the background of looking to what power is.

Now with power we are lucky, because unlike democracy, where we cannot enlist the support of any authority past or present, with ‘power’ we may turn to Foucault, Michel Foucault, the French philosopher and historian who commands an acclaimed position in the history of Western thinking and, what more, a favorable influence on that<sup>1</sup>. – Now if all those who admire the work of Foucault would pose to think, to contemplate on what he says, then they would also launch themselves in a position to understand the concept of democracy that I champion. To illustrate Foucault’s ideas of power and set the background for understanding the correlation between power and democracy I will below quote from and comment on a passage where Foucault presents his conception of power.<sup>2</sup>

Foucault defines power both in terms of what he considers it to be and what he considers it not to be,

---

<sup>1</sup> Although I have to note that unfortunately Michel Foucault was not able to completely free himself from the Marxist oriented so-called post-modernistic thinking with its class theories, and remained therefore to a large extent hostage to those prevailing conspiracy theories in accordance with which a metaphysical capitalist class was conspiring against the rest of humanity

<sup>2</sup> I quote from Foucault 1990, pp. 92 – 97. For the clarity of presentation the text is somehow altered from the original translation.

or rather those aspects of the notion ‘power’ which traditionally first come to mind but which he rejects as mere surface aspects. – “By power I do not mean Power as a group of institutions and mechanisms to ensure subjugation of citizen to the state”, Foucault says. – “I do not mean either a mode of subjugation in the form of a rule, as opposed to subjugation to violence”, he continues and adds that he does not either “have in mind a general system of dominance exerted by one group over another...not a system that through its effects would pervade the entire social body”.

After these disintegrating observations on what power is not Foucault says: “It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies.” - Foucault’s style of writing is affected by the Continental metaphysical traditions going

back to Hegel and the Marxists, and therefore it may sometimes be difficult for a reader not versed in these traditions to decipher the meaning of phrases like “force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate”, and to understand why these “force relations” appear in the text as if they would depict some physical entities, but nevertheless I would think that a reader positively inclined to understanding the meaning will do it. From the above paragraph the important message to understand is that Foucault describes a situation where a large, infinite, amount of stimulations stem from an unknown number of sources (“multiplicity of force relations”), and that he tells that the way these stimulations affect people is not linear or hierarchical but rather the result of infinite variances (“ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses...”), and that all the power relations can be seen to form a system, but not an orderly one, not a predictable one, and by no means a perfect one (“thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from another”). This is similar to one of the most important scientific postulates of Proust: “An image presented to us by life brings with it, in a single moment, sensations which are in fact multiple and heterogeneous.”<sup>1</sup>

Foucault: “Power’s condition of possibility, or in any case the viewpoint which permits one to understand

its exercise, even in its more ‘peripheral’ effects, and which also makes it possible to use its mechanisms as a grid of intelligibility of the social order, must *not be sought in the primary existence of a central point, in a unique source of sovereignty from which secondary and descendent forms would emanate*; it is the moving substrate of force relations which by virtue of their inequality, constantly engender states of power, but the latter are always local and unstable.” – In above paragraph I supplied the italics to highlight what I find as the most important aspect in it i.e. Foucault’s stress that there is no ‘central point’, no one leader or leading body on the top of a pyramid.

He speaks of ‘the omnipresence of power’ whereby he means that power is not something that one person subjects another person to, but rather a bundle of complex relations, or as Foucault says “it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another. Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere”. - Foucault rejects the simplistic perception of power as a mere hierarchical relation between superiors and subordinates, and he says “it is in this sphere of force relations that we must try to analyze the mechanisms of power. In this way we will escape from the system of Law-and-Sovereign which has captivated political thought for such a long time...”

<sup>1</sup> In Search of Lost Time, Time Regained, p. 289

Although Foucault does not state it in the same terminology as I developed for Expressions and Interpretations, I think his conception agrees with mine in accordance with which power should not be seen as a ‘thing’, not anything existing, but life mirrored from the perspective of the notion ‘power’, that power is a perception on those issues that are considered to affect power relations. The problem is that – as it is with all perceptions – power is viewed in very simplistic terms as e.g. a relation between a president and a people. Only very few have like Foucault been able to devote the issue as much thought as to note – similarly to his fellow countryman Marcel Proust – that all aspects of people’s interrelations (power being but one aspect of, or perspective on, these interrelations) are governed by, or is the result of – reflections on – endless, infinitesimally small aspects of life and the forces that affect life. We will not be able to advance in science before we for ever give up the simplistic world-view propped by the Academy and the Western educational system – a world-view based on the language of things and a mental picture which has not advanced a bit from base arithmetic and second grade geometry. – Somebody would need to write a Proustian volume on power and democracy and to include in the treatise all the aspects of life that are related to the topic, to fire a salvo of aspects demonstrating all the traits of social life which have to be included in the treatment, to destroy the myth of power and democracy as being kind of a logical

formulae, a view in accordance with which power perches on top of a social pyramid and spreads its wings down from there in accurate linear mathematical forms – and democracy correspondingly builds up from the base of the pyramid in linear forms to the top – and this while we do not even know who perches on the top, and whether the pyramid would be a completely different pyramid if all of a sudden the leader, perceived to exist on the summit, was to be replaced (as it clearly happens once in a while), if a totally new bird with new wings would sit on the top. For, after all, history is full of instances when there is a new leader, and yet it does not mean that the pyramid has altered, and correspondingly the social relations may alter even when a person formally on the top remains the same.

There are endless aspects of life that affect power relations, and there are endless power relations; just to name a few we may return to quote Foucault who said that “power comes from below; that is, there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix – no such duality extending from top down and reacting on more and more limited groups to the very depths of the social body. One must suppose rather that the manifold relationships of force that take the shape and come into play in the machinery of production, in families, limited groups, and institutions, are the basis for wide-ranging effects

of cleavage that run through the social body as a whole...”. – But, even more: power is not even in these relations, power is in the eyes of the beholder as perceptions of viewing these human relations, and even so power, or the various competing views on power, are kind of internal aspects of these relations, or rather they are in their resulting outcomes, in the reflections on life that these relations bring about, or as Foucault says “relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relationships – economic processes, knowledge relationships, sexual relation – but are immanent in the latter”. – Not in a position of exteriority, but immanent – all in one holistic whole.

And I agree with Foucault who says that “power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of ever changing relations.”

From yet another angle Foucault says that the network of power relations ends by forming a dense web that passes through social institutes and structures “without being exactly localized in any of them... they traverse any social stratifications and individual unities.”

Foucault concludes: “Power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it certain strength we are

endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society... it does not result from the choice or decision of a particular individual subject; let us not look for the headquarters that presides over the perceived system; neither the caste which governs, nor the groups which control the state apparatus, nor those who make the most important economic decisions direct the entire network of power that functions in society.” – Foucault says that power is all over, and yet nowhere, because power is not a thing, but merely social practices that we view from a certain point of view. – One who is willing to accept Foucault’s notion that ‘power - is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society’ will have made quite significant advances in acquiring a new sort of vision for aspect-seeing, for seeing the infinite variances of life, and understanding the philosophy of social practices and interpretation of feelings.

I think that Foucault would agree with me asserting that power is in the social practices, traditions, encoded in language, in personal relations, in religion, ideology, literature, sexual conceptions, superstition, propaganda, in the arrangements of journalists’ housing needs, in economic gain, avarice, hatred – and (but less) in love.

**When power is as complex as this, then certainly its remedy, i.e. democracy, cannot be any less complex.** Thus democracy is not a question of simply holding elections, because elections can be fair and telling of people's choice only if all the underlying conditions – all which Michel and I listed above – are fair and such that they provide for a free and pluralistic process of democratic competition. This is why I so wholeheartedly oppose the hypocrite view on democracy promoted by the sanctimonious propaganda media, Financial Times, The Economist, Washington Post, The Telegraph, and the likes – and their lackey, Mr. Barroso. Democracy is not a question of the survival of the richest and the most audacious, the ones that have the means to buy the media coverage and stage street protests, but democracy is about all having equal opportunity to freedom of speech, and a right to propose one's own ideas for the democratic agenda, or a right even to simply tacitly agree with the ideas and actions of political leaders.

And yet, a majority of the world's political elite is trying to convince us that democracy does not mean anything else than the periodic conducting of elections. They forget that even the USSR was democratic with that measure; in the USSR they also periodically called the people to the ballots to confirm the monopolist. [Although they also admit a role for the “free press”, which they define as ‘any privately owned press no matter how monopolistic and with

any level of corruption’. - Maybe they mean that democracy in the USSR would have been complete if instead of the state the Soviet media was owned by one or two local Murdochs.]

The ballots are, of course, decisive, but only as a part of the overall framework for a competitive democracy, as the culmination of fair democratic competition. There are instances when it is more harmful for democracy (the sovereign power of the people) to conduct ballots in circumstances where all the conditions for a democratic choice are absent, than to implement other mechanisms that better serve the requirements of the democratic choices (the change of the system how governors are appointed in Russia is a case in point).

Now, keeping in mind this analysis into the essence of power, and its alter ego, democracy, and the infinite variances in which they are manifested and interrelated, I invite the reader to consider the ideas of democratic competition, which I present below, as guidelines for how to understand democracy as a function of all the conditions for competition on all levels and depths of social interaction, and how to organize the democratic competition in society (to the extent that we can at all speak about deliberately organizing them). – The reader should emerge from this with an understanding that democracy is like a fabric woven together from all the different threads

of life- threads that entwined with each other in infinite variances form the most variegated patterns of social interaction, all threads constantly in flux, and all patterns constantly blurred by other aspects of life – and with the understanding that we can grasp and feel the consistence of this fabric called democracy only if we put it against all the other fabrics of life.

