

Oh, but what will the title be? I did think of *The Rise and Fall of the Fourth Reich* but others have used it. *The Hospital* has possibilities. True, it is reminiscent of Solzhenitsyn's *Cancer Ward* but then isn't it pretty much a sequel?

THE PRINCE, THE CARDINAL, THE DUKE, THE POLITICIAN AND THE PROFESSOR

The prince, the cardinal and the duke expect obedience. The politician and the professor duly obey: there's money in it, a lot of money

The prince flies in regularly to desecrate a chunk of Nash Terrace . The cardinal currently hangs from the rafters in Hill Street, on loan from an obscure South American state, the chief claim to fame of which is the refuge it gave to former members of the Waffen SS. The duke has estates in Plaza-toro; still has estates in Plaza-toro, though his grandfather, his great-uncle and sundry loyal helots were massacred by the *brigadistas*. He really doesn't like the niece of a Jewish Communist who fought in the Spanish Civil War. He expresses his detestation by creeping around behind closed doors to achieve injury to her body. People are impressed. You can tell he's a real gentleman

The politician pretends to represent the oppressed working-class (this despite being a key figure in New Labour). The professor pretends to be human.

The prince, the cardinal, the duke, the politician and the professor have in common sexual practices not for the squeamish.

The other thing they have in common is commitment to the destruction of the free world.

See the distress this 'freedom' causes to the little people of sincere belief. That the education provided by the prince, the cardinal and indeed the duke through his various charitable foundations has failed to develop either the hearts or the minds of the little people, such that they remain helpless slaves, slaves of their masters, slaves to themselves, intellectually and emotionally incapable, goes unremarked. They are victims!

The politician likes victims. Victims are critical. Anything that distresses victims is clearly evil and must be abolished instantly.

The professor of course provides the intellectual rationale

Since mind does not exist, democracy is unnecessary.

There is no human capacity to over-ride the hard-wiring, therefore there is no liberty. Where there is no liberty, there is no responsibility - if you are not free to choose you cannot fairly be held to account for your actions: you cannot choose if you have nothing to choose with and so clearly the notion of elected government is puerile in the extreme.

This is merely the quasi-scientific formulation of the world according to prehistoric religion, where independent function of heart and mind is self-will. When you have abolished or condemned all that makes us human, we are the product of our instincts and of what is taught us, empty vessels to be told what and who to be, what to say, what to think, what to do. The mediaeval popes understood that as readily as did Hitler and Stalin: just believe.

Like the religious zombie, the medical zombie functions intellectually working within a given frame of reference, regards it as frightening, evil and perhaps impossible to smash through the walls of this cage, question the frame of reference. Propositions are not considered objectively, on their merits if any, but regarded as good or evil, sane or mad, depending on whether or not they mesh with the assumptions that constitute the walls of the cage.

In vain do those of us with opinions of our own claim they actually are our own. The claim is dismissed. We are the products of our external circumstances. Freedom of conscience is not an issue because there is no conscience to be free. Having been imbued with false consciousness or possessed by the Devil, as you prefer, you must be reprogrammed to right thinking. Biological fundies such as Phelps deconstruct the West with their 'practical man's' contempt for all that makes us human. Can you synthesize a word? Can you grow an idea? Arf, arf, we are all good practical men here. Man is the tool-making ape. Education consists in learning to wield tools, a technical training. No training of the mind can take place because the mind does not exist. Since mind doesn't exist, 6000 years of its coping with the illusorily complex business of being human are meaningless.

The only reality is the PPO and the particular head of your monkey-troop. Our new high priests are endowed with understanding of the entirety of the human condition via a grasp of cell biology. Those who have received a technical training are superior to those who can think, because learning to think, to analyse arguments, doesn't actually exist. There are no internal differences between individuals in ability (or volition, desire to learn). Some have had tool-wielding pasted onto their exteriors, others not.

Alcibiades. Please, Pericles, can you teach me what a law is?

Pericles. To be sure I can.

Alcibiades. I should be so much obliged if you would do so. One so often hears the epithet "law-abiding" applied in a complimentary sense; yet, it strikes me, one hardly deserves the compliment, if one does not know what a law is.

