

# TO LOSE POWER OVER POWER

---

to Dictate, to be Dictated, to be a Dictator

An analysis

---

Eef Veldkamp 2014

What makes this exchange of letters so interesting is that these letters have been written by a dictator and a democratic revolutionary. While in democracy there's a gigantic gap between political powers and the people, it's already exceptional to hear about the personal lives and the reign of democratic leaders, not to mention to hear from a dictator who was being confronted with democracy. which raises questions about freedom, power, morality and nature. The relevance of this question is in the fact that we know democracy doesn't really work as we want it to work, but nevertheless we see it as the best social political system there is; this story made me wonder about the functioning of democracy. I tried to understand why this dictator had such a hard time understanding the system he was opposed with.

To do so I imposed myself with the task to analyze this story, to use it as a metaphor to weigh and oppose dictatorship to democracy. To do that I will address philosophers and other theorists that I think are fitting well with the context of the conversation. You will find my analysis in the footnotes. They can be read together with the letters, but you don't have to.

<sup>1</sup> The first question that comes up to me is 'whom is he writing to' and 'why?' He opens his letter with some Greek myths; they always have some sort of moral lesson in them. Maybe he's searching for a 'divine' answer to his questions? He starts with Icarus: A Greek mythological figure that had wings; in order to escape Crete. His father, who made the wings from wax and feathers, warned Icarus to not fly too close to the sea, which would loosen the feathers and he warned Icarus to not fly too high, because the sun would melt the wax his wings were made of. Icarus did fly to the sun, the wax melted and he fell back to the earth. In this passage I think the dictator wants to express that his people were already granted a good life, but they started wanting too much, eventually leading to the fall of the nation. What apparently had a bad influence on the people living in the dictator's country to.

<sup>2</sup> The Donkey in Lions skin is yet another Greek story. It's moral is very much like Icarus' but it expresses how one can fool himself into something he's not. It's about a donkey dressing up as a lion that terrorizes all the other 'stupid' animals; eventually a clever fox exposes the donkey. Erasmus also uses this reference, but he praised the stupidity of the donkey, and the animals, to be the only method to happiness. I think the dictator is trying to say that he has lost his persona, and that was what kept him in power. This addresses the fact that image is one of the key parts of being a leader.

<sup>3</sup> This dictator likes to speak in riddles. But when someone keeps referring to these Greek I think it to be kind of pretentious: He has some sort of an image problem. The Cornucopi is the horn of plenty, yet another Greek myth. It's said that the Cornucopi has fed Zeus; 'father of god and man' during his childhood. The dictator speaks as if he was Zeus, god of sky, lightning, thunder, law, order and justice; ruling and granting life to his people. Hermes; god of transition and boundaries but also of trade, thieves and guidance to the underworld, has apparently stole the Cornucopi. More importantly is that Hermes is the son of Zeus: Suggesting that the dictator has been overthrown by one of his own blood. This can mean two things, figuratively speaking as his people or literally as his own son.

<sup>4</sup> This is actually not as dictatorial as it sounds; Sigmund Freud, the famous inventor of psychoanalysis had proclaimed that man is irrational by nature. He actually believed that civilization wasn't an expression of human progress and freedom but that it was constructed to control the dangerous animals inside every human being: we're driven by beast like urges and drifts as hunger, thirst, sex. To live in a civilized society these urges were to be repressed. Freud believed that this was sort of a contradictory; these urges and drifts had to manifest themselves, making man dangerous and selfish. But his daughter Anna Freud and nephew Edward Bernays believed that these urges were controllable: Through the Super-Ego; rules, etiquettes and laws imposed by the state and culture that are strictly guiding and proclaiming what we can and cannot do. It frames within which boundaries we should think and act. Before this was discovered, people were judged by statutory values as age, sex, and income etcetera and more importantly were treated as rational thinking. But because it was discovered that everyone had his own personal needs, people were from that point on to be judged on their needs; we became consumers. The one point that's generally forgotten is that the ones making the rules or products, the ones controlling our irrationality do also have these irrational drifts themselves. *"It's not that the people are in charge, but the people's desires are in charge."* - Stuard Ewen.