## Competition and democracy

In Expressions and Interpretations I chose the word Competitionism as a term for encoding my idea of what empowers all and everything in our social world. I built the idea of Competitionism bottom-up from the basic notions of philosophy, for describing that all in life is subject to competition, ever on-going competition inherent in all aspects of life, equally in individual dealings on a personal level as on a macro level in the economy and politics. Competition is what solidifies all aspects of life, which merges individual actions to social patterns of behavior by way of averaging out the extremes; and this smoothing of multitude of individual behavior into relatively stabile social practices is always a result of a historic process best depicted as a process similar to the image of a hermeneutical circle – but here the idea of a hermeneutical process is used not only for interpreting the reality but also for understanding how present reality is formed through historic processes where one stimulation leads to another stimulation, to kind of a counter stimulation, each indicating the range of the possible. – And the stimulations can be thought of as arguments, which return us once again to the competition of arguments, where each stimulation, each argument in a free competition serves to define the range of possible arguments (this is one more manifestation of the forces of pain and pleasure in action, in the search of a balance) – When

there is no free competition - or when the competition is more distorted than the customary – then the range of the possible, or the acceptable, is blown up, then the traditions, the existing social practices, will fail to contain the quality of arguments which as a consequence turn coarser and coarser; and peaceful persuasion based on the merits of the argument will give way to violence. This is how the arguments of violence are born, how murder, revolutions and wars come about. – And this is how our world has been shaped. This is how the European democracy (this thing) was made through murder, wars, revolutions, through immeasurable sorrow – sorrow that even mathematics, the language of social science fiction, cannot render intelligible - through the Guillotine - the veritable start of the glorious revolution, that parted 40 thousand human beings with their heads, an achievement the French still nourish with precious pride, as one of the most eloquent arguments for democracy resulting in a Corsican opportunist proclaiming himself Emperor – and all the French believing the hallucination, like the fairy-tale in reverse: not an Emperor without clothes, but clothes without an Emperor - and starting an endless row of wars and human suffering leaving millions dead on the glorious road to European democracy -1848 more revolutions and killing and man-made misery in France and all over Europe; 1871 more misery in France, 17,000 killed to commemorate the new dawn of European democracy, 1914-1918 Finnish Civil

War with 37,000 dead including casualties at the war fronts and deaths from political terror campaigns and in prison camps; 1914 -1918 World War I 15 million people dead; the Weimar Republic, the road which brought yet new milestones – and tombstones – to the glorious path of the European democracy, now 60 – 80 million people dead in World War II. In between these two most glorious milestones of European democracy there was 1922 the March on Rome and Mussolini's fascist coup; 1923 Hitler's first strike, but not last; the coup d'état and dictatorship established in Portugal; 1933 Hitler's appointment as Chancellor of Germany; 1936 – 1939 Spanish Civil War with close to 1 million dead, followed by the dictatorship of Franco until 1975; 1944 – 1949 Greek Civil War 1945 Atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki–the most remarkable achievements of the democratic civilization of the United States of America reported to have been committed as an argument for the sake of European democracy; installation of a series of unelected socialist governments in Eastern Europe (later as a result of a new and fresh look at the data of natural geographic renamed Central Europe), countries which showed the first sign of democracy in later 1980's.

That is the glorious history of European democracy – something that the eurodeputies, the journalists at the Financial Times and Mr. Barroso think that only Europeans (i.e. all the Europeans west of Narva as

they define it) are capable of – and they are right. – It is only the living – not the dead – that think that all this is so damn glorious. It is only as a result of this European insane competition of arguments where bullets, gas, bombs, and death have been the main arguments under the last 500 years that the Europeans now enjoy the balance of terror that they take to be democracy, and rightly so, it is democracy, but a democracy built on blood. – It seems that people with such traditions are the very last ones that should come forward with their arrogant claims to teach the Russians how to build democracy, for Russia is a country which has not spent 500 years and 100 million dead on their path to democracy. The Russians peacefully liberated themselves from the European ideology, the Marxist yoke, which destroyed in 70 years all the collective political traditions, and yet the Russians built a new society in record time, entirely peacefully, in 10 – 15 years a functioning society with a functioning democracy. Mind you, Mr. Barroso, this is not the same kind of democracy as they practice in Europe, but neither is the Russian road to democracy the same that started with heads rolling off the Guillotine. – And the Russian is not the same kind of democracy that they have in the United States, and neither is the American similar to the European, not is it the same that they have in Brazil, and in Europe they do not have one but many forms of democratic government – although all gradually being suffocated by the resurgent Holy European Empire,

which will build yet many memorials to the beautiful word, democracy.

Like the things in nature social practices take shape and gain strength by the effects of competition. The economy, and how we understand it as a free and competitive market system, serve as a case in point to illustrate how social practices are reflections of the efforts of an infinite number of people, people whose efforts are the more fruitful the more equal and free they are. By today most people will agree – after the socialist experiments in the 20<sup>th</sup> century with planned economy and regulations – that in the economy competition and freedom is the decisive constituent force. Therefore I invite the reader to try come to terms with all the processes which affect the economy (the constituent elements of a successful economy) and then to mirror this insight into the economy to all the other perceptions on social life. At the end of an honest contemplation everyone should be able to apprehend that the same processes (elements) that affect the economy affect all other spheres of life, and furthermore now especially the parallel with democracy should become evident, for what is the essence of democracy if not competition! In the human interactions we call democracy there is a constant competition of all and everything, a competition of arguments on all levels, in all aspects of life, and it is this competition that builds up to and that cumulates in democratic decision making, now

in a mirror image, or rather a second dimension of Foucault's conception of power.

In competition people's historic social traditions, or the competing views on them, are balanced one against another, to create a competitive balance. In mature political systems, like the Western European states - (for mature they are, the question is only whether they've not turned dead-ripe) - this historic balance prevents people from seeing that it is in fact all about competition, now that the competition has been restricted within a tighter range of competing views (not least by the considerations of *commel-faut*, peer control and conceived good manners) – arguments are more and more refined within a limited range of dissonance - a situation where there is a mainstream of arguments that all can agree upon, and therefore the arguments in competition are fine-tuned to nuances that are not so readily perceptible as they are in societies where the competition has started a fresh from a vacuum like it is e.g. in Russia of today, and especially as it was in Russia of 10 years ago. The problem with the Soviet Union was the destruction of past traditions and the lack of competition in all aspects of social life (this, more than the ideology itself, was to a greater extent the problem), and thus Russia's dilemma and struggle after the fall of the Soviet state was to build the best possible society without having recourse to all of the best traditions of its own past, and not having the luxury of the

shared experience from best practices of the world. – Nevertheless, by today Russia has covered a lot of distance and it is fair to say that Russia has regained time, enough knowledge experience to merit to be considered a democracy among democracies – in a world where there is a long way to go for all societies to reach the ideal of democratic competition.

Democratic Competition means democratic and competition on each level, from the human individual to nations (states). In all societies, all political systems there is a democratic competition similarly like there is an economy in all societies, but as with the economy only a free market economy is a functioning economy and so with democracy only in conditions of a free (from all constraints) democratic competition can a well-functioning democracy come about. The competition has to be a free competition, and a competition equal for all, a process where all people have to have a chance to voice their opinions on equal terms. This is of course an ideal, similar to the notion 'perfect market' of economics. But, while we label it as an ideal, it does not mean that we should not strive towards that ideal, and we may indeed approach the goal where all people have an equal voice and equal opportunity to make the voice count - maybe eventually, at the end of a historic road that mankind has entered upon, only a few aspects will separate us from this ideal. The distance between contemporary reality and

the ideal can be shortened by conscious efforts of a political leadership to tear down the obstacles to free competition in all social spheres. The process could be hastened through the implementation of some kind of broad competition laws - similar to the anti-trust (anti-monopoly) legislation we are familiar with from the economic - to be applied to all fields of social life to affect all aspects of life, to all social relations where there is a particular problem with free competition caused by abuse of a dominant position in society. – In an ideal competitive democracy there would be a truly equal opportunity and equal voice for each and every individual. Individuals - this is the crucial point: democracy is about individuals organizing their mutual dealings in society, states (nations) on the other hand are always unequal and cannot be but unequal; the states are sovereign, but all states do not command the same influence on the exterior – and cannot command - simply because states are not generic entities; ‘states’ are purely legal constructions which all have developed in the context of the own specific history and legal traditions; they encompass territories of different sizes, situated on non-comparable locations, endowed with a climate and natural resources of different composition, all leading to completely different living conditions, challenges and opportunities; they have different population size, ethnic composition, languages and cultures. States are bundles, legal constructions that capture the living conditions specific to certain people

in certain conditions, and nothing except for certain ritual surface notions merit to compare one state with another. – And these issues are confused by the most basic ritual conception i.e. the term ‘state’ in itself, for while there are between ‘states’ only similarities and dissimilarities like family resemblances the term ‘state’ has created in the thingly minds of people an idea of there being these fixed entities that behave like people and are like people, and are treated by scholars and journalists alike as if they indeed were people with a mind and a will. This is why the journalists may say: “Finland supports Estonia”, “The European Union has to speak in one voice”, “Russia is wrong” or “The US rejects Russia’s concern...” or “UK wants beerdrinkers’ fingerprints”. –States are not generic entities, particular cases of one species, but rather like legal constructions, something to be compared with legal agreements which regulate similar issues but which still remain particular to each individual case, like for example two agreements on acquisition of separate real estate, one by which the Smiths acquire a house in London and one whereby the Wessons acquire one in Glasgow; while we can say that both are agreements on purchase of a home, but no matter how similar the agreements may seem for a legal scholar there is nothing similar in them for the Smiths and the Wessons, for the Smiths cannot move to the house in Glasgow and the Wessons cannot move to the Smiths’ house in London, and the sellers of the house in London could not care less what somebody

is up to with a house in Glasgow, the terms of these agreements do not have anything to do with each other; but still the scholar may say that both agreements are under British law – and be wrong in this too – and then we can change our example and say that in the other cases the house was bought by the Boulangers in Paris, and then there are nothing left of the similarities except for the irrelevancies of science. – States, like legal agreements on various topics between various parties, cannot enter in any kind of symmetric relation with each other which is the necessary condition for democratic competition, competition between equal individuals. - States are manifestations of democracy between people but the states as such cannot be subjects of democratic competition. And, further, therefore between states it is the ideal of democratic competition that has to serve as a model – while not the mechanism - for organizing a functioning international co-operation: a non-monopolistic competition in a multipolar world free of any social, cultural, ideological, and economic influence exerted by a dominant hegemony.

## **Academic anecdotal definitions of democracy**

Most educated people come as far as to realize that the word ‘democracy’ comes from old Greek. It is from the word ‘demokratia’, probably derived from ‘demos’ meaning ‘people’ or ‘region’ and ‘kratia’ meaning ‘power’, ‘rule’ or ‘strength’, which add up to the idea of people ruling (it is interesting to note that the notions power and strength reappear here). – These old Greek words, though, do not throw any further light on the essence of democracy, on the question what are the necessary elements for a people’s rule to become reality. We have to look elsewhere for the substance and ask what democracy has historically ideally meant and what should it ideally mean. Merriam-Webster’s dictionary definition is a good start saying: ‘a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections’ [We may note that by these criteria the European Union is the first to fall out from the club of democracies].

