

# If you think big brother is bad – beware of big sister

I received the following message from one of my Facebook friends. He was writing to all of his Facebook friends. I have deleted the names because they are not important to the idea I present.

My friend wrote:

To all of my Facebook friends...

The last few months, I have been very immersed in the political arena, especially the presidential election. I have been a loyal advocate of Donald Trump, not because he was the ideal candidate, or that he oozed presidential characteristics; no, it was mainly because I agreed with the bulk of what he says, but not necessarily the way he said it. But more than that, it is because I feel Hillary Clinton is so despicable, and so dishonest, a criminal, at best. I felt it prudent that I kept preaching the Trump gospel. The downside to my demeanor is that it has potentially cost me some friends that do not support Trump, in fact, they think he's dangerous and insane..

The truth is, some of my best friends are Democrats. They are all intelligent and thoughtful people that simply don't see things the same way as I do. People have told me that those friends who are not talking to me over my very vocal support for Trump, were never really good friends to begin with. I don't agree with that. I think that I may have pushed them too hard, debated with them too much, and that pushed them away. I am a very strong willed person, and very passionate about everything that I take on. However, the reality is that my vote, and my opinions in this matter will amount to nothing in the grand scheme of things. I have devoted a tremendous amount

of my time and energy into something that has, in my opinion, proven to be destructive to me. At this point, I'm not changing anybody's mind, so what am I really doing, aside from alienating non-like minded people that I really care about?

So, while my opinions and support have not yet changed, what will immediately change, is my propensity to initiate conversations of little else, other than politics.

I went out to dinner with some friends the other night, and not once did I bring up politics in any way. It felt like a real accomplishment.

Comment #1: We are all Americans. Sometimes we just see things differently.

Comment #2: Well articulated!

Comment #3: It's been a particularly intense election year.

Comment #4: Mitchell Goldstein (the author)

I truly wish that I could let this slide, but the stakes in this election are too high, e.g. the Supreme Court.

I am sure that these well-meaning and intelligent friends will make all the appropriate excuses when martial law is invoked because of some false flag operation created by an anti-American Clinton administration, similar to the recent fake coup in Turkey, a country now under almost dictatorial control by a militant Muslim currently holding our military personnel hostage.

Just like Bill, it is clear that Hillary Clinton is working to gain complete governmental control over US, i.e. to create a plutocracy, where a small group makes all the decisions and the rest of US dangle on their string, plainly called "The New World Order" by fellow anti-American conspiratorialist, George W Bush.

How many times have we heard the same old slogans? We all know the problems that need fixing. Isn't it obvious that since the

problems have not been fixed – that the political class does not want to fix the problems. The Mischreant Political Class promises things to get elected, knowing full well that people will hope against hope that this time it will be different. Besides being stupid and gullible, these people are cowards! That these fellow Americans refuse to acknowledge the facts in front of their nose proves that they lack the knowledge and the courage of conviction needed to uphold a pro-freedom agenda.

I have never understood how it is not obvious that a government solution is the worst possible path to solve any issue. However, know that these will be the same “friends” who, when it comes to it, will sell you out for a few food ration coupons; just ask any emigre from Eastern Europe or from Cuba.

Of course, they will feel bad about their betrayal, but their personal survival is paramount, isn't it? Political correctness, liberalism, et. al. has sapped the moral fortitude from our culture. Our “Me-centered” narcissistic culture justifies any action so long as we each get what we “feel” we want.

At this time, we all need to choose “friends” based upon who we would want in the foxhole next to US. You are well rid of these noxious individuals. Their only utility is to supply you with monies so you can buy more items to help your family survive the coming Anschluss – an Anschluss that they helped perpetuate with their decision to turn away from the obvious treason unfolding in front of their eyes.

Bottom Line – When you look at the long list of Hillary's crimes and compare them to the idea that Trump is not saying something the way we would like him to say it – it is easy to pick the better party – Trump. To be acceptable, Trump merely needs to learn how to speak “PC.” However, don't expect Hillary to undo a lifetime devoted to Statist ideals, i.e. she

is devoted to a totalitarian agenda. If you thought Big Brother was bad; Beware of Big Sister!