<sup>5</sup> It's very common for leaders to study psychoanalysis or psychology. As democracy literally means 'by rule of the people', a leader has to understand how the people act and reason. Saying that he, our dictator, freed the people from the oppression of democracy sounds very controversial. But it's not such a crazy statement; It depends on how it's interpreted. For example: the 'Federal Code of Regulations' that was introduced in the USA in 1925 and counted only one book. Anno 2010 it contains more than 200 books, of which only the index already measures 700 pages. Another example: to be able to vote in the USA one has to measure up to 500 pages of laws. This trend of growing amounts of laws and rules can be seen in all indirect democracies. How this should implicate personal freedom just depends on your definition of freedom; it can differ from person to person, from culture to culture. Freedom is not a static term. *"Democracy is two wolves and one lamb deciding what they are going to eat for lunch. Freedom is a well-armed lamb who can defend itself from the outcome of this election"* - Benjamin Franklin

<sup>6</sup> I don't think our dictator means what I interpreted. But it fits with the context to associate this passage with Plato's allegory of the cave: Socrates asks his discussion partner to imagine a cave in which people have been imprisoned from childhood. These people are chained to the wall, preventing them from moving or looking around: they can only see the opposite wall. Above the wall the prisoners are chained to is a ledge; behind that ledge is another ledge with a fire. On the first ledge people outside the cave place objects, puppets and other things; casting a shadow on the wall the prisoners are looking at. Socrates suggests that this shadow substitutes reality for the prisoners because they have never seen anything else. This can also be applied on our experience of freedom. How we experience freedom and reality is shaped by the society we live in, meaning that there is no eternal definition of freedom. Plato also talks about a prisoner that has escaped. After all those years in the cave, he's shocked by what he sees: he's afraid, nothing is as he has known, he is so afraid and confused that he runs back into the cave and starts looking at the shadows again. Freedom and reality are to things that go hand to hand. Plato's cave implicates that 'seeing' the 'reality' is not something easy, it takes bravery and power, as it does take a sense of responsibility too. Reality implicitly means 'what's seen as normal'. Normal is a very static word these days. Though the world has become smaller, we know more different cultures and ideas, we have also become less flexible. Something

special has to be normal too. Through psychology and medical sciences we have discovered how things should work, and how they can be fixed. This creates a very static form of being normal; it only takes a little to be seen as abnormal. The problem is that nobody is the same, as no culture is the same. We want people to correspond to what we think is normal, even though we ourselves are not even corresponding. Politics has seen the same trend, we're less and less reluctant with different systems and the other is something dangerous. It suggests that it's possible to do some things different that how it's currently done.

<sup>7</sup> Plato's cave raises some questions about our perception of freedom, and the fear to face something that transcends our current perception freedom. Kant suggests that we should take responsibility for our freedom, meaning that freedom is not a basic human right; it something with obligations. We should use our capability to reason to measure freedom, not to what extent our urges are fulfilled. One thing that makes us fear freedom is that there is something in the contrary; to be imprisoned. Being imprisoned is yet again a very subjective term. One can feel imprisoned when he's missing a leg, but one can also feel imprisoned when he's not granted any intellectual opportunities. But freedom can be in everything, As Sartre explains it just depends how we deal with the choices we have, and more importantly, how we take responsibility for the choices we make. It's very common for autocratic regimes to punish people by physical punishment, not by institutionalizing, as we do in democracy, it's like living propaganda: It leaves very distinct scars on the body, telling others what not to do. There are some key differences between physical and mental punishment. Philosopher Michel Foucault uses the metaphor of a panopticon to described mental imprisonment. Jeremy Bentham's panopticon: *"Bentham's Panopticon is the architectural figure of this composition. We know the principle on which it was based: at the periphery, an annular building; at the centre, a tower; this tower is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring; the peripheric<sup>7</sup> building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building; they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; the other, on the outside, allows the light to cross the cell from one end to the other. All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy. By the effect of backlighting, one can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light, the small captive shadows in the cells of the periphery. They are like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible. The panoptic mechanism arranges spatial unities that make it possible to see constantly and to recognize immediately. In short, it reverses the principle of the dungeon; or rather of its three functions - to enclose, to deprive of light and to hide - it preserves only the first and eliminates the other two. Full lighting and the eye of a supervisor capture better than darkness, which ultimately protected. Visibility is a trap."* - *"The soul is the effect and instrument of a political anatomy; the soul is the prison of the body"* - Michel Foucault. Foucault first underlines that one can imprison a body, while the mind can still be free. But when one imprisons the mind, the body is also in control. The fact that this system works is because the prisoners are their own guards; they're so afraid of being watched that they eventually keep themselves calm. In other prisons where it's dark, you're enclosed and hidden; the mind can get the perfect circumstances to plan an escape.