Many of the Greek city states created some kind of direct democracy, Athens being the largest among them stands out as an example. In Athens the democratic institutions were a legislative assembly (itself also called the demos); a court; and a kind

of executive council (boule) of 500 representatives, which was responsible for drafting preparatory legislation for consideration by the assembly, overseeing the meetings of the assembly, and in certain cases executing legislation as directed by the assembly. The 500 men – for they were all men - were selected by a lottery, held each year among the free men – for not all men were free in Athens - over thirty years of age.

We note from above that in Athens, the system which is the most cherished as the ideal image of democracy, half the population was excluded because they were not men, and yet other men were excluded because they were not free and were *subjugated to the free and democratic men in order to serve as their slaves*. This was a society where the overwhelming majority or some 85% of the inhabitants were excluded from political power by the most cruel and inhuman actions, and therefore we should ask ourselves what kind of democracy there possibly could be under such conditions! And in fact we see that there was no democracy in Athens, there was no authoritarian self-rule of one despot, a dictator or a king, but there was a non-democratic rule of few privileged men. So we shall note that after all ‘democracy’ has not been passed down to us from the ancient Greeks, and that in fact what we have from them is nothing more than this beautiful word democracy, a word like any word which can be filled with any content

as long as the content is backed by authority. We see that even in the very heart of what is today thought of as the cradle of democracy lies this fiction. While the Athenian political system certainly had some laudable features of an advanced representative government it would not stand to any comparison with a majority of the governments in today’s world. And what this also means is that we should be a bit more skeptical when interpreting past and remote traditions; we can look at the Athenian democracy as a historic curiosity, but not a model for democracy. We may give credence to the achievements of the ancient Athenians when we consider their traditions against the background of the given circumstances. And it is precisely these ‘given circumstances’ that we should always keep in mind when assessing the traditions of another country, another culture, keep in mind that theirs is different from ours, and ours different from theirs, that we may frown at the habits of others, but also that the others may frown at us, and that sooner or later our descendants will wonder how primitive we were in our social practices. We have not reached perfection, and we are not even anywhere close to it. Clearly some systems are better than others, clearly some people have more advanced social practices (in certain aspects of life), but all the achievements should be held to measure against the competitive circumstances of a given country, how far the country has progressed in relative prosperity, economic strength, security from external enemies,

de-monopolization of the economic power, decriminalization, the development of the judiciary, the development of responsible, non-corrupt, and professional journalists (not to mention non-corrupt and freedom loving owners of media corporations), political traditions, etc.

### **Athens was not a historic exception**

The Greek system comes down to our times as ‘the birth of democracy’ mainly due to the rich literary traditions which have enabled to keep the ancient Greek culture as a direct part of the Western cultural heritage, and not least by the influence of the Roman Empire and the Catholic Church, and later by the universities and then the European secondary school system. – In a more balanced world the influence of the Greek culture would have merited a fraction of what it has been assigned through the Academy and the authoritarian institutions of Europe, and instead our teachers and historians should have drawn from the histories of various European nations, not to mention from the great civilizations of the world.

Through history many other peoples of the world have governed their societies by means of common decision making and equal rights. For example in the Nordic and Germanic societies, there were governing assemblies for solving disputes and making political decisions, the so-called thing or *ting*. The ting was the assembly of the free men of a country (representing hundred households). The tings formed in essence a network where the local tings were represented at the ting for a larger area, a province or land. At the ting, disputes were solved and political decisions were made. The tings met at regular intervals, legislated and elected the leaders (chieftains, kings). The tings

were also courts that judged according to the laws passed on in the oral traditions of the society in systems displaying the same social stability that the Anglo-Saxon scholars call rule-of-law. – In Kievan Russia, before the Mongol invasion, all cities had a democratic town assembly, called the *veche*. All free male citizens took part in the veche that met to discuss and decide on the most important matters of the city, such as matters of war and peace, law, appointment or expulsion of rulers.

World history abound of evidence of various forms of democratic rule, which seems to have been the historic norm; anthropologists have furnished us yet with a multitude of other examples showing that most cultures have aspired towards and developed political systems of common decision making which should be regarded as democratic (at least by the same standards by which the Athenian system is measured).

Yet even today we do not know what ‘democracy’ should in fact mean; ‘democracy’ is like so many of our cherished mental images, - these ideas in the mind we think of as ‘things’ and nourish in our hearts - , perceptions we care for by mentally wiping and polishing them as e.g. by sprinkling the conception of democracy once in a while with a little bit of Athens and a little bit of Montesquieu; perceptions kept in high esteem and fiercely defended, while in fact being totally ignorant to the substance, to

the real essence of the perception or concept, not seeing that all we have are words which in reality like hallucinations take shape in the mind only to be filled with content consisting of our most sacred moral and patriotic prejudice . – It is only in the mind that the concept democracy is converted into a picture of that pompous building on the Capitol Hill, or the Big Ben, the Clock Tower at Westminster, London, or prime minister Tony Blair smilingly, next to his joyful wife Cherie, looking out from the door opening at Downing Street 10...Contemporary understanding of democracy has not advanced much past these mental images so much reminding of the stickers depicting the beloved fairy-tale characters that little girls collect and trade, just like scholars exchange their views on Montesquieu, or Mr. Barroso contemplating the mental image of democracy, which he thinks is a thing, kind of a ball that the European diplomats toss from one to another, and want to export to and impose on people they consider less fortunate, and people who they considered endowed with a lesser capacity to gain the deep insight they consider themselves having reached.

## **The European traditions of democracy are of more recent origin than Mr. Barroso's grandmother**

And how old are the European democratic traditions? Very few come to think how recent, in fact, phenomena the European democracies of today are; people talk about 'European democracy' as if it would have been around forever, at least since, Plato and Aristotle, while it is not older than the grandmother of Mr. Barroso. Anything resembling the standards that people place on a democratic rule (in the meaning free and equal vote) has come about only with the turn of the 20th century. The extension of the right to vote to all citizens – which we have to regard as the real test for a true representative democracy – is even more recent: Australia 1901, Finland 1906, Norway 1913, Germany 1918, UK 1918 (or perhaps 1928), Sweden 1921, France 1948, Greece 1952. This is to mention but a few examples. Consider the years of fascism and wars which for decades interrupted the democratic process and you should really be able to appreciate what a young phenomenon we are talking about. – And then against this background it is amusing to here the European herd, at the European Parliament (which is not a mere talking shop) and other gatherings of supreme political intelligence tell how “Russians have never learnt democracy, they always have had a need for a strong hand...” – as if a few decades of democratic

experience (trial and error) would make a difference in the historical perspective. And while on that they forget, that even during the years of Marxism Russia was much more advanced than any of them – that is, based on their own values – not mine. In 1917 Russia had chosen to implement the hottest thing, the most advanced social model, recommended by the majority of scientist in the European Universities, Marxism, which even today the majority of the contemporary eurodeputies admire as an ideal utopian social model. – I propose that the eurodeputies should just calm down, look at the facts, work hard to turn the EU back to the democratic orbit, and rest assured that Russians can take care of their own commonwealth; implement the choice the Russian people made in 1991 on their own free will, without any outside help nor interference.

## This is Democratic Competition

In this essay I discuss democratic competition, the ideas whereby I want to demonstrate that democracy in reality is a part of the great human enterprise of living together, part of the eternal quest to avoid pain and reach out for pleasure, social practices formed in the competition of arguments. Democracy is a certain grand political perception on all the aspects of social practices pertaining to the joint quest for pleasure, which is a road lined by pain.

We return to Merriam-Webster's definition of democracy: "a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections" This is a definition of 'representative democracy', the question on who gets to rule the 'official governing bodies'. – My fundamental aim is to help to bring about the apprehension that this is only one side of the coin, or one side of the Rubik's Cube; one side of the mental puzzle. – Already this first issue is immensely difficult, and covers such spheres as: 'what are fair elections?', 'is there equal access for all to be candidates?'; 'the role of the governing bodies', 'majority vs. minority'. – 'Majority and 'Minority' are more of those metaphysical entities; people seem to think that there could be an entity called 'Majority' and another entity called 'Minority',

and the one entity Majority would consist of people sharing the same opinions and values on each and every issue, and the Minority, correspondingly, would consist of a smaller amount of people, but equally unison in opposing all the same ideas that the Majority support. – But in reality there are no such Majorities and Minorities, only millions of people that continuously hold millions of opinions on all aspects of life, and all these millions of opinions are in infinite variances directed towards millions of preferences which lay behind all their choices. You can find majorities or minorities only on one or another issue, and even so only for the very moment a question is asked – at the longest.

Democracy is not just about voting, and nominations, democracy is about everyday life, of taking care of the common and particular issues, each day. - The Marxists and socialists traditionally argued that the systems of electoral democracies (which they termed 'liberal or bourgeois democracies') were integral parts of the capitalist class-based systems and that they therefore were not, and could not be, fully democratic or participatory. They claimed that in the "bourgeois democracies" only the most financially powerful people would hold political power. – This criticism is not totally misplaced, and although I will not in this essay deal with the problems of those times, the alternatives and the outcomes, it should be noted that these bourgeois democracies and their adherents have been proven right in relation to the

socialists. However somehow the socialist critic has to be considered and understood in order to form a comprehensive conception of democratic competition. This is like one of the situations that Proust described in the Search saying that “certain comparisons which are false if we start from these as premises may well be true if we arrive at them as conclusions.”<sup>1</sup>

In this connection we do better to leave the European Union outside the discussion altogether, simply because it does not qualify as a democracy to start with. The EU is a confederation of states, ruled by diplomatic conventions, more or less transparently (less, to my opinion). The aim of the EU is to recreate a powerful economic-military Empire in Europe in the spirit of the Holy Roman Empire. The problem the European politicians face is to create a façade of democratic legitimacy for the Empire. The draft constitution for the Empire shows that there cannot be even talk about any democracy in the EU, because any sensible person will understand that constitutions are documents governing the relations between people, but the European Constitution is drafted to govern relations between metaphysical entities called states. States cannot be the participants of constitutions; it is the other way around: people’s constitutions create the states. In an attempt to

deliberate fraud, to give an aura of democracy, mentions of real humans have been scattered here and there in the draft constitution, as if to decorate a room with flower arrangements or pepper a meal for added flavor (pepper the people to be swallowed). – The EU can possibly not become a state ruled by democratic elections and procedures, but it seems that for the key architects of the new Empire it is not even intended to be so; instead I think that that the EU is designed by those who nourish the ideology of one-world-government, a world ruled by the global elite. We can see, or, in fact, we are prevented from seeing - we can guess – we should find out - which are the interest groups that influence the EU decision making; who are those behind this all. – Though, one thing is loud and clear: his master’s voice comes from the Financial Times of London.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Search of Lost Time, Time Regained p. 305

## Competitive Justice

A real democratic system integrates competitive justice in the concept of democracy, in the democratic competition. – Competitive justice is the notion of law as a competition of arguments, where the competition of arguments takes place in all spheres of human life every day.