It might help to turn people against Hillary were we to know details about some Obama/Hillary/New World Order policies, e.g.

- the North American Union where the US, Canada and Mexico are being planned to be merged into one regional country similar to the EU, and under the egis of the UN;
- the details of TPP, ex: that companies can import foreign workers into the US and pay them the prevailing wage of the country they came from rather than the competitive wage in America; Indian engineers would be paid \$17000, Vietnamese engineers, \$8000;
- Agenda 21 and 2030, a UN treaty amongst whose covenants require that US property rights be subject to UN approval, ex: if you want to put an addition on your house or business, you would need to get UN approval, etc.;
- the International Monetary Fund's plan to have only one currency in the world, thus removing the constitutionally mandated control of our finances from Congress and into the control of some New World Order plutocracy;
- acceptance of the New States of America Constitution as written by the Ford Foundation.
- These are only a few of the plans that are in place to enslave US. If you don't know the details of these and other issues then it is hard to effectively show how our government has gone off into a direction that will eventually turn America into a dictatorship.

Another friend Skyped me. He has turned hard left and has embraced the ideal of the Socialist Anarchist. We parry back and forth with him never admitting to the dictatorial zeal of the left.

Friend: What's UP?

Mitchell Goldstein: The AC repairman just left. He repaired a leak in the central AC. Last month a previous repairman had repaired a bad braze which was leaking at the same joint. How to “prove” it was the same leak so as to mitigate the \$500 bill? How will the company “prove” that it was a different leak or that the joint was damaged in some way, creating the leak? Conundrum!

Friend: You don’t prove it, you pay and move on. The nature of “Work” in our capitalist society is that it’s completely alienated. Marx spoke of this, and this is one of the consequences. The fact that “companies” exploit the labor has also been true, they’ve gotten so compartmentalized that they now also exploit their customers.

Mitchell Goldstein: A certain standard in the quality of work is to be expected, otherwise simply showing up is sufficient to bill and collect. It is appropriate to demand a level of quality and that the work stand up to ordinary conditions.

Friend: Sure, it’s “appropriate” it’s just not effective.

Mitchell Goldstein: It didn’t used to be this way. There used to be a much higher standard that was expected and provided in quality and service. Now, corp’s are in the midst of a “throw-a-way” standard, not a “make it last” standard. This purposeful lackadaisical attitude has affected all areas of society, to our detriment. Honda has made a reputation of maintaining high standards and it has been “effective” for them.

Friend: Yes, this is what happens over time with capitalism. Predicted almost to the stroke by Marx. National brands are largely immune to some of these problems but even those who have “quality” get awards for it LOL. Because quality isn’t its own reward, it would seem.

Mitchell Goldstein: It is not Capitalism that is at fault, but Socialism. The cartels and near monopolies that are currently

ruling US are antithetical to Capitalism. The corp giants are allowed to combine and their virtual monopoly is created by lobbyists whose special interest legislation gives special benefits. The corps do not get bigger through better competition but by legislative fiat. They eliminate competition and create monopoly practices. That is not the fault of capitalism. It is the fault of installing socialist plutocratic practices, also desired by Marx.

Friend: It must be scary for you living in the world.

Mitchell Goldstein: It truly is

Friend: By the way, I completely disagree with what you wrote...in title but not in conclusion. Good thing is Marx's words are written. So we can see he's "right" about what's happened.

Mitchell Goldstein: What I've never understood is that large corps are reviled for their monopoly power, yet, there never seems to be any worry about how a plutocracy, e.g. the Central Committee, will rule in socialism. They are uniformly authoritarian.

Friend: Um, "never" is a strange choice of words. But, beyond that, Noam Chomsky has very eloquently addressed that if you'd like to hear it

Mitchell Goldstein: send link

Friend: YouTube Video

Mitchell Goldstein: Of course, even if Chomsky has some theoretical ideas that have merit, the reality of all socialistic regimes are that they are authoritarian.