<sup>8</sup> Leaders depend on backers to stay in power. It's a must for all leaders. Leadership is never a one-man job; even a dictator has advisers and bureaucratic organs. Backers have a strange kind of political power: They have to support the leader to keep him in power but if a leader wants them to do so, he has to do something in return: mostly resulting in money or policies. Backers are anyone keeping the leader in power. But leaders don't want their backers to feel as if they have the right to be too critical; that's dangerous. When a backer thinks he knows something better, he can also think he is a better leader, which can eventually lead in overthrowing the leader. So you want your backers to stay calm and busy with other tasks as working, consuming and so on. As a dictator you want people to hold on the idea that you, and only you, know the 'divine' answers. A leader wants to be the guard in the central watchtower of the panopticon. He needs to be there to make the system work, but he also needs the prisoners to be able to be in the watchtower. Democratic leaders even depend more on backers and on more backers. Making it even harder to keep them happy with your reign, so democratic leaders have to put extra effort in keeping his backers busy and content, this generally works with providing them with anything their urges demand, not what their reason demands.

<sup>9</sup> Of course he knew what happened in the basement; to be a leader one has to be somewhat ignorant and naive. When one always cares about others, and always looks what affect his actions could have, one could never ever introduce policies or utilize his power - he has to keep a 'healthy' distance to the people. *"People know what they do; frequently they know why they do what they do; but what they don't know is what what they do does."* - Michel Foucault. To be able to lead, one has to take risk. This has consequences one of them is complete failure. When people don't know 'what what they doe does' they can never anticipate or take responsibility for their action. The important question to ask is what's the motivation to do the things people do. Is this from a individualistic, communal, economic, consumerist, emphatic, rational or irrational (and so on) standpoint. Because some reasons to do things are a priori evading the consequence of the action. While a consumerists' action is a priori the consequence too, regardless of what has happened with the product before or after the consume.

---

<sup>10</sup> The reason his father didn't want him to spend time with the people of the country is because the gap between government and the people is there for a reason. To steer and rule over a country a leader has to generalize it's subjects. He has to create a stereotype; he can't treat every citizen as an individual, he has to make policies for the general good. To do that, a leader has to keep distance in the literal sense of the word. A common critique of democracy is that the people have no connection with their leader; they feel that when they choose a leader they should be able to refer themselves with him/her. A more drastic view is that his father wanted to prevent that his son would feel empathy for the people; which would have certainly resulted in a weak leader – in the dictatorship discourse. Though empathy is one of the most powerful tools of human beings, its seen as a threat. This is because, as I already suggested, leaders have to keep a distance from the people to keep a healthy political environment – and this is true. Important to notice is that, as Foucault said, power is never in the hands of one person or even a few; it's in the hands of us all. We admit and take the power we grant a leader. We're responsible for that power and as long we grant that power on individualistic basis we will always be discontent, because it will not be heard. One person screaming is loud and clear. Millions of people screaming becomes noise, unintelligible and has to be filtered out. But the voice of one is almost worthless in mass democracy, what a contradiction. I hear voices in my head boggle but it true, we have to admit. I want to suggest to shift granting power, or in other words: voting, from an individualistic basis to an emphatic basis: public voting. So that we have to look around us, to see what the problems are in our society. Normally one vote's in complete privacy: looking at oneself and the benefits for the self that could come with a certain vote. I would like to suggest changing that habit. I would like to suggest that people should flaunt with their ideas, engaging in discussions and mostly be emphatic. Look around you; what are the problems others walk into? What's wrong in our society? Democracy is a group thing, not a group of individuals – at least not in the political sense.

<sup>11</sup> If the people are always afraid, a leader has to be too. He probably knew that his people didn't like him, and therefor could find reason to kill him. To prevent this from happening he had to be on guard, all the time, and the only reason why one is on guard is because he's afraid. Hand in hand with that he wanted to keep a sort of god like status to his reign intact; knowing that when people could see him as a normal man, they could also see themselves as supreme leader – image is very important - in every form of leadership. A leader wants his people to see him as a strong person, as someone that has the capabilities to rule. Propaganda is a very good way to steer public opinion. Edward Bernays also knew this; He reformulated the term 'propaganda' because of it's bad reputation to 'Public Relations' – with the function to steer and crystalize public opinion concerning products, services and policies/political campaigning.

<sup>12</sup> First the dictator says that everyone is wearing these old clothes – implicating poverty -, than his teacher says that their economy is flourishing. Maybe the economy is flourishing for the wallet of the leader – taking money away from his people. High taxes are a symbol of autocracy, this is because it demobilizes and demotivates people – as a leader you don't want your people to have the resources to revolt. But it's important to relativize. The consequence of very high taxes is that people will dodge paying taxes by doing undeclared work. Taxing is an act of balancing; do you want a big part of a small cake, or a small part of a big cake? In many democratic countries the governmental spending is about 50% or more of the BNP. Remember that all government spending almost purely consists of taxes paid by the people.