When a society is not sufficiently competitively democratic and free, and when all the other competitive constituents in society do not function properly then the outcome of justice is unsatisfactory (which is the situation more or less all over the world – any perception of superior justice in the West is purely owing to comparisons with places where it is worse). Only individual human beings can lay a claim on justice (but just people in a just society will have to guarantee a just treatment to all other animals as well).

Whatever is called law deals with the normative expressions and interpretations which interact in producing justice. A comparison of law and justice with medicine and health could be illustrative. Now, I argue that law should be about promoting justice, in the same way as medicine should be about promoting health. Hereby I stress that the prevalent theories of law (the fallacious theories which I criticize) - and especially the Anglo-American theories which are

overly focused on the precedents of the supreme courts - can be compared with an idea whereby we would think that health is produced (exclusively) on the surgeons operating desk (law in a supreme court, health on the operating desk). Instead I stress that competitive justice is a continuous process going on in all aspects of life, all the time, between all people. In law proper the two most important constituents of competitive justice are the competition between normative arguments in a court (of all levels) and between normative arguments in politics; the latter resulting in strong normative arguments called statutes (or laws). Both these particular competitive processes function far from perfectly. The main obstacles for grasping the true nature of law and justice and which hold up the free normative competition of arguments have to do with the fact that there is so miserably little understanding for the fact that law is nothing except a competition of arguments manifested in social practices, and with the corresponding mental fallacy to adhere to the prevailing primitive anthropomorphic conception of law (the idea to linguistically and mentally treat law and the provision of law as thingly entities, to which misconception they have been catapulted by way of their grammatical position as nouns forming a class of words that are combined with determiners to serve as the subject, the doer of an action, an agent).

The courts and the 'lawmaker' (parliaments and other

‘sovereigns’) are in a constant competition about the right to issue strong normative arguments (or ‘make laws’ as they say). In the United States this is admitted in legal theory and in practice, while in Europe they want to pretend that this is not the case. This very competition between courts and ‘lawmakers’ is the basis for a well-functioning society and this is the state of affairs any society should aim for. – An honest recognition of this would advance the cause of justice

There is no real separation of powers in the systems of European parliamentarism. – In Europe the legislative and executive branch are in fact one and the same, while in the United States, on the contrary, these branches are separated: The President is elected by the people and the government is appointed by the President. – The European brand of parliamentarism leads to a situation which could be called if not monopoly then at least ‘abuse of dominant market position’, and hence it is a distortion of justice – and a challenge to the fundamental conditions of life, a challenge to life itself. – To advance democracy in Europe the thrust in the democratic process has to be on breaking up the EU power monopoly and restore democratic competition.

More important than the division between the executive and the legislative is the separation of powers between the legislative and the judiciary. The

normative squeeze caused by the non-competitiveness of parliamentary democracy can be broken only by guaranteeing a truly independent judiciary. The judiciary should be independent to challenge any strong normative arguments issued by the parliament (so-called ‘laws’ or ‘statutes’) – the fact of the matter is that in many countries even the positive law recognizes this right on the level of constitutions (but the judges are not brave enough to oppose the parliament and render themselves into the service of justice). In the United States the judiciary and the legislator are placed in an open competition.

The true solution is to make the judiciary in reality independent and receiving its mandate from the people, but without any direct elections of the individual judges. A solution of the dilemma between the democratic control and the independency of the judiciary could be accomplished by instituting an elected public judiciary chamber which would not be subordinated to any other authority than the people.

## Laissez-laissez-faire

In my view a communist state is an extreme form of monopoly capitalism; it is capitalism where all the capital is concentrated formally in the ownership of the people, but de facto in the hands of a small circle of leading elite. Correspondingly the idea of unlimited monopolistic capitalism is very close to the idea of a communistic state capitalism. Both should be rejected. And to bring order in the perceptions I propose to replace the term ‘capitalism’ with ‘market economy’ whenever we have in mind the system of non-monopolistic democratic market economy. ‘Capitalism’ is better reserved to serve as a derogatory word denoting an unwanted and baneful system which is contrary to the interests of a democratic people.

A free liberal economy used to be marked as laissez-faire until the term was converted to a pejorative word for describing something termed as “unrestrained capitalism”, yet later the adherents of socialist planned economies stamped with laissez-faire just any system of free economic activity, and so successful were they in this that today there is almost nobody left to dare to stand up for the idea of laissez-faire, which after all is just a description of the fundamental economic reality, and not only, because it is a fundamental description of all social practices.

Laissez-faire means ‘let them do’, and I take it to decipher as ‘give the people all the freedom to conduct their businesses as they deem it best done’, or “Stay out! Don’t interfere in people’s choices, and all will turn to the best”. And naturally, this freedom is the basis of the economy - as freedom is the basis for all human activity. Criticizing the idea of laissez-faire, people forget that the economy does not happen in a vacuum, it is a part of all other social activities such as law and politics, which practices in themselves impose restrictions on the economy, and therefore the economy as such is certainly not in need of any additional restrictions. – A mindful reader will note that in the preceding discussion I am trapped in the difficulties imposed by the language of things; I am forced to use the thingly grammar, the thingly terminology, to point out from the one side differences and the other side interrelations between ‘law’, ‘politics’ and ‘economy’, but all the same we should keep in mind that they are no different ‘things’ to start with, but only perceptions on the same social practices considered from different points of view. This in mind, nevertheless, we should in policy, in thinking, in theory, keep in mind that ‘economy’ is the perception of the ‘well-functioning machine’ and we should ensure that this machine keeps running smoothly and not shove spokes in the wheels of the economy any more than the economy is already burdened with all the considerations that stem from law, politics and environmental concerns. - The critics

do not understand that the problems in the economic sphere, and society at large, were quite different at the time when the ideas labeled 'laissez-faire' first emerged, and problems of later make have unduly been mixed up and confused with the original idea of laissez-faire, the idea of freedom.

On the contrary it is freedom that is at peril, economic freedom should not be restricted but enhanced. But economic freedom like all other manifestations of freedom means an active struggle for the conditions of freedom, and conditions of freedom are conditions of equal opportunity. In the economy this means that all have to have an equal opportunity to conduct business in a non-monopolistic environment; therefore in the economy free competition means a fight against monopolies and all those who abuse their dominant market position. Today the danger and the challenge is more than ever the increasing monopolization of all spheres of economic activity. For a free economy, and for free people, it is imperative to realize this threat and to actively oppose it. Therefore I would like to rename the concept capturing the idea of economic freedom under a new label 'laissez-laissez-faire' (with a double 'laissez'), where the additional 'laissez' points to the idea of an active and constant opposition to all abuse of dominant market position and monopolies in order to ensure that there would constantly be opportunities for a democratically equal competition

in the economy. The term would then mean: 'Make sure everyone can compete on equal terms'.

## Private Property and State Ownership

Time after time considering what are the most fundamental features of our social practices be it art, morality, law or whatever I find that at the end of the thoughts I have returned to the idea of competition. Whatever way we look at social life, whatever way we turn the aspects around we are always left with the idea that competition is the common denominator for all social practices (where we detect stagnation there the common denominator is lack of competition). I am convinced that all development (or change if we prefer a word with less positive connotation) comes about exclusively through competition - whether we want it or not. – The idea of competition is also the fundamental underlying reason which led me to postulate the philosophy of social practices: there is no other knowledge than the kind of knowledge that is reflected in social practices as a result of what people do; nobody has access to any superior knowledge over other people to any extent that would make a difference on a global scale. Knowledge, or what is thought of as knowledge, is exclusively a product of competition, and then all social practices are manifestations of social competition. A well-organized society is one where the social practices have developed and reached an air of dynamic stability – stability, for predictability and consistency – and dynamic for gradual, piecemeal change. A well-organized society is not a society in

which mathematical precision has been applied to draw geometrical models of subordination, rather a well-organized society is one where the conditions for competition have been successfully advanced in all spheres of life, where infinite variances have through the processes of competition been tuned in to relative *synchrony* – while the ultimate goal of a free competition of arguments and the ultimate reality could well be a perfect *harmony*.

Given these considerations I propose to update the notion of classical liberalism with the inclusion of new perspectives on how to view two of the most decisive aspects of the idea: one aspect is in regards to the treatment of private property; and the second aspect is about the treatment of economic monopolies.

Classical liberalism has given root to a religious-like belief in the idea that all property has to be in private ownership, while at the same time ignoring the need to stand up and fight against the pernicious influence of monopolies. Rejecting, as always, any sort of fixed ideas that are not supported by material considerations, I contrary to the classical idea, advocate a preference for private property, but approve of common ownership of strategically important resources or businesses. We all agree that it is normal that property can be in the joint ownership of two persons, and that it can be in the hands of 5

people, or 10, or 100 or thousands of owners and so on. But, if we accept common ownership by thousands of people, then I do not see any reason that we should not accept common ownership by all the people in a country; and no reason that we should reject the idea that the state, as a beneficiary for the people, would enter in the role of the owner of the common assets (which could well be compared with any other form of juridical trust arrangements). For example the national wealth in form of a country's energy and other natural resources may well best be put to serve the interests of all the people if they are owned by the people through the intermediary of state companies.

State ownership of strategic resources does not pose any kind of threat to the economy and social system of a society. State ownership is bad for the economy when the state is a big owner which would suffocate other economic activity, or when state's ownership would unduly extend to none-strategic areas of the economy, and when the 'strategic areas' are defined too broadly, or when the state is not sufficiently democratic leading to inadequate and non-transparent control of the management of the assets. On the contrary, given the necessary circumstances, state involvement in the ownership of productive assets to a certain degree may be altogether beneficial, for example we may take the case of state ownership of strategic natural resources and strategically important

capital intensive businesses which are beneficial for the creation of an overall competitive market economy with low taxes (a trend experienced in e.g. contemporary Russia). Whether to choose state ownership or not should not be based on any fettered and old fixed ideas but rather a choice based upon consideration of each particular case on its merits and its effects on the common good and the fundamental conditions of competition on all levels of society.