Friend: Socialist regime is like speaking of a geocentric solar system. That is... all REGIMES are authoritarian. Not all socialist economic expressions are regimes. They speak to different questions. Much like atheism and agnosticism. They speak to different questions

Mitchell Goldstein: We've been down this road many times in our conversations. While there are technical differences, the general theme is that socialistic regimes all concentrate power for the explicit purpose of concentrating power. The aim, at the least, is to control people, or, at worst, to enslave them, for the aggrandizement of the select few.

Friend: ...again, better if you say "all regimes" Socialism is a "coincidence" in much the same way that if you objected to a theft and kept calling the person a black thief. That would show a bias and racist one...even if it happened to be true (coincidental) to the thief. The "race" is not the relevant part.

Socialism answers a question about production and distribution and it can be and often is much more democratic than capitalism.

Mitchell Goldstein: Socialism is nothing but a marketing system, meant to keep control of the population in the hands of the plutocracy. It uses flawed economic theory and class warfare to fool people into gaining support.

Friend: no, it is that economic theory. You may feel there are those who use it to their benefit, but that's not a critique of the theory. As far as flawed, theories, what makes you say that? Belief?

Mitchell Goldstein: The proof is the failed Soviet Union, Cuba, Eastern Europe, etc. The proofs are the testimonies of emigres who run from these "wonderful" societies because they hate their constricted life.

Friend: Ah, okay, faulty thinking on you part is the proof. And worse, "anecdote" without considering incentives.

By the way, that's not how you test theories.

Mitchell Goldstein: The real proof of the theory is the

reaction of the society. You believe it doesn't matter if the outcome is bad; was the idea well intended even if the outcome is bad? I don't believe that the idea was well intended.

Friend: Of course... But, that an "outcome" is bad doesn't mean it was an outcome "of" the idea or the perception of it.

For example... Your eye tells you that the St. Louis Arch is taller than it is wide. But we have a way to test that theory. We measure it, and we learn that your perceptions are wrong. What's interesting is that like this subject for you...knowing your perception is wrong doesn't fix the perception... that is, it continues to look taller than it is wide.

Mitchell Goldstein: You constantly refer to technical differences that don't create real distinctions. I don't perceive anything except the testimony of those who have run away from their country, leaving behind all possessions and family

Friend: For example, say that something has a 10% chance of X and a 90% chance of Y. It's a good idea to do it if you want Y. The "x" outcome doesn't invalidate the approach. Right, bad self-selected bias. Probably one of the worse ways to test something. Get this, you're not only perceiving ...you're perceiving about a "feelers" perception.

Consider someone who leaves the Orthodox Jewish Lubavitcher faith. Would you trust their perceptions about the problems of Judaism?

Mitchell Goldstein: If 90% left, yes.

Friend: LOL. Making up numbers again. And thank you for admitting you WOULDN'T. You know why Baptists think that sex is bad, right? ...they're convinced it will lead to dancing.

Mitchell Goldstein: Do you have any doubt that if an honest poll were taken within Cuba or Soviet bloc countries, that the population would roundly express their disappointment and ask



for something better.

Friend: I wouldn't make the mistake of thinking it says much about socialism. But it might say a lot about the power of economic sanctions and threats from an empirical power like the US... and other issues such as Castro's failure to live up to his ideals...the reason that Che G. left and went to Africa after the revolution.

Mitchell Goldstein: Interestingly, Che went on a killing rampage. He could have continued to do that in Cuba; killing in the name of freedom and doing it for your own good, of course. Che kills you because he loves you.

Friend: Yes, it's interesting that he was willing to put down the doctor's bag and pick up the rifle and fight for the people.

Mitchell Goldstein: He was fighting for personal power – period.

Friend: Not what I see in his biography. Unless by personal power you mean merely equal power. He left because Castro wouldn't give the land to the people as planned but saved it for authoritarian favors and power.

Mitchell Goldstein: I know. But Castro's actions were entirely predictable. As I've said, socialists use marketing to gain control. Have you come to the idea yet that, like Che, it is OK to kill regular folks if they will not fall in line with your ideals?

Friend: Do you mean "ethical" by the question OK? And by "fall in line" do you mean "follow blindly" or do you mean "resist the power of the people?" Of course it's legitimate and ethical to have revolution.

Mitchell Goldstein: You label a lack of desire to follow the dictates of a dictator as "resisting the power of the people."