Pericles. Fortunately there is a ready answer to your difficulty. You wish to know what a law is? Well, those are laws which the majority, being met together in conclave, approve and enact as to what it is right to do, and what it is right to abstain from doing.

Alcibiades. Enact on the hypothesis that it is right to do what is good? or to do what is bad?

Pericles. What is good, to be sure, young sir, not what is bad.

Alcibiades. Supposing it is not the majority, but, as in the case of an oligarchy, the minority, who meet and enact the rules of conduct, what are these?

Pericles. Whatever the ruling power of the state after deliberation enacts as our duty to do, goes by the name of laws.

Alcibiades. Then if a tyrant, holding the chief power in the state, enacts rules of conduct for the citizens, are these enactments law?

Pericles. Yes, anything which a tyrant as head of the state enacts, also goes by the name of law.

Alcibiades. But, Pericles, violence and lawlessness--how do we define them? Is it not when a stronger man forces a weaker to do what seems right to him--not by persuasion but by compulsion?

Pericles. I should say so.

Alcibiades. It would seem to follow that if a tyrant, without persuading the citizens, drives them by enactment to do certain things--that is lawlessness?

Pericles. You are right; and I retract the statement that measures passed by a tyrant without persuasion of the citizens are law.

Alcibiades. And what of measures passed by a minority, not by persuasion of the majority, but in the exercise of its power only? Are we, or are we not, to apply the term violence to these?

Pericles. I think that anything which any one forces another to do without persuasion, whether by enactment or not, is violence rather than law.

Alcibiades. It would seem that everything which the majority, in the exercise of its power over the possessors of wealth, and without persuading them, chooses to enact, is of the nature of violence rather than of law?

To be sure (answered Pericles), adding: At your age we were clever hands at such quibbles ourselves. It was just such subtleties which we used to practise our wits upon; as you do now, if I mistake not.

Xenophon, *The Memorabilia* (trad. HG Dakyns)

Of course everyone knows a classical education is irrelevant to the modern world.

In this world where everyone is non-human, it is hard to be precise about the particular category of sub-humanity in which belong women. Women are irrational. His Grace's grasp of reason is tenuous to say the least. He commands. Others obey. The rationale for that obedience is that he was born to rule. Women are emotional. His Highness is merely psychotic. People are property, pawns on his chessboard. It is a mistake to say he is emotionally dead. Naturally the exterior is suave, sophisticated. You will not see His Grace screaming the hate he feels for those who refuse to accord with his wishes, nor the cardinal, nor the prince. Only the wilful and

rebellious must suffer, torment, pain unending. Especially if they are women. It is given. It is the divine order

The word is consensual. Most practitioners of BDSM are sane they recognize they practise a fantasy, even if that fantasy is 24/7; both parties are free to walk away.

For some a reciprocal satisfaction of need can never be enough nor is submission fantasy, merely execution of the divine order. Slaves do not walk away.

Self-will is evil. Will must be broken. The unwilling slave must become compliant, surrender, become a creature of her master's will, yearn, beg to please. Become the tireless servant of Truth.

'War is Peace. Freedom is Slavery. Ignorance is Strength.'

Mr Orwell would have understood perfectly. Dezzi too understands.

Mr Rushdie or Sir Salman, as he now is, would understand something further: the particular threat posed to an ideology by those who were born into it and have now matured.

The prince is a Muslim, the duke a Catholic, the politician a new Stalinist and the professor merely an undifferentiated fascist. Zere aim is world domination. A reasonable person might say OK, for the moment they are united by a hatred of Jews, women, gays and freedom, but the New World Order has to have a dominant ideology and they can't all be top dog. Actually, since the new Stalinists are second to none in upholding the rights of capital and of property, they can; time is not of significance to Allah and demographics will ensure the eventual Caliphate. For the moment we are all going to live happily ever after in the Fourth Reich. They have of course in common also being raving mad. Nonetheless, for reasons we shall go into later, they have seized the citadels of bourgeois power; not only do they believe the free world will fall to them, but they have a lot of other people believing it too.

There is no point in fighting. Ford Prefect would understand.

Consequently Dezzi is being thrown out of a Vogon air-lock.

This is merely the first time. Just don't mention petunias.