I stress that to my view monopolies, in most cases, are anomalies which have to be counteracted, but I also recognize that sometimes there are situations when monopolies may serve a beneficial function, this for example when there is no choice but to settle with a natural monopoly. In those cases where there is no alternative to a monopoly, then it is clear that a state run monopoly is preferable to a privately held monopoly - it is far more preferable that the people jointly through a state company enter the role of the owner than accepting that a few individuals amass vast influence over society as a owners of monopoly corporations.

## The State and Civil Society

Some adherents of classical liberalism have historically been skeptical to real democracy and viewed it as a collectivist ideal, concerned with empowering the masses in the form of the state, whereas the liberalists themselves have been concerned with limiting the power of the state over the individual. With the idea of democratic competition this dilemma is eliminated; when we understand that democracy is not a thing, and that democracy is about the infinite power relations between all people in society, a constant competition – and in the ideal a free competition - then we understand that there cannot as such be any conflict of interest between the individual and the state, for the individual is for real, and the state is merely a metaphysical concept, designed to delimit and juridically arrange certain aspects of life of a large group of people. In a system of a competitive democracy the state is simply the normal legal environment for taking care of the common matters, and the individual participates in all aspects of the common matters to the extent of his interests in the democratic competition.

Today it is fashionable to speak about civil society, and the discussion seems to presuppose an antagonism between a state and civil society. This mere controversy shows how traditional democracy has become institutionalized, and how the democratic

process is increasingly distanced from the citizens. Simultaneously the political parties have come to look like mere electoral corporations, campaign machines, interested only in gaining a market share of the electorate leaving behind the real issues of the citizens. In democratic competition there is not this clash between these two perceptions, the state is simply the highest form in which civil society is manifested, and within the democratic competition citizen partake in various democratic activities including those that the ossified institutionalized democracies have been compelled to eject as something alien to their democratic theater and relegated to the role of ‘civil society’.

We now see that traditionally ‘democracy’ has been exclusively associated with elections, representations, assemblies etc. These are for sure part of democracy, but they are but surface aspects of contemporary democracy. At the final analysis democracy can only be about an equal-rights-equal-opportunity rule of the people, and hereby the actual form of the government and procedures for democratic participation may vary greatly between nations. At the end of the day a democracy is such a society where all have an equal voice, and everybody’s voice is, in reality, taken into consideration. – And here comes the problem: how to make sure that everybody’s voice is indeed given equal weight? – Experience has shown that attempts to resolve the

problems simply by calling people periodically to the ballot boxes without simultaneously making sure that all the conditions for a democratic competition is in place are not viable; what happens at the ballot box makes sense only when all are equal participants in the democratic process. – Today democracy is not anymore, unfortunately, a question of how a nation organizes decision making in their commonwealth, rather today ‘democracy’ is often used like a Trojan horse, where nontransparent forces try to sneak in to state power taking advantage of the underdeveloped traditions and weaknesses of a nation. - Hitler’s road to power as Chancellor of Germany was precisely a ride within a Trojan horse of propaganda and manipulation. – The misfortune of Russia is that the enemies of open society (sometimes even in a double fake calling themselves “The Open Society”) are constantly mounting such Trojan horses against this young democracy, taking advances of all the difficulties the Russians have had with creating prosperity, justice and stability on a vacuum that opened up after the fall of the Soviet Union. There are many of those dark forces – including foreign powers - that using the weakness of the young society want to overtake the country in the disguise of one or another of these Trojan horses named in allusion to the fancy verbiage of democracy.

I understand that the recent doctrine of sovereign democracy developed around the current leadership

of Russia acknowledges this fact, the danger of the young democracy being manipulated by the enemies of open society. Therefore I am, naturally, in sympathy with this tenet. In my understanding with the ideas of sovereign democracy the aim is in a Russian context to address the same kind of threats that challenge the free democratic competition world over.

## The enemies of open society and democratic competition

The democratic ideal is that each voice counts, equally, every day. This is the ideal, but not the reality. In reality people are restricted in their democratic freedoms by the predatory forces of cartels and monopolies, all kinds of abnormalities of the social market place, all kinds of abuse of dominant position in society. We understand the terminology of market distractions from the economy, and it is widely accepted that monopoly power will have to be restricted for the economic markets to function properly, but this same kind of thinking has to be broadened to encompass all social practices. Thus we have to understand the importance of reining in on all kinds of illegal and unfair social practices, conspiracies, unhealthy concentration of mass media, monopoly parliamentarism, historically established dominance of any few parties, all ideologies and predatory acts designed to reduce the competitive vigor of democratic competition. We need anti-trust thinking in all spheres of life: in politics, religion, science, media and so on. – In politics the aim should be to remove all obstacles for achieving a free democratic competition with complete equality on the level of each individual, thus, for example, an owner of dominant media should be stripped of his power so as to match that of any citizen. In Europe it will be especially important to enact anti-parliamentarism

measures to fight this perversion of democracy.

All these market distractions are the manifestations of the enemies of a free and open society, enemies of democratic competition. To give an idea what is meant I list a few of these crucial challenges:

1. Economic monopolies
2. Political monopolies
3. Abuse of media; unfair journalism and monopolistic concentration of media in hands of few; abuse of freedom of speech ('the license to lie')
4. Propaganda - the archenemy of open society – produced by the monopolistic media and various dark forces, specialist propaganda organizations
5. Dominance of ideology
6. Dominance of religion
7. Poverty
8. Poor level of education

In the United States there is in principle a well-designed constitution providing for the legal framework for competitive electoral process. In Expressions and Interpretations I discussed the advantages of that system. However, there are other problems with the electoral processes; the constitution provides for the formal framework for democratic competition, but the participants in the process would also have to be competitive, and that is not the case in the United States of today. Today

the competitive system set forth in the constitution is being undermined by the social evil of monopoly; in this case the monopoly to power that the two national parties, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, have carved out for them. As a result of the monopolistic position these parties hold they do not anymore represent the genuine democratic will of the people and should rather be seen as some kind of political marketing corporations which have been fully taken over by career politicians who function like corporate executives, while many of the leading politicians are promoted to high offices in a hereditary line of succession, like it is the case e.g. with the Bush clan; congressmen and senators function like lobbyists selling their services for money (similarly to the profession which I do not regard as the oldest one), while the propaganda machines and their media keep the two in power under all conditions. While these parties had a beneficial role in the early stages of American democracy they now de facto constrain the free choice of the electorate having become some kind of institutionalized conspiracies in restraint of a true and free democracy. Therefore it seems to me, that in order to save the American democracy (with its important repercussion to the whole world) and to protect society – and the world - from unfair social and electoral practices competition should be returned to the American political process, and this should be done applying means similar to those with which corporations enjoying a business

monopoly can be broken up and disbanded as illegal monopolies; applicable to these parties one could say that they should be disbanded as organizations – or conspiracies – restricting the free democratic choice of the people and hindering fair political decision making. For when two parties for over a century wield such exuberant dominance over the voter then this is the very same predatory oligopoly, which we may subsume under the broader category of terminal social ill: monopoly. Societies are in dire need of such antitrust laws directed against parties holding a monopoly power in order to guarantee fair play in politics and a level field for democratic competition; only by these means would there be a chance for all competing opinions, for all people, to take part in the democratic process on equal terms.

Problems of monopoly and other forms of abuse of dominant market position are especially crucial in regards to the mass-media. The media is the new superstructure of today's world, and it is my conviction that the concentration of media ownership into fewer and fewer hands is the biggest threat to democracy world-wide and thus the biggest threat to humanity and mankind itself. The problem is most pressing in regards to the Anglo-American media groups with global reach, the ownership of which has been concentrated in very few hands (with only a handful of dominant media corporations holding sway over most of the Western countries). These corporations

have established a de facto control – I would even say censorship - on Western thinking. With seemingly unrestricted propaganda manipulation the media has seized control over the democratic process in most of Europe and North America. – And it seems that these media groups have converted the idea of freedom of speech into a *license to lie*.

Most people will agree that freedom of speech is a crucial component for creating the conditions for competition, which competition is the essential prerequisite for democracy. But, as always is the case with these sacred code words, nobody bothers to consider what freedom of speech in essence is; nobody asks what kind of prerequisites should be in place (what are the necessary conditions) to enable in practice the phenomena that we call freedom of speech? Therefore I propose to give it a thought, consider that for freedom of speech, like for any human freedom, there has to be a real possibility to exercise this freedom: freedom of speech is like freedom of thought, everybody is free to think, and at the end of the day, surely nobody can *restrict the thinking as such* (although, of course, free thinking can be, and continuously is being restricted by, among others, this very same media; all information is in itself a restriction, all information is tainted; and language itself is tainted by past misinformation, past misconceptions. In fact this book and Expressions and Interpretations deal with this very problem, this

most fundamental problem of life. And also I have to note that I surely understand that there are forces that subject men and women to various degrees of specific, personal, brainwashing which certainly restricts free thinking. In this connection I referred to the more ordinary cases of thinking and how it as such can barely be restricted); but all this I say because the point is not the restriction on speaking and thinking but the point is to have a real venue to speak, a real possibility to voice one's thoughts. Freedom of speech has to mean that each person is given a real possibility to voice his opinions in public. And this is not the case in the world today, and this is not the case in the Western World either due to the problem with media concentration, the problem I call monopolization of media. For it is so that efficiently the few media corporations that control Western media also control Western speech; it is utterly difficult to come through with any dissenting opinions, while at the same time the Western media has gone over from a mere aim to report and disseminate information to creating opinions and manipulating thought through continuous propaganda efforts. – For freedom of speech to be relevant there has to be two sides to it, both absence of any kind of actively enforced restrictions to speak out; most people do not have any problems with understanding this much, but they fail to see the equal need for the corresponding access to a forum where to speak. With this kind of understanding, or

rather misunderstanding, in regards to the nature of freedom of speech, the notion has been converted into a kind of a slogan for the consolidation of media ownership into the hands of fewer and fewer corporations, with a stronger and stronger market position (the license to lie). – Real freedom of speech would mean that there truly is an access to speak, a true possibility to voice one's opinions, to make competing opinions known, and for this to become reality what we need is a competitive and pluralistic media where journalists are constantly on the watch for competing opinions to challenge the purported truths. At the final analysis *freedom of speech, like everything else, is a competition of arguments*. Therefore the very first criterion for freedom of speech is that no media outlet has a dominant position at any location and in any language. Today the situation is, however, far from the ideal in most parts of the world, and certainly much worse than it used to be a hundred years ago when market entry for new press was relatively easy and no one corporation enjoyed dominance over the readers. Today on the contrary in the Western world where they brave themselves as the “free press zone” there is a veritable monopoly or at best an oligopoly in every geographical location, in every language area and in every major city with only one or a few dominant outlets, and thus these dominant outlets have been able to establish themselves as the speech police.

