
Subject: The real evil in this world!

Posted by [Jimmy](#) on Wed, 13 Jul 2005 13:05:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

have been afforded to them.

This influence has existed to one degree or another for decades. Yet it was another Supreme Court decision, handed down in 1976, that allowed these super-citizens to establish a strangle-hold on our politics and government institutions.

The Supremacy of the Super-Citizen

In 1976, the case "Buckley v. Valeo" came before the Supreme Court. Senator James Buckley, former Senator and Presidential candidate Eugene McCarthy, and several others had filed suit to challenge the constitutionality of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA) and the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. Among the defendants were Francis Valeo, Secretary of the Senate and ex officio member of the newly-created Federal Election Commission, as well as the Commission itself.

The final Supreme Court decision split a number of legal hairs. The decision upheld the constitutionality of limiting political contributions to candidates, and the disclosure and record-keeping requirements established by FECA. The aspects of FECA deemed unconstitutional, however, became the basis for the supremacy of the super-citizen. In short, the Court decided that limiting the amount of money a candidate could spend was a violation of the First Amendment. In other words, the spending of campaign money was equated with the right of free speech.

On the surface, the decision makes sense. Because so much of modern political campaigning involves television and radio advertisements, direct mailing of campaign literature, extensive travel and lodging and staff payrolls, and because all these things cost money, a limitation on campaign spending necessarily restricts the ability of a candidate to practice free speech in the political realm.

The danger, of course, was that corporations would take advantage of the new spending freedoms enjoyed by politicians and flood them with influence-creating cash. The Court attempted to address this concern by upholding the limits on contribution amounts, stating that these limitations were the "primary weapons against the reality or appearance of improper influence stemming from the dependence of candidates on large campaign contributions."

The Court's attempt to address this concern failed, in no small part because of the existence of so-called "soft money." Soft money was supposed to be cash given to political parties for "party-building activities" rather than for the direct support of candidates and campaigns. Soft money contributions were not subjected to limitations, allowing super-citizens to flood outrageous

amounts of money into the process. Because the soft-money rules were so vague, and because soft money contributions were so huge, the money was invariably directed towards the support of individual candidates. The politicians became corporate entities, commodities bought and sold by the super-citizens.

The passage in 2002 of the Campaign Reform Act did little to cut into the massive influence in politics enjoyed by the super-citizens. The Campaign Reform Act made most soft money contributions illegal but created a loophole large enough to sail a British tea ship through, with the enshrinement of 527 groups as political entities. 527s are tax-exempt organizations created to influence the nomination, election, appointment or defeat of political candidates.

The soft money previously given to political parties goes now to these groups, and these groups enjoy umbilical connections to the parties and candidates they work in favor of. In other words, nothing really changed, and the influence of the super-citizens was undiminished. The Campaign Reform Act also raised the hard money contribution limit from \$1,000 to \$2,000, thus doubling the ability of super-citizens to exert direct financial influence upon candidates and office-holders.

Today, virtually every politician holding national office is financially beholden to a corporation. Beyond the favorable tax status for corporations established by these owned politicians, the effects of this ownership are felt by average citizens every day.

Foreign policy is all too often decided by corporate considerations, and these decisions often lead to war. The air we breathe, the food we eat and the water we drink is contaminated by pollutants that corporations are legally allowed to spew, thanks to the legislative protections created by corporate-owned politicians. Draconian sentencing rules created by legislators that incarcerate millions of Americans - think "The War on Drugs" specifically - have as much to do with the influence of the corporate-controlled prison industry as with anything else.

This list goes on and on. Super-citizens define our reality by controlling the information we receive via television, newspaper and radio. Super-citizens make sure that information casts them in a favorable light. Super-citizens pound us with advertising and thus maintain the fiction that spending money on products defines the nature of a person.

The best and brightest are drafted out of law school to work for corporate defense firms for six-figure salaries, thus ensuring that super-citizens enjoy a level of legal defense not available to anyone else. Many of these corporate attorneys graduate to the bench, where they extend the influence of super-citizens across all levels of the judicial branch.

More than anything else, however, super-citizens control the ways and

means of government at every level. They bought it, they own it, and they make sure it does their bidding. The needs, requirements and best interests of the average citizen do not enter into the equation.

