



## Continuing on the Question of Fascism...

Posted by [Prof. Goose](#) on May 1, 2005 - 7:08am

Big Gav of Peak Energy [has an interesting and extensive discussion of, well, quite a few things today](#), namely the growing power and momentum of right and the oil supply.

A thought that I should elaborate on this topic: it is interesting that the Reagan idea of conservatism was defined by a penchant for limited government, if not libertarianism, and local control instead of federal control. Take the money and regulatory power out of government hands and give it back to the people and the states!

[As I said a couple of days ago, times have obviously changed with regard to the right](#). Now, we have massive federal government expenditures, a lot of it on defense spending and anti-terrorism/homeland security efforts. These expenditures are merely the growth of government and centralization of another form and purpose than those of the Great Society in the 1960s and 70s here in the US.

You see, when the left centralizes, the goal is socialism or maintaining a redistributive equality of resources. The New Deal, The Great Society, both are not without their problems...but that was government growth about redistribution of wealth and higher taxes.

When the right centralizes, the goal is the maintenance of an order as defined by a principle (the "Reich," etc.). If you, as a citizen, are a part of what defines the order, you're fine as long as you play by the rules. However, if you are neutral or are a part of what the order is organized against, good luck to you.

When there is less centralization, there are more freedoms/less restrictions/more democratic input. The ultimate in decentralization with a government is libertarianism. The ultimate without is anarchy, (but then we just return to the state of nature...).

When there is more centralization, well, the converse is the case.

The extreme of centralization on the left is communism, the extreme on the right is fascism. Both are totalitarian in nature, and actually resemble each other quite a bit as the government controls the social ideology as well as the economy.

(NB, these recent centralizing efforts from the right are quite dissonant with the ideas of Reagan. Reagan's ideas were against the centralization of the left, not for the centralization of the right. However, it seems in retrospect, without the steps under Reagan, we never would have gotten here, now would we? The power had to be taken from the left and given to the right...)

Think about it, we have massive deficits being run up, spending the future's money on rules, machines and men to keep an order that those on the right get to define because they are in power, not the democratic whole.

In other words, the pieces are being put into place. The momentum is on their side. The soonest the Dems could get power is 2008. That's three years more for the right to get more entrenched and run this show their way, pushing it towards the right. Is it a pendulum? Will it swing back? Extremes either way are bad, and lead to totalitarianism.

As Gav suggests, we could cooperate globally and "powerdown" slowly, coordinating with other nations. But again, the idea of [governing the commons applies here: The rational choice by any actor is to hoard until there is a penalty for hoarding or reward for cooperation](#). In better words, we would need a central coordinating authority to enforce an actor from taking more than its share, and that's not going to happen willfully on the part of any actor until another actor has the teeth to stop them. That's why no Kyoto. That's why continued beating down of the UN.

Instead, it seems the US plan is to [maintain its crack supply by whatever means possible](#). As I said in that post: "It's not just ANWR folks, it's a state of mind. Because of our dependency, the United States will behave like a crackwhore sooner or later...rational courses of action are not taken by crackwhores, last I checked."

A money quote from Gav's detailed analysis of the chessboard:

"Still - unless this is all just left wing, paleo-con and libertarian agit-prop, the slide down the slippery slope does seem to have begun - and the weirdness doesn't end with the nastiness pointed out in the articles above. For example, you have Morgan Stanley's Steven Roach looking at the economy and saying "I am not a believer in conspiracy theories. But the Fed's behavior since the late 1990s is starting to change my mind.". You have the Taipei Times noting that 2.1 million americans are in prison - as a proportion of the population this is 7 times higher than in communist China and authoritarian Russia. You have Seeing The Forest noting that the administration has blocked Democrat supporters from attending international conferences. You have the, to me, incomprehensible Minute Man Project going on. You have Paul Krugman saying that the new bankruptcy legislation will create a Debt-Peonage Society. You have pre-election rallies for the Bush-Cheney campaign where attendees are rigourously screened and have to sign loyalty oaths. You have billboards appearing showing pictures of "Our Leader". You have a mass media system that seems to have been largely transformed into a right wing propaganda organ."

Definitely worth a read, very provocative. He even drops in some [Jay Hanson/dieoff.org](#) props.

Maybe go get a glass of water first though.

Technorati Tags: [peak oil](#), [oil](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 United States License](#).