Television is still the dominant means for opinion making, therefore it is especially important to keep television free from the corrupting influence of monopolies; on the other hand television – notwithstanding all the technical possibilities – is by nature such that on any given area the choice cannot be but restricted to one or two, at best three main choices of broadcasters; hence television always tends to form a natural monopoly. With natural monopolies we are bound to choose if we will give over the control to a private monopolist or give the control to the collective monopolist of the people represented by a state corporation under appropriate public control, and again given the choice it is far more preferable that the television remains in public control. – We should not reject state ownership, but concern ourselves with developing democratic means of ensuring that pluralism is guaranteed; among such guarantees I would see processes of diversified and rotating executive control of the broadcaster and – especially important to stress - control independent of any parliamentary majority.

## Democratic traditions

Democracy needs to be understood as a competition of arguments, opinions, and it needs to be understood that the competition to qualify as democratic has to take place on equal terms between equal people, that it is a competition free from any influence of monopolies and abuse of privileged or dominant market position. Free democratic competition needs to be supported by a competitive social environment, competitive social practices in all aspects of life, such which offer basic economic prosperity in order to guarantee genuine possibilities to participate in the democratic competition as informed citizen.

Notwithstanding all what has been said above regarding the necessary elements and conditions for democracy there is one even more fundamental and crucial constituent of democracy: that is time. – At the end of the analysis, after all the claims to what democracy is or what it is not we return to the most fundamental insight of philosophy, of social science, that democracy – like all perceptions – is but a name that we have assigned to certain social practices, these are the social practices we look upon from point of view of power and in so doing we shall keep in mind the ideal of equality between all people, and that all equal people shall have a right, and not only a right, but a real opportunity to affect the power relations on equal terms.

Today we are fortunate to live in a world where the principle of equality is widely avowed, although rarely upheld in practice. It seems as if people take equality to be a question of emotions, a matter of taste. I have a need to repudiate those emotional considerations and instead bluntly state that *equality is a biological fact*. The proof for equality is in the facts of the human biology, the fact that each human being is a biological being, each born through the same biological circumstances, a product of the same biological evolution, with the same biological and physical needs, and subject to the same process of withering way – and the same needs to fight this withering, to stay alive – and each condemned to lose the fight and die. Each person has an equal right to go through this process of life, to make it as happy as he can, and to face his death sentence not through another man. – This is all the evidence we need for equality and thus for democracy.

Social practices are manifestations of historic processes, the result of historic development, results of time; and good social practices, the ones we – or an informed posteriority - should find laudable are the traditions that come about through peaceful, piecemeal development in a stabile society open to foreign influence on terms of mutual respect and free of any sort of manipulations. And so only with the passing of time will the social practices that we term democratic traditions come about, these are

the results of unrestrained democratic competition tending in the right direction (I speak about ‘direction’ not of the present balance, for we have to keep in mind that democracy, like all in life, can be judged only in relative terms, in this case as a comparison between past traditions, the present conditions of life in society, and the trends in social development).

The experience we have from the former Soviet bloc countries shows that it is very difficult to cast democracy on a vacuum, that lack of democratic traditions leads to a kind of political lottery. Without traditions and a history of democracy the voter is prevented from making a balanced choice, for meaning – a meaning that will serve as the base for a political choice - can not be deduced from separate incidents, but only from a web of experience. Therefore the merits of each candidate and each party can only be considered against the background of what the political system on a whole has historically performed; what the separate parties have previously performed; what the individual candidates have previously performed; what are the real possibilities of the country at a given stage of development etc. Only against this accumulated experience will it be possible to weigh the potential of a particular political candidate or political program. – It is also a question of the voter to understand what, in general, are the possibilities of a new parliament or a new government to affect life in society. In a mature democracy there

is a historic tacit understanding of the underlying circumstances. In a new democracy, however, there are no traditions to guide the voter who is much more likely to cast his vote out of frustration, and without a consideration as to the fundamental circumstances affecting his choices, or to those restricting the range of political action; he is likely to vote in protest to the current leadership, whatever it be – protest for the sake of protest, leading to a kind of rollercoaster democracy which has been a striking feature of all Eastern European countries in transition.

The role of political parties is crucial – in good and bad – for the political system of Western countries; there the parties have gradually evolved to become the backbone of the system; historical allegiances to parties resemble much of the allegiances to a religious fate; this feature is to a large extent a problem (hindering discussions on merits, leading to abuse of dominant market position etc), but it is also these very features that that bring stability to Western democracies as a big portion of the electorate under all conditions support the status quo by voting for the party of traditional choice, and swing-voters by their choices merely affect the direction of the democratic process within the established political scene. In Russia this feature of Western democracies is lacking, and it cannot be but lacking, for want it or not there was only one party in Soviet Russia, the Communist Party. So therefore it is essential for Russia to find

other means of providing for the most important features of Western democracies, the stability that historic party adherence brings about. – I need to remind the reader, that it was a quite rough, and bloody, ride that process under which during two hundred years the party system was developed in the West. Russia is engaged in an interesting project to create a stabile democracy in a short time avoiding the same bloody mistakes that Europe and the United States have gone through.

The lack of democratic traditions makes a society and its electorate especially vulnerable to direct assaults by those who want to manipulate an innocent society by taking advantage of the yet undeveloped traditions. These forces operating through pressure groups and propagandists function like pedophiles who are attempting to seduce a young society by showering the victims with attention, gifts and grants, taunting them with democratic rhetoric, after which the propagandists like the pedophiles put their manipulative skills to work unleashing them on societies they deem troubled. First they try to gain the confidence of the weakest in these societies approaching them as friends, then identifying a few chosen ringleaders, whose self esteem they set to build up, and who like the pawns of chess are led to believe that they can with the help of the propaganda candy man checkmate a whole society, and thus having won their trust these pawns turn themselves into willing

accomplices for the social pedophiles preparing the assault on the commonwealth. They proceed with a strategy of media dominance and deceitful rhetoric by which they try to bring society to submission; finally when the society is unconscious of anything but the propaganda message the predator gets a stranglehold of society, strikes, and brutally tries to rape the young victim, politically, economically, violently. – For any society to have a future it must protect itself against the mental violence called propaganda (and it is only a matter of time when this mental violence is turned in to physical violence; and, in fact, the difference itself between mental and physical violence is but a matter of degree, or perhaps they are aspects of the same). And hence a society has to protect itself against the violence of propaganda similarly as a man protects himself and his family against any form of violence. Society has to protect itself no matter from where the propaganda assaults are launched: a domestic media oligarchy; specialist propaganda groups (often in disguise of charitable and lofty causes); undercover lobbyists; foreign intelligence services, international media monopolies etc.

## This is the third way!

Democratic competition is the famous third way. But it is not the road they used to be looking for left from the center, rather, a combination of all the paths that people will take in a peaceful and non-monopolistic society, with perfect competition that equals co-operation, and where the individual is the king, each individual simultaneously.

## References:

Carter, W.C. (2000). Marcel Proust: a life. Yale University Press. (Carter 2000)

Eidinow, J., Edmonds, D. (2005). Wittgenstein's Poker. Faber and Faber

Einstein, Albert. (2000). The World As I See It. Citadel Press

Foucault, M. (1990). The History of Sexuality. An Introduction. Volume I. Vintage Books.

Hellevig, J. (2006). Expressions and Interpretations. Our Perceptions in Competition. – A Russian Case. My Universities Press.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. (1966). The Savage Mind. University of Chicago Press.

Monk, Ray. (1991). Ludwig Wittgenstein – The Duty of Genius. Penguin Books.

Popper, K.R. (1977). The Open Society and Its Enemies. Volume I, The Spell of Plato, Fifth edition revised 1977, Princeton University Press.

Proust, M. (2003). In Search of Lost Time Vol. VI: Time Regained. Modern Library

Proust, M. On Art and Literature. Carroll & Graf

Selden, R. edit.(1990). *Theory of Criticism*. Longman Group UK Limited.

Wittgenstein, L. (1965). *The Blue and Brown Books*. Harper Torchbooks. (“Blue and Brown Books”)

Wittgenstein, L. (1984). *Culture and Value*. Edited by Wright von, G.H. in collaboration with Nyman, H. University of Chicago Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (2004). *Philosophical Investigations*. Edited by Anscombe G.E.M., Anscombe, E., and Rhees. R. Third edition. Blackwell Publishing.

Wittgenstein, L. (2004). *Tractatus-Logico-Philosophicus*. Routledge, London

## Index

A	
Academic	18,29,30,71,84,86,133,188,200,201,223
Academy	19,30,56,70,71,73,174,188,190,201,206,227
Aesthetic	26,80,81,83,84,89,90,93,99,100
Aesthetic aversion	90
Aesthetic beauty	90
Aesthetic disgust	90
Aesthetic feelings	26
Aesthetic pleasure	90
Against Sainte-Beuve	99,34,36
Age of Superstition	56
Ahbez, Eden	5
Alchemy	10,55,57,60,132
All is art	21,35,41,76,77,80,81,188
America	118,146,166,174,189, 215,256
American	147,154,157,159,161,166,189,196,216,236,254,255
Ancient Greece	200
Anglo-Saxon	228
Animals	7,43,44,49,51,58,121,12,236
Anti-monopoly	220

Anti-trust	220,252
Aristotelian	85,86
Aristotle	53,54,84,132,230
Art	84,85,86,89,98,106,130,142, 155,176,188,244
Artist	31,33,35,36,67,80,81,87,91,93, 97,110,111,112,130
Artistic	30,34,76,77,78,84,95,96,112, 154,200
Asia	162
Asian	159
Aspects	8,21,25,27,28,29,37,40,41,46, 62,66,77,81,87,89,98,111,122, 170,187,188,189,200,203,206, 207,208,212,213,217,218,219, 220,224,232,233,237,244,245, 248,249,260,265
Associations	157
Athens	201,222,223,224,227,228
Atomic bombings	215
Auschwitz	56,65
Australia	118,230
Aversion	61, 90,91,99
Axioms	60
<b>B</b>	
Bachelor of Arts	84