That is very Stalin-like of you.

Friend: It is not ethical to kill people who “disagree” ... freedom of thought is ONLY possible in a collectivist society. Dictators have nothing to do with what I speak of.

Mitchell Goldstein: Now who is being silly?

Friend: Unlike you, I have a full and complete distrust of abiding authority. You are a Minarch. You believe in a “constitutional power.”

Mitchell Goldstein: Yes I do believe in a highly restricted government. Explain how a collectivist society can have freedom of anything, especially freedom of thought or expression?

Friend: Well, the irony is it's the ONLY way you can. Without the collective, without “relationship” there is no way to test/expand one's views... If one were “isolated as an individual” they would only have their automated thoughts, instinct, bias. Only by having a relationship to others can we identify thought...and only in an anarchist society can we have freedom.

Mitchell Goldstein: In some ways, it is sad there is no possibility of having an anarchist society. However, dictatorial collectivism abounds... “Collectivism means the subjugation of the individual to a group – whether to a race, class or state does not matter. Collectivism holds that man must be chained to collective action and collective thought for the sake of what is called ‘the common good’.” – Ayn Rand,

Collectivism in the real world is slavery – not freedom. Only in the ivory tower is a noxious idea like Collectivism believed to be a good.

Friend: It means the proper understanding that the individual is a sort of illusion. That the meaningful expressions of

humanity can only be understood as a social level. So in one “sense” it subjugates. But in another way entirely, it’s the ONLY way for the individual to do well

For example, a guaranteed minimum income would open up levels of individualism we’ve never seen and...growth for the collectively we’ve never seen. And, by the way, people admit this all the time when they’re honest. Things like...recognizing the special exploration of identity that comes in a marriage contract...or upon becoming a father/ mother. These are collective relationships.

Mitchell Goldstein: There is some possibility that a guaranteed income would provide some good; you could be accurate to some degree.

The part that I fight within myself is the idea that without the “collective” or “the village” to help, the religious congregation or fraternal organizations are not always enough to help in continuing difficult situations, e.g. bad health or significant unemployment. However, I’ve always seen that the negatives of the collective far outshine the positives to society.

Friend: There is no “society” without the collective. Do you really not get that?

Mitchell Goldstein: I do. But your collective will always morph into plutocracy.

Do you really not get that?

Friend: I get that it doesn’t happen most of the times...and does happen when we lose sight of the collective. The collective cannot be plutocratic, because it’s inherently democratic and anarchistic.

Mitchell Goldstein: That is philosophical silliness. The collective, in the way you are thinking of it, starts out well, well-meaning and well-run. Then, talented individuals rise, gain more control, and their natural tendency is to

gather more power, until the ideal is ruined. The weak amongst US are as lambs led to the slaughter. Lord Acton was absolutely correct about power corrupting.

Friend: LOL So are you part of the weak?

Mitchell Goldstein: Yes, to some degree. Mostly not.

I have ability. But that ability is constrained by the collective – for the collective – in the name of the collective – and enforced by the collective – but, it is for the benefit of the individuals at the top, the plutocracy.

Friend: Ha! “Enforced by the collective” What the F would that even mean?

Mitchell Goldstein: The legitimate collective of the people has been taken over by the plutocracy that had planned to do so all along. It always uses the collective “good” as its purpose for enslaving US.

Friend: See any good movies? (Changing the subject.)

I have come to understand that liberals just want things to be “nice.” That, everyone should “just get along” as Rodney King proposed. Well, the competitive spirit in man prevents that. The best we can manage is to be comfortable with chaos, i.e. to manage chaos, via a legal system, a moral system and an economic system, all that are essentially fair.

Some men will always seek power. They will use power to promote themselves and to aggrandize themselves. They will gather and surround themselves with servile yes-men. They will all lie, cheat, steal and promote policies for their own benefit which are inimical to the population they control.

In the latest brazen show of power, the FBI Director has manipulated (rigged) the system to let Hillary off. By all rights, she should now be sitting in jail in a highly fashionable orange jump suit.

G-d Bless US – we really need it!

© 2016 Mitchell Goldstein – All Rights Reserved