<sup>13</sup> One cannot do 'whatever he wants' if one has to obey a law. But on the other hand, to live in a society there have to be laws, at least that's thought. Freedom is very usually closely related to having money; when one has money one has freedom. Because one doesn't have to be a part of the every day routine, as we all know it, to be able to fulfill our basic needs. Freedom is the aim to be completely independent. Our dictator suggests, implicitly, that he want's the people to be dependent; this is what generates political power. Dependence means that one relies on the other to be able to survive. Everyone has political responsibility, which means that anyone indeed has influence and is also responsible for the influence and consequences of actions from the other. Granting someone else your political responsibility generates dependence. As man, according to Kant can't bear the responsibility of one's own actions, we want's someone else to bear this responsibility. Kant says that this is part our responsibility because we are lazy and cowardly, we don't want to do more than is necessary and this is part fault of the state, in which the structures are designed to keep us calm and lazy. With the implicit message 'keep calm, we will arrange it'. This is where the state comes in, democratic or dictatorial, it offers to adopt this responsibility in exchange for being part of its system of laws, obligations and norms and values. It will arrange the way we live, think, and interact with others in exchange for submission and money. Due to this fact, which dates back to the first societies mankind knows we eventually 'learned' to be lazy cowards. Being a coward is not a human characteristic, it's a response to a human characteristic: fear, and responses are not fixed; one can learn to respond differently to certain situations. The thing preventing this change in responses to happen is laziness. Laziness is a human characteristic responsive to fear; it keeps us from confronting it and forces us to stay in our own safe, happy state.

<sup>14</sup> As I already described with the panopticon it's very common for more autocratic countries to use a more physical form of control in contrast to the mental oppression in more democratic countries people do feel safer when a force surrounds them but what most people don't see is that it also places them in a controlled

---

environment: A wall keeps others out, but its also keeping people in. When you live in a democratic country, you can't decide you don't want to be part of this democracy: you must. You can't permanently escape democracy.

<sup>15</sup> Thanks to the huge bureaucratic system in most parliamentary democracies police officers spent more time filling in form that actually solving crimes. In the Netherlands at least 700.000 crime reports stay untreated (2011). Even from which some 100.000 the culprit is known. In autocracies there usually isn't such a big bureaucratic system thanks to the fact that there are less government agencies as public schooling or welfare; it functions more as a - and this sounds very controversial - liberalism. If people want something, they should make use of their 'freedom' to arrange it themselves. Liberal economists suggest that when there is less government influence people will feel more motivated to undertake action and control over their own lives.

<sup>16</sup> Journalism and free journalism are often seen as two very different things; it can be a tool for propaganda, controlling what people can or cannot know. And with free journalism it's suggested that it's autonomous to the state. Of course freedom is a very abstract term: It doesn't have a clear - dictionary like - definition. It's dependent on culture and morality. Eventually 'someone' decides what will be the news, filtering out things that are seen as irrelevant or even dangerous. Journalism in most democratic countries is a particularized 'public good'. This means that economics rule journalism; the one who pays the most, gets the news. Leaders tent, especially in democratic countries to bend journalism to their own benefit; they don't want something harmful to be said about them. This makes me wonder about autonomy of journalism; to what extent is it possible to act and be autonomous? I think it's the worst when it's said that something functions autonomous, but it actually doesn't. When it's honestly admitted that it isn't autonomous; it at least gives the watcher and listener a chance to be conscious about the fact. In dictatorship everyone knows it's controlled by the state.

<sup>17</sup> This can be interpreted in multiple ways. When the system decides what's reachable by the public, it controls the way the public experiences freedom. But it can also function as blinkers; a leader can very delicately decide what's in the horizon of the public, gently steering opinion and propagandize. This is something that happens in every social political system. There are rules in every society that proclaims what we can and cannot see, hear, buy and experience. For example, in democracies we have lobby groups: organizations representing corporations as oil, tobacco, agriculture companies which try to advocate their interests onto politics

<sup>18</sup> Actually most dictators do think that they are doing the right and good thing. But I think this tells us more about the person than about the system. There's one big question on my mind; it's undeniable that many dictators were crazy. According to psychological studies done about Saddam Hussein, Hitler, Kim Jong-Il and other dictators it was found that they very regularly suffered from: Narcissistic Personality Disorder, Paranoid Personality Disorder, schizophrenic Personality Disorder, Manic Depression or Antisocial Personality Disorder. Now I wonder, do the most powerful positions attract crazy people? Or do these positions that claim the most power make these leaders crazy?