Bad	7,10,21,24,26,39,43,90,91,114, 134,167,172,191,194,196,199, 246,263
Barroso, José Manuel Durão	191,195,197,198,210,215,216, 229,230
Beasts	44,174,175
Beautiful	28,84,91,118,156,192,217,224
Beauty	34,67,70,83,86,87,88,89,90,91, 164,166
Behavior	29,30,58,122,138,142,143,192 ,213
Being	25,45,54,64,68,74,76,77,78,80, 81,83,85,88,89,91,94,102,106, 111,114,116,121,122,124,126, 142,150,155,160,172,188,191, 216,223,251,261
Belgium	152
Beliefs	23,43,46,49,50,69,72,110,125, 139,154,156
Beni-Hasen	145
Beslan	65
Big Ben	229
Bill of Rights	201
Binary struggle	24,29,38,89
Biological	7,8,22,24,25,26,27,28,29,39,48, 49,51,53,61,62,77,79,80, 86,89,100,116,119,120,123,124, 134,143,167,169,261
Biological homeostatic system	7
Blair, Tony	229

Body	22,24,28,29,30,31,32,33,49,51, 52,61,72,75,77,78,84,91,115, 158,159,197,203,205,207,208
Boulangers	222
British	74,146,155,222
Bush, George W.	254
Business	74,80,81,120,242,254
<b>C</b>	
Canada	146,151,152,153
Capitalism	140,240
Capitol Hill	229
Catholic	71,227
Catholic Church	71,227
Central Europe	215
Chagall, Marc	38
Chantilly	67
Chardin, Jean-Baptiste-Siméon	93
Chinese	64,156,160,161,162,164,166, 167
Chomsky, Noam	55,124,167
Church	71,74,174,227
Civil Society	248,249
Classical liberalism	245,248

Cognition	18,19,28,39,41,47,48,49,52,66, 79,84,85,86,88,96,101,104,106, 110,111,121,132,133,138, 142,169,172,187,191,238
Commission	175,195
Communicate	43,51,125,126
Communist Party	195,263
Competition	8,37,40,48,54,61,68,70,72,73,76 ,90,106,134,142,143,153,159, 170,173,174,186,189,191,199, 210,211,213,214,216,217,218, 219,220,222,232,234,236,237, 238,239,242,244,245,248,249, 250,251,252,253,254,255,256, 260,262,266
Competition of arguments	54,61,68,70,72,142,143,153,173 ,174,213,216,217,232,236,237, 237,245,258,260
Competitive	8,9,19,143,189,211,217,219,221 ,225,236,237,239,247,248,252, 253,254,258,260
Competitive justice	143,236,237
Concepts	9,11,30,36,98,139,155,190,192
Conceptual reality	36,66,122
Consciousness	38,100,164,165,167
Continuum	79,80,82,90
Corsican	214
Culinary organ	168

<b>D</b>	
Damasio, Antonio	7
Dancing	81,102
Danone	167
Dean, James	159
Definitions	77,223
Deliberate	26,31,35,39,66,68,79,81,82,83, 84,85,96,98,120,156,178,199, 211,235
Democracy	120,121,122,137,155,186,187, 188,189,191,192,193,194,195, 196,198,199,200,201,202,206, 207,210,211,212,213,214,215, 216,217,219,220,222,223, 224,225,228,230,237,234,236, 248,253,260
Democratic competition	186,191,199,210,219,222,232, 236,238,248,252,260,266
Democratic Party	254
Democritus	54
Demokratia	223
Discovery	58,70
Disgust	88,90,91
Doctor	71
Don Quijote	43
Downing Street	229
Dream	25,102,114

Druzhiba	160,166
<b>E</b>	
Eastern Europe	138,215,263
Economics	219
Economist	210
Education	74,177,206,253
Ego	50,69,211
Egypt	145
Egyptians	113
Einstein, Albert	43,66,76,125,179
Elite	55,57,72,167,198,210,235,240
Emotions	7,27,28,32,61,89,100,174, 177,261
Emperor	133,214
Empiric	18
English	40,84,98,118,126
Estonia	221
EU	82,194,231,234,235,238
Eurodeputies	195,215,231
Europe	84,138,160,167,174,179,187, 189,195,197,214,215,216,227, 234,238,252,256,264

European	71,120,121,146,147,152,155,156,167,171,174,175,177,179,189,194,195,196,198,215,216,218,221,223,227,229,230,231,234,238,262
European herd	120,167,174,179,230
European Union	120,155,171,174,194,195,196,221,223,234
Evil	56,69,89,90,91,120,154,179,180,187,194,254
Evolution	27,48,51,61,66,85,89,123,148,149,169,195,196,214,261
Exist	23,35,41,86,97,99,123,124,135,137,168,207
Existence	35,44,70,77,134,155,205
Experience	9,19,23,36,42,44,52,63,66,116,128,188,190,219,231,249,262
Expression	7,21,22,25,26,27,28,31,33,37,38,45,53,59,62,66,68,76,77,78,80,85,88,89,93,100,103,106,110,113,157,158,159,191,196,197
Expressionism	95,96
Expressions and Interpretations	18,21,22,24,30,31,46,49,85,88,90,115,131,134,137,142,188,189,191,206,213,236,253,256
External	22,23,24,25,26,27,31,36,47,49,50,76,80,82,84,91,93,100,170,171,195,196,225
<b>F</b>	
Faculty	24,55
Feeling	7,26,29,37,62,66,76,81,84,89,94,98,109,137,178
Fifth Amendment	201

Financial Times	210,215,235
Finland	151,152,231,230
Finnish Civil War	214
Finnish Ice Hockey Association	145
Finns	152
Foucault, Michel	199,202,203,204,205,206,207,208,209,210
France	167,214,230
Franklin, John	146
Free	40,56,59,77,106,110,141,150,158,171,172,187,210,213,214,217,219,220,222,223,227,228,230,232,236,240,242,245,248,251,252,260
Free competition	171,213,214,219,220,242,245,248
Freedom	68,70,73,111,121,128,132,140,153,170,172,187,188,210,217,226,241,242,252,253,256,257,258
Freedom of choice	140
Freedom of speech	70,121,210,253,256,257,258
Freedom of thought	140,256
French	74,93,118,167,202,214
Freud, Sigmund	25
<b>G</b>	
German	55,153,174,215,227,230,250

Germany	153,174,215,230,250
Glasgow	221,222
Global	65,140,171,198,235,244,255
Global warming	65
God	70,71,72
Good	7,17,21,24,26,38,39,47,55,63,65,79,81,82,89,90,99,101,111,114,117,135,150,173,187,191,197,199,218,223,247,261,263
Grammar	30,42,52,53,57,68,77,116,130,137,159,167,168,241
Grammatical	59,136,237
Greek	53,84,215,223,227
Greek Civil War	215
Grenoble	152
<b>H</b>	
Halifax	146
Haoyu	163
Healers	71
Heart	32,57,101,112,150,164,225
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich	132,204
Hellevig, Jon	17
Hesse, Hermann	104
Hiroshima	56,65,215

Hitler, Adolf	215,250
Hockey	144,145,146,147,148,149,150,151,152,153
Holy Roman Empire	174,196,234
Homo artisticus	24,27,79
Homo creatine	79
Homo europeaus	179
Homo sapiens	27,78
Human	7,17,21,27,78,38,44,51,60,64,68,76,79,83,84,85,87,89,92,109,110,114,115,116,121,124,128,130,134,136,142,156,169,176,188,190,191,208,217,224,236,241,255,261
Human knowledge	18
Hume, David	18
<b>I</b>	
Ice-hockey	144,145
Ideology	176,180,198,209,216,218,235,253
Ignorance	18,41,46,47,56,126,132,134,154,178
IIHF	147
Imagination	19,49,79,98,100
Impression	26,89,93,94,96,103,117,157,165,169,190,197,201
In Search of Lost Time	34,37,87,88,89,92,94,112,133,176,179,190,193,204,234

India	162
Individual	18,21,22,25,31,44,57,73,78,82,85,95,117,120,124,142,152,163,170,171,172,176,187,191,192,209,213,219,220,222,236,247,248,252,262,266
Inexpressible	67,94,112,67
Infinite	7,8,29,30,33,37,44,46,52,57,62,64,76,80,86,96,98,102,106,111,118,123,144,156,160,169,187,191,199,204,209,211,217,233,245,248
Infinite variances	8,29,30,33,46,52,62,64,65,68,76,77,78,86,96,104,118,144,156,187,191,199,204,209,211,233,245
Intelligence	17,22,23,29,44,72,113,179,230,265
Internal	23,24,25,31,32,76,80,82,170,171,208
Interplay of feelings	49
Interpretation	7,8,18,21,22,24,30,36,46,76,78,85,86,90,105,109,115,122,131,137,142,155,169,188,191,192,206,213,236,253,256
Interpretations of feelings	8,18,48,93,191
Interpreting	25,34,35,47,50,51,52,62,169,213,225
Inventions	63
Iraq	65,193,194
Italy	152

<b>J</b>	
Japan	162
Jealousy	29,40
Journalism	253
Justice	142,143,144,148,149,150,187,236,237,238,239,250
<b>K</b>	
Kafka, Franz	104
Kant, Immanuel	55,56
Kelsen, Hans	82
Kievan Russia	228
Kingston	146
Knowledge	7,9,17,18,21,22,23,24,25,29,41,42,43,46,47,48,49,50,54,56,63,64,68,72,76,78,84,88,90,113,115,123,128,132,142,208,219,244,251
Korea	162
<b>L</b>	
Laissez-faire	240,241,242
Laissez-laissez-faire	240,242
Langer, Susanne	94
Language	7,11,18,21,27,31,37,40,46,49,59,68,76,88,89,96,101,106,113,118,123,125,128,130,136,141,155,167,175,191,200,206,209,214,220,241,256,258,

Language of things	42,52,62,63,77,80,101,106,131,137,139,141,206,241
Language organ	167
Law	82,122,137,142,143,144,148,149,150,151,153,155,187,188,203,205,222,228,236,237,239,241,244
Legal practices	142,144
Lévi-Strauss, Claude	154,169,170,171
Liberalism	245,248
License to lie	253,256,258
Life	8,9,10,17,21,23,24,25,27,28,29,30,35,41,42,46,52,55,60,62,64,66,73,76,81,86,89,92,100,110,113,122,133,139,142,150,154,164,169,176,187,188,191,198,199,204,213,217,225,233,236,244,248,257,260,261,262
Lillehammer	152
Linguistic Alchemy	57,60,132
Logos	84
London	118,125,221,229,235
Louvre	79
Love	5,9,29,37,38,39,40,52,56,94,95,101,114,144,156,175,209,229
<b>M</b>	
Machiavelli, Niccolò	201
Magna Carta	201