Created Equal

Arguments can be made that corporations are good for the economy and the country. They can get things done with a speed and efficiency not often found in the bureaucracies of government. When the country had to get itself ready to fight World War II, for one example, it was the industrial and manufacturing corporations that produced the means to achieve victory beyond anyone's expectations.

In the final analysis, however, the influence held by these entities is antithetical to the fundamental ideals of the nation. We are not all created equal, and within that inequality lies the potential for enormous evil. Consider the case of I.G. Farben, the industrial giant that was the financial core of the Nazi regime. Farben produced the gas used in the concentration camps, and made lucrative use of slave labor in the camps. Before the war, Farben worked hand-in-hand with a number of powerful American corporations, the most prominent of which was Standard Oil.

In the aftermath of World War II, the crimes committed by Farben were considered so enormous that many wanted the corporation to be utterly destroyed. Instead, Farben was split into several smaller entities, several of which still exist. Millions of Americans purchase aspirin from Bayer, a company that was once part of Farben. Commercials for BASF tell us that company makes the products we buy better, but do not tell us that BASF was once part of Farben. It speaks to the power enjoyed by corporations that Farben, the company that forced concentration camp laborers to manufacture the Zyklon-B used to exterminate them, and which was the backbone of Nazi financial power, was not destroyed out of hand once the war was over. Farben is still with us. Its charter has merely been changed.

Are all corporations on the moral level of I.G. Farben? Certainly not. Many corporations work for the public good, and many that work for their own enrichment do not necessarily undermine the country and its principles. But some do, and exist beyond punishment or account.

The potential for evil is certainly there when super-citizens exist above the law. When the New York Times reviewed the book *The Crime and Punishment of I.G. Farben*, it observed that the story of Farben "Forces one to consider the possibility that when corporate evil reaches a certain status, it simply cannot be defeated."

In the end, the existence of incredibly powerful entities that enjoy the status of citizens demote the vast majority of average citizens to second-class status. If the ideals we hold sacred have any truth to them, if the myths

we sleep by have any basis in reality, such a division is intolerable and must be changed. "All men are created equal" once excluded vast swaths of Americans from their basic rights. Battles were fought to change that. Today, a battle to realign the balance of power between the citizen and the super-citizen must also be fought. It must be won. Neil, you have good taste. Fat Tire is a fine Colorado beer from New

Belgium Brewery in Fort Collins.

http://www.newbelgium.com/beers_ft.php

Their neighbor brewery, Odell, makes a really excellent beer called 90 shilling. Highly recommended if you can find it in your locale.

http://www.odellbrewing.com/brew_90.htm

Kim, congrats!

Cheers,

-Jamie K

<http://www.JamieKruz.com>

Neil wrote:

> "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

>

>>Anybody got a recommendation of a first class beer I should buy a slab (case)

>

> of to celebrate? :o)

>

> I've recently been introduced to Fat Tire Ale, and it's pretty

> good... somewhat reminiscent of Guinness stout in taste, but

> not as heavy or dark. Give it a try if they carry it down there.

> Congrats on the raise! (TODAY is when they'll give you the

> news about the company car: "But Kimmers, how can you bitch

> about this, mate? After all, you just got a nice pay increase

> yesterday!")

>

> :)You can buy one now instead of that extra special beer for your extra coming money;-)

Erlilo

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> skrev i en meddelelse
news:42d50ab5\$1@linux...

>

>

> STOP IT!! I WANT ONE!!! ;o)

>Hey Erlilo,

The United States of America is strong enough and secure enough to face constructive criticism (or praise) any time, anywhere. I don't agree with any implication that it's appropriate to suppress discussion because of the terrible actions of a few English criminals.

No country is perfect, but one of the real strengths of the USA is the ability to speak freely, and point out errors where they may (or may not) lay. We are a country of opinions, disagreements and noisy expressions of both.

Being human, sometimes emotion comes into play which is OK. But now and then it and drowns out logic for a while which is not. Sometimes we have our episodes of suppression but so far we have been able to shake them off.

We have many great accomplishments as a nation and contributions to the world in which we take a certain pride, and profound respect for the accomplishments of other nations. Indeed we owe a debt of gratitude to the nations who helped us establish our great experiment; the foundation of thought on which we built our nation; and a long history of emmigration of people and ideas from all over the world that have helped us grow and innovate.

We also reserve the right to criticize other nations where they stray, so it would be hypocritical to not expect criticism from others. We especially cherish our right to criticize our own government as we each deem necessary, and to "throw the bums out" periodically.