<sup>19</sup> Well, true, but in practice I doubt the fact. Again there's an intentional gap between the people and the leader. Next to the fact that its literally impossible to speak to 'the people'.

<sup>20</sup> Again he refers to the idea that freedom can cause oppression and oppression can cause freedom too. I think this is a harsh statement. But when one thinks of the effect that oppression causes, it actually can cause freedom. One has to take his own destiny in his own hands; one has to become ruler of his own existence, as Sartre described in the existentialism. He literally said we're responsible for our own freedom. He famously said that "existence precedes essence" meaning that not the fact that you're 'there' matters but what you do with the fact that you're 'there'. *"Freedom is what we do with what is done to us."* — Jean-Paul Sartre

<sup>21</sup> The dictator sees this 'fulfilling basic needs' as a very important part of society. Logically people have to fulfill these needs in order to survive and this is often related to economics. Bruno Latour describes that our first nature: these animal-like or bodily needs we all have to satisfy. Has switched with our second nature: the systems we live in. meaning that we can only satisfy our needs on basis and rules of economics and politics. But I think the dictator uses it as a method of control. When one keeps his people busy with satisfying these needs, they probably wont have the time and opportunity to think further and question their context. On the other hand, when one is so hungry and so unsuited to satisfy these needs it will drive him to revolt - the dictator has to balance between content and discontent. In many democracies one does not have to spend all his time on satisfying these needs, there are social securities that will provide the unluckiest with housing, income to buy food etcetera. It's generally thought that this causes space for critical thinking and participation in the society, and does, but not to the extent that's thought. When everything is provided, people will get lazy, as Kant tells us in "what is enlightenment", it's like being full after a big meal. Everyone has to be part of the circle of economics, as a food chain. When one is individualized enough to be able to produce and live completely on his own (as a small form of communism or liberalism) one can step out of this chain, endangering the welfare of others: the entrepreneur loses a customer which can cause him to lose profit and starve to death himself. That's why, as Freud said, we have to be discontent to live in a society. We have to want more and more, we have to think that everything we buy, we buy because it

---

satisfies our basic needs. For your consideration: these needs are impossible to satisfy, they will keep coming back and back – just like hunger – forcing us to stay part of this circle of economics, the food chain.

<sup>22</sup> I wonder what he sees as the dangers of pornography. It can be a decision based on moral, but it could also be that he didn't want his people to admit to excesses. He could think that it causes the people to radicalize. As some leaders are afraid that playing videogames in which killing is the most important fun factor, will increase mortalities due to gunfights. Georges Bataille, also named philosopher of evil, has said that man has separated himself from being part of nature (same as first nature from Latour and Freud) through labor. But, as Freud also suggest, everyone has an urge to return to this nature. The only way that's possible, according to Bataille, is through death – becoming an inorganic state again, just as any animal will end up. Death is forbidden by the system, it dangerous to oneself and the other, there are tons of rules, laws and social securities which will prevent you from dying or killing others. Next to that one will not be part of this 'food chain' I already introduced, one will not be profitable. That's why most leaders and even dictators do not hesitate to invest in hospitals. But we want and need to transgress. There are a few ways we can get 'in touch' with nature: through sublimated transgression. Although these ways are designed and supervised by the system, these discourses allowed by the system that will grant us a short touch with nature: As shooters, pornography, (some) drugs as alcohol or cannabis and sex.

<sup>23</sup> This sounds very much as what George Ritzer described as 'McDonaldization': the process of when a culture adopts the characteristics of a fast-food restaurant. It moves traditional thinking to rational thinking. It consists of 4 parts; efficiency, calculability, predictability and control. Keep McDonalds on your mind. Efficiency means getting from hungry to full as fast as possible: every employee has his own specialization like baking burgers or fries just in order to get the food as fast as possible into the customer, and the customer as fast as possible out of the McDonalds, to make room for another customers. Calculability means to value quantity above quality. The taste of the food is subordinate to how much food is sold. But the important part is that the customer thinks it get's lots of 'good' food for little money. The cook is assessed on the basis of how fast he can cook, not on how good he can cook. Predictability means that it's the same, everywhere, anytime. The burger will look the same every time you eat it, wherever you are. Even the employees wear the same uniform everywhere, anytime. The tasks of the employees are routines, specializations. This is all because it has to work predictable, as a machine. And the last is control: for every process and action in the McDonalds there's a guideline, code of conduct, instruction manual that are ought to be followed.