Majority	19,112,179,210,224,225,231,232,259
Manipulation	70,72,120,132,192,250,256,261
Mankind	21,35,37,38,54,82,113,117,121,138,144,154,156,174,176,193,219,255
March on Rome	215
Marx, Karl	70,132,150
Marxism	231
Marxist	176,187,204,216,233
Marxist yoke	216
Master of Arts	84
McDonalds	166,167
McGill University	146
Meaning	9,25,31,34,38,45,51,59,66,68,80,84,95,98,100,104,107,108,110,122,164,166,188,190,196,199,204,223,230,262
Media	120,121,179,210,211,226,252,253,254,255,256,257,258,265
Medical imaging	31,32
Medicine	32,72,129,143,144,236
Memory	48,49,67,82,109,118,134,144,157,163,164,165
Mental	18,26,27,30,31,34,39,42,50,52,53,56,70,80,82,84,89,91,99,110,115,122,131,169,175,192,206,228,229,232,237,265
Mental health	26

Merriam-Webster	223,232
Metaphysical	39,130,171,203,234,248
Microscope	92,98
Mind	18,23,24,29,31,35,37,41,42,46, 56,62,68,72,76,82,84,92,101, 106,107,108,109,115,119,121, 125,133,134,136,137,139,155, 158,164,168,170,175,187, 189,193,203,211,216,221,225, 228,240,260,262,264
Minority	232,233
Mirrors	57
Mongolia	162
Monopolies	242,245,247,252,253,255,259, 260,265
Monopolistic	171,210,222,240,242,253, 254,266
Monopoly	220,238,240,247,252,254,255, 258,259
Montesquieu	201,228,229
Montreal	146
Moscow	153,160
Murdoch	211
Music	38,62,97,100
Mussolini, Benito	215
Mysterious	50,66,72,82,91,104
Mythos	84

<b>N</b>	
Nagano	153
Nagasaki	56,65,215
Narva	215
Nazism	180
NHL	147,150
Norway	152,153,230
<b>O</b>	
Objective	36,42,68,96,108,120,134
Oedipus	196
One man	197
Open Society	132,133,140,250,251,252,253
Organ	24,55,167,168
Organism	26,27,48,53,57,61,77,79,89,123
Originality	99,111
Orwell, George	120,121
<b>P</b>	
Pain	8,24,26,27,28,29,30,33,37,38, 51,61,62,76,80,81,86,88,89,90, 91,92,93,94,95,98,101,102,114, 138,158,175,213,232
Pain and pleasure	8,25,26,27,28,29,30,33,37,38, 51,61,62,80,81,86,89,90,91, 92,94,95,98,115,138,158,175, 213

Paris	222,79
Parliamentarism	201,238,252
Peking	162
Perceptions	8,37,40,43,48,49,77,83,90,91, 92,96,106,122,134,136,137, 142,144,157,178,188,189,191, 206,208,216,228,240,241, 249,260
Perfect market	138,139,219
Phenomena	30,82,136,141,188,189,192, 199,230,256
Philosophical	8,10,50,56,57,60,106,130,131, 132,138
Philosophy	9,10,18,23,24,34,50,55,85,86, 90,96,101,130,131,132,133, 138,139,141,159,191,209,213, 244,260
Physics	42,60,133
Pinker, Stephen	55
Plato	29,53,54,84,132,230
Pleasure	8,24,26,27,28,29,30,33,37,38, 51,61,62,76,80,86,88,89,90,94, 98,114,139,158,175,181,213, 232
Political systems	218,219,228
Pollution	65
Pop Art	83
Popper, Karl	130,131,132,133,134,135,138, 139,141,188
Post-Soviet	187

Poverty	65,156,253
Power	10,96,111,121,155,173,174,186, 187,191,192,199,200,201,202, 203,204,205,206,207,208,209, 210,211,218,223,224,226,232, 233,238,248,250,252,254, 255,260
Practice	8,63,64,73,141,144,148,152, 187,191,216,238,256,261
Prague	152
Press	148,149,155,174,177,178, 210,258
Principles	60
Private Property	244,245
Processes	27,28,31,48,49,85,87,89,92,134, 149,192,195,199,200,208,213, 217,237,245,253,259,261
Profound	30,91,92,98
Progress	21,37,61,73,74,154,156,157, 159,166,167,172,173,175,187
Propaganda	65,70,120,121,155,178,179,180, 193,194,209,210,250,253,254, 256,257,264,265
Propagandists	192,264
Protagoras	54,78
Proust, Marcel	29,30,33,34,35,36,67,86,87,88, 92,93,94,99,102,103,112,133, 157,165,175,178,190,193,204, 206,234
Proustian	206
Psychoanalysis	26

Psychological	8,133,134
Putin, Vladimir	151,180
<b>R</b>	
Reality	18,23,30,33,35,36,39,42,43,52, 64,65,66,68,70,72,74,77,83, 102,104,106,110,114,119,134, 154,158,167,177,189,193,195, 199,213,219,223,229,,232,233, 239,240,245,249,252,258
Reason	10,23,24,38,53,55,56,57,58,61, 71,78,94,101,113,154,180,187, 244,246
Reflecting	24,57,88,143,175
Reflection	21,23,25,26,48,63,64,77,78,85, 89,169,175
Regained time	219
Religion	10,39,50,72,82,122,133,140, 168,188,209,252,253
Republican Party	254
Repulsion	88,90
Roman	149,175,196,227,234
Roman Empire	174,196,227,234
Rome	215
Ronaldinho	81
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques	201
Rubik's Cube	232
Rule-of-law	148,151,155,228

Russia	138,149,150,151,153,176,177, 178,179,187,193,211,216, 218,219,221,228,231,247,250, 251,263,264
Russian	17,150,160,178,194,216,231, 251
Russians	149,150,151,176,187,216,230, 231,250
<b>S</b>	
Sartre, Jean-Paul	170
Savor	79
Science	7,18,21,29,30,36,41,47,50,53, 54,56,60,64,66,70,74,76,80,84, 88,91,96,98,104,118,122,131, 136,155,159,167,177,188,190, 193,200,206,214,222,252,260
Scientific	18,24,26,30,38,39,56,58,59,64, 67,70,73,77,83,95,101,107, 134,137,140,141,174,188,189, 200,204
Scientific method	140,141,188,189
Scottish	146
Search	31,33,34,39,56,85,111,164,169, 190,213,234
Second World War	56
Self-evident	60,86
Sichuan	166
Sincerity	78,99
Skills	98,100,264
Slave	224

Smiths	221
Social	7,17,18,19,21,24,30,32,41,44,50,57,60,69,74,76,78,82,85,88,92,101,114,119,121,132,139,141,142,148,150,159,167,172,175,187,191,199,203,213,225,231,232,237,240,244,252,260
Social Contract	201
Social practices	7,17,18,19,21,31,41,44,49,57,61,69,76,78,82,85,92,101,114,121,134,139,142,148,150,167,171,187,191,200,209,213,215,217,225,232,237,240,244,252,260
Social science fiction	18,19,30,50,58,60,78,214
Social sciences	18,32,50,64,70,72,132,199
Societies	120,154,170,171,173,218,219,227,255,264
Sophistry	54
Sorcerers	56,71,72
Soros, George	138,139,140,141
Soul	23,24,82
Sovereigns	238
Soviet	149,187,211,218,250,262,263
Soviet Union	149,218,250
Spanish Civil War	215
Sport	74,81,108,146,167

State Ownership	244,246,247,259
States	120,133,134,204,215,216,218,219,220,221,222,223,234,238,239,253,264
Stimuli	60,61,63,86
Stockholm	153
Subjective	94,96,109,122,134
Svetovoin, Ivan	186
Sweden	230
Swedes	152
Switzerland	153
Symbols	25,37,104,106,107,108,109,110,111,112,122
Szechuan	160,162
<b>T</b>	
Talent	99,100
Telescope	92
Texas	118
The Telegraph	210
Theoretical	64,90
Theory	11,33,42,70,238,241
Thing	5,24,43,50,59,66,67,72,84,86,94,99,116,119,141,142,191,198,206,209,214,227,229,231,235,248

Thingliness	11
Thingling	11,43,55,57,64,78
Thingly	9,11,25,29,37,43,46,47,48,50, 52,77,81,86,87,106,116,119, 122,136,137,13,154,155,199, 200,221,237,241
Thinking	11,24,37,43,47,49,51,53,54,57, 58,60,62,72,80,83,95,104,106, 113,114,115,116,118,120, 130,132,136,138,140,142,154, 164,167,190,192,194,197,202, 241,252,256,257
Third way	187,266
Thought	36,46,50,51,56,60,69,87,88,90, 91,103,104,115,121,132,134, 137,140,147,154,157,161, 166,176
Time	23,29,30,34,39,44,47,52,69,78, 82,92,102,104,106,111,114, 129,148,151,156,160,164,168, 171,176,177,180,181,187,188, 190,191,192,205,216,219, 237,242,244,257,260,264,265
Time lost	157
Time Regained	34,157
Ting	227
Totalitarian	120,121,132,171,187,195
Traditions	17,24,29,41,53,54,55,72,78,84, 101,107,110,116,117,132,134, 144,150,160,166,169,170, 176,188,195,203,204,209, 214,216,218,220,225,226,227, 228,230,250,260,262,263,264

Transmutation	26,56,57
Trojan horses	250
Trust	38,39,40,94,220,246,252,264
Turin	153
<b>U</b>	
Ugly	84,90,91
UK	221,230
Ultimate Stimuli	60,61
Undulation	186
United States	120,215,216,238,239,253,264
United States of America	215
Universal Cookbook	168
Universal Grammar	167,168
Universities	18,71,74,189,227,231
Unknown	35,36,91,112,154,158,204
US Constitution	201
USSR	149,210,211
<b>V</b>	
Values	83,121,122,149,165,172,175, 176,194,195,231,233
Veche	228
Veronika	160

Vichy	164
Vision	70,98,99,100,119,200,209
<b>W</b>	
Warhol, Andy	83
Washington Post	210
Weimar Republic	215
Wessons	221
Western	47,83,120,121,132,149,151,155, 156,173,174,177,179, 189,191,202,206,218,227,255, 256,257,258,263,264
Westminster	229
Wikipedia	58,83,190
Wisdom	9,41,47,54,78,79,154
Wittgenstein, Ludwig	18,117,128,130,131,154
Wizards	71,72,75
World 1	133
World 2	133
World 3	133,134
World War I	215
World War II	215
Writer	33,36,98,104