I appreciate your sincere research into your own family's history and sacrifice. Thanks for sharing your thoughts.

Cheers,
-Jamie K
<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

erlilo wrote:

> Don, I knew it well that you're not mad at me but feelings for right or
> wrong can often do some stupid behavings all over the world.
> If we don't get souches from all sides, not only one side, we will grow up
> without wisdom at all in our minds. The documentations I for the most have
> found was not only "made in Europe", there were plenty of American documents
> too. I wanted to find out something from different sides, trying to find
> some understandings. You see, I had to find out why my father had to be
> killed in the second worldwar because of different leaders stupidness and I
> must say I found out a whole lot, as you may have seen with my struggling
> writings here up against the year:-).

>
> Take care, Don
>
> erlilo
>
>
>
> There are
> "DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> skrev i en meddelelse news:42d4682b\$1@linux...
>
>>Erling,
>>
>>I appreciate you struggling with english to communicate with me,
>>and I am not mad at you, nor was I accusing Norway of
>>anything.
>>
>>This is simple. I consider it unethical to use the death of innocent
>>people as an opportunity to trash my country. You come visit,
>>I will solidly refute every euro-socialist cliched view you hold of this
>>country, and send you home a better man. You need to stop
>>getting all your info from euro sources...
>>
>>And that is as far as I am going to participate in the act of attacking
>>and defending anyone's country. yours or mine.
>>
>>Be well
>>
>>DC
>>
>>
>>
>>"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote:
>>
>>>Please, please Don, I am not doing any defence of any terrorism or
>>>terrorists at all, can't you really understand these facts? And I'm not
>>
>>>trying to score any cheap points at all on the London bombing or all the
>>
>>>sivilians that have lost their lifes because of stupid statemen affairs
>>
>>up
>>
>>>against the years. I have just tried to show you an opinion, from outside
>>
>>>America, how the roots to people like these can grow up and hate so much
>>
>>>t
>>

>>
>>
>>hat they are doing these kind of things.
>>
>>>By the way, saw they have arrested someone up in NorthEngland after the
>>
>>>bombs in London earlier today. Hope it's some of the right persons they
>>
>>have
>>
>>>arrested and will find them all.
>>>Michael Moore? you mean that famous American filmmaker that don't like the
>>
>>>American President's behavings and is saying it high and clearly? Sorry
>>
>>to
>>
>>>say, I havn't heard him speaking or seeing any of his films. Have just
>>>read
>>
>>>about him, that he have won big American and international prizes for
>>>works
>>
>>>like "Fahrenheit 9/11". It must have reasons that he have won these high
>>
>>>prizes and I think it can't be for any lies he have told in these films.
>>>
>>>So, yes I did it again Don, but not for the reasons you are throwing at
>>
>>me
>>
>>>here. You see, I don't need any Michael Moore or any President or American
>>
>>>lifestylist to think for me at all.
>>>
>>>Nonsense, accusations, and lies? Have you documentations to stand besides
>>
>>>your speaking here or is it just believings? Sitting nearly three years
>>
>>in
>>
>>>different Scandinavian libraries, doing research for a book about second
>>
>>>worldwar and my father, gave me plenty of documentations about the last
>>
>>>couple of hundred years of wars to stand behind what I'm trying to say
>>>here
>>

>>>about war and terror.
>>>
>>>Sorry to hear that you don't know at all what Norway stands for in
>>>humanity
>>
>>>and political thinking. If it wasn't for me, maybe you didn't had any
>>>knowings about Norway at all? So, I think it's time for you to find out
>>
>>real
>>
>>>documentations and facts about that nation too before throwing out talk
>>
>>>about racism and intolerance that really can be used as a mirror to why
>>
>>the
>>
>>>world have all these kind of problems.
>>>
>>>Take care
>>>
>>>erlilo
>>>
>>>
>>>"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> skrev i en meddelelse news:42d402ed\$1 @linux...
>>>
>>>>"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Hello again Don,
>>>>>I can see and understand that you don't have understand what I have
>>>>>written
>>>>>
>>>>>at all. You have just seen words that you don't like at all, as an
>>>>>patriotic
>>>>>
>>>>>American and have gone directly and deeply into your shooting grave,
>>>>>firing
>>>>>
>>>>>up at once at all those bastards that's saying "ugly