<sup>24</sup> The dictator sees the dangers that an individualized society could create opposing to his reign. When people will only act from their own motivations, and not from those of the group. In democracies we know this is very common, and promoted through commercials, political campaigns and so on. It's handy for democrats because one can address his standpoints on individual basis, addressing a person. This makes it impossible to construct a firm group and when individuals collect in a group, their individual responsibility and power will exponentially grow as they collect and bond, they will merge into something bigger than themselves. This is dangerous for democrats because 'the rule of the people' is what democracy is based upon, so they have to listen. This is not the case when there is just a very large 'pool' of individuals because one vote is negligible. Dictators are not representing 'the voice of the people', this emediatle makes all the people a group, they are bonded in the fact that they do not have a voice, no freedom as we know it. But because they are one big group the do have power. Due to the fact that the dictator's peole are a priori one big group, he can't make individualized policies, he can't adress one at his personal needs. This emediatly forces the dictator to excersize politics at a metaphysical level, generally causing policies that are based on the countries moral, tradition or adressng structural problems.

<sup>25</sup> Well, it's true that dictators aim to be in seat for a very long time, and this does make long term plans possible like how to deal with global warming etcetera. In most parliamentarian democracies the government will be reelected about every 4 years. Due to the fact that people nowadays almost never vote the same, parties have to campaign with different standpoints every election. Next to that the newly formed government will sweep most of the plans generated by its predecessor from the table as soon as they take seat.

<sup>26</sup> *"Seek not the favour of the multitude; it is seldom got by honest and lawful means. But seek the testimony of few; and number not voices, but weigh them."*— Immanuel Kant

<sup>27</sup> He jokes that it is not him or the people that have dug their own grave, but the dictator that has cast himself to his own destruction. 'Hades' is the Greek god of the underworld.

<sup>28</sup> Honesty is a big word. One should see it in context. Many dictators reign in a very direct way. They dare to apply their ideologies and thoughts on morality onto the country. There are many examples of dictator's who did the craziest things. For example; Saparmurat Niazov, leader of Turkmenistan from 1990 until he died in 2006 made forbidding voice-overs into a law. Or; Rafael Trujillo ordered all the churches in his country to put a signboard next to the door saying: "God in Heaven, Trujillo on earth". Or this real superlunary one: Francisco Macias Nguema closed down hospitals because he believed the Witch Doctor Ancestry to be better, he even banned the word "intellectual" and for a unknown reason he banned fishing too. These are extreme's but they are very direct and they all focus on the image of the leader. Democratic leaders tend to be subtler, first for the fact that they want to be reelected; dictators don't have to be reelected. Second because they depend on lots and lots of other people like their followers. As everyone thinks something else, these ideas have to be distilled; they have to be generalized to be applied on the public. This makes them very cautious with saying or doing things based on ideology. But this makes them appear dishonest to the people too. Because of the huge group of backers democratic leaders have to relate to their standpoints have to be generalized; they have to be compromised so that every backer can kind of agree with them. This is why the policies and law accepted in democracies are usually very minor ones like driving 130 km/h instead of 120 km/h on the highway. The sharp edges of the laws and policies we see in dictatorships are not that easily found in democracy. It could generate very nuanced policies and laws, but it could also result in laws and policies that are so nuanced that they are slippery and unintelligible eventually framing every aspect of life.

<sup>29</sup> When one controls what is learned, one controls the intellectual opportunities of the people. This is a thing in every system that organizes public schooling, and it's a great tactic to control. While there's a big difference between the ways this is executed between the dictator's system and the democrat's system it indirectly means the same. While under the dictator's reign his people learned much about the dictator himself, we, in the democratic system almost only learn about theoretical sciences. Schooling does steer the mindset of the people. It generates the contexts the systems want their people to think within. It can work in the opposite direction too: when people only learn about a dictator something inside them can generate an urge to learn about other things. Public welfare tells us a lot about the state of the country and it's politics. In most western democracies we learn about theoretical sciences, this shows us few things. For example theoretical sciences are very much ruled by laws, you can have it exactly wrong or right. According to this outcome you're graded, everyone is graded according to the same standard, discarding individual talents and weaknesses; this is how people are labeled smart or stupid. Our schooling systems stem from the industrial revolution and are actually based on the system of a factory. The students are the products, the teachers are the assembly line employees, the machines are the teaching methods and the state is the director. Producing people that are all ought to have the same qualities, intelligences and skills. This will, again, create a predictable citizen. Prepped for the jobs already out there. What we can learn at school tells us a lot about the moral of the state. But nevertheless it's a good thing that state's provide public schooling, the only important question is if they should be the one's deciding what's learned, and how it should be arranged. This makes schooling a machine. Subjective to the needs of the leader and the state, this generates dependence and grants every individual a function that's profitable for the state.

<sup>30</sup> So the democratic is one of the 'normal people'. Democracy literally means 'rule by the people'. But how can a representative stand for the normal people? He too has to generalize his subjects to be able to lead them. Stealing is to take something from someone without asking and without giving something back. In dictatorship this is very translucent. One has to pay enormous taxes without seeing something back in the form of policies. In democracy a person pays for all the other people in democracy: 0.00001% pays for 99.99999% of the people, and the other way around. But there's a small problem. People also pay for things they themselves do not want, but the others maybe do. They may have voted against a policy, but they have not won the election therefor they have to pay for something they don't want. This doesn't mean that these policies aren't needed or good; it just means that it's not 'the people' that rule, but just the multitude. The way these systems are executed generates hate towards one another; you will never get what 'you' and the other will never get what the 'other' wants. This makes everyone feel powerless and this makes everyone always blame the others. I suggest we should be more emphatic, I don't think the system of how individuals access and make use of their personal power or responsibility works. Voting in mass democracies (democracies with many 'others') is demotivating and demobilizing. I think we should search for a system that doesn't emanate from political color, but from a problemization. Leftist or rightist motivations should be put aside, we should all be neutral: this is the only form in which you can address a case or problem at its cause instead of its consequence. It forces us to think about morality on a metaphysical level, instead of a self-centered profit based level.

<sup>31</sup> Being afraid is very important in the way power is divided and distributed. The fact that the dictators' father has kept him from the people is because his father was afraid, afraid because he knew his people were angry and could possibly hurt his son. This caused that the dictator was afraid too and tried everything to keep the people within boundaries. People are also afraid of the ones in power, fear

demobilizes people, it confronts people with death and death is the ultimate withdrawal. For people it feels like giving in to the problem. Though, when fear is so abundant, it can also reach a point in which people lose their fear of death, and even see it as a sacrifice. This is when people will revolt; any spark of hope they can see on the horizon will promise more than the misery they live in. In democracy we are too prosperous, to dare to face our fear of questioning and criticizing the system. Our fear is that we will lose all the benefits we experience in democracy when we criticize the system. Fear is a form of self-defense, but not a proactive form. Fear can generate a feeling of uselessness and make's people feel as if the have no influence. But influence is not only in the litigable forms of carrying out power as voting. It's exactly and only functions in the space between the oppression and the ones oppressed. It's a discursive and abstract thing, voting degenerates the feeling of influence because it's promoted as the only form of real influence. In dictatorships there is no voting, the influence manifests in everything the people do that eventually leads back to the oppressor.

<sup>32</sup> Dictators like to be treated as gods because just as gods in religions they are unchangeable. It also gives them the image of being inviolable, suppressing the people to undertake action against him, and therefore suppressing his own fear. It does fear people when someone else has more power than you do, and fear is always demobilizing. Positioning one as a god suggests being there forever, and there's nothing and nobody who can change that. Democratic leaders have to face the fact that they have to be reelected, so they can't position themselves as gods, they have to be dynamic. But this has more to do with positioning than with dialectics or reasoning.

<sup>33</sup> Why do we choose the leaders we choose? Back in the day when religion had a stronger position in society people chose their leaders and party's as if it was a religion too. Religion played a big role in prescribing how people should think about politics and more importantly about morality. Party's campaigned with almost the same moral points applied on problems every election period. Which political color treated problems the best would be defined by time. Resulting in a very stable political environment. In 1882 Nietzsche proclaimed the death of god; because we didn't need religion anymore to define the world around us, science now claimed that task. This meant that the moral values opposed by religion weren't relevant anymore; we had to reformulate morality and that's hard, for example; after more than 1800 years of Christianity these moral values had formed the base of our society. These days the campaigning topics change as fast as the wind. First because of the fact that politicians aim for the individual and his desires, second because people themselves don't have these eternal moral values anymore. Contemporary democratic politicians are so afraid to campaign according to ideology or moral that they are forced to campaign with populist points or topics addressing desires. Psychology has played one more important part in contemporary politics. This is in the fact that leaders now realize how image and looks influences our ideas about someone. As we all know, since the television is publicly accessible, how our leaders look and act within the stage presented by the media, we easily associate characteristics with people, for example he looks nice, friendly, smart, stupid, dumb etcetera. Looking nice or smart is something else that being nice or smart. Image is very important, not only with the dictator but with every leader. Façade seems to say more about content than content itself. For example the 'usage' of makeup or clothing; which are wore to carry out a statement or to say something about the person who wears it. The first nature of clothing is to keep us warm, protect the body and keep some sort of privacy/exclusivity. The second nature is what we want to state by wearing these cloths, and how this is a part of the systems we live in. It seems that nowadays these two natures, as well as that of politics and economics, as Latour already told us, have changed positions. Nietzsche has never found out what this new morality should be.

<sup>34</sup> As we now know a small part of how we chose leaders and that leaders want to be reelected, it does sound reasonable to ask how leaders want to be reelected. The thought that it will cause politicians to perform their jobs better is a very noble and reasonable one. But what I already suggested with Kant's 'what is enlightenment' is that people are lazy, and we will only do the absolute minimal to reach the goal we intent to reach. So there are two different questions, which are almost the same. How do I get reelected and what do I have to do to get reelected. The answer to the first one is very simple; win the public opinion. The answer to the second is harder; do I want to win the public opinion through good standpoints or through using public opinion to win it. The first answer is a problematization the second one is a polemical answer. A problematization addresses problems that occur, using public opinion as a medium that addresses these problems; it's aimed to address the source of the problem, not the outcome. It prevents the same problem to occur over and over again. Polemics admits the questions and needs opposed by the public you want to win for yourself. It addresses problems at their outcome and not at their source, giving the politician the opportunity to address this consequence every time it occurs without having to address it's source – it works great for being reelected, not so great for creating a better society. This is what we see in populism.

<sup>35</sup> As stupid as these policies may sound they do provoke creativity. They can be a thread to everyday welfare but are more of a tickle than a stab. We see these kinds of policies a lot in dictatorships. Look them up it's fun! For the clearness of the case: this is different than a dictator killing his people because of any ideology. These are policies and not direct consequences of craziness. Many democracies have endless rules for everything. From how a wristband of a watch should look to how warm the coffee should be when you buy it at a local kiosk, I don't see how this is different. This degenerates creativity, for everything are rules

---

and laws. It's said to protect us against the consequences of the economics of the free market – a very rational consideration, but economics rules politics too. To me this sounds more like control than to be unable to wear a beard or to buy clay roof tiles – or in other words - consequences of policies sprung from morality.

<sup>36</sup> This is a really good question; why does he do that? But he not only does that. When someone gives me advise about one of my weaknesses I tend to give the same advise to someone with the same weaknesses without having solved my own weaknesses. I think that I, and everyone else want to be the 'leader' in human interaction. When one gains information through interaction there's always a giver and a receiver. Which generates a very distinct hierarchy. The dictator has eulogized this phenomon, but why? I think because a leader has to keep up an image of being more than everyone else. This is because people will not want someone as their leader that admits he is a person with problems as everyone else. It will make the leader look weak, and people will not trust him with their vote or responsibility.

<sup>37</sup> This is a reaction to the dictator's statement about how one should not count voices but weigh them. It's a typical example of the dualistic about if quantity or quality has more value. Democracy is based on the voice of the multitude that defiantly implicates quantity; it's a very honest and noble gesture. Everyone, independent of statutory values, plays a part in deciding everyone else's future. This has nothing to do with quality, but even if it did, quality is very subjective. One does need the voice of the multitude to decide if something has quality. Quality itself only exists in the judgment of people. There is one big 'but', the judgment is heavily influenced by the expertise of the people judging. Sometimes one has to exclude the unwitting to be able to come to a valuable answer. That's why it would be weird if politicians didn't have knowledge about politics. That's why it would be weird if the minister of public schooling hasn't been a teacher himself. Well, actually, this is the case. Many politicians have never studied politics, and many ministers of public schooling haven't been a teacher themselves. We see this in every facet of government. How could they judge over how this is arranged, if they don't really know anything about how it's done?

<sup>38</sup> Well, in parliamentary democracies politicians are representatives of the people, so one could say that they don't need the expertise, they only need to capture and retranslate the voice of the people. Again this is a very noble gesture, but it embodies quantity and not quality. But when a democratic coalition is formed they need at least 51% vs. 49% to win. First of all this embodies quantity but it also embodies the discrimination of the other 49% based on nothing but their political color/preference. The 49% has to pay and participate in the choices and policies formed by the 51%, meaning that they have to be a part of something they explicitly voted against. In dictatorship one could say that it's one's voices against the rest. Although this one percent has excess to complete power, the quantity is still with the people, this is one of the most important parts in forming revolutions. The quantity can conclude on the quality of the one percent, not the other way around. *"Democracy is nothing more than the reign of the mob. Where 51% of the people can steal the rights from the 49% of the people that are left."* – Thomas Jefferson. Democracy is the dictatorship of the multitude. Dictatorship is the democracy of the few.

<sup>39</sup> Any political system experiences benefits when it keeps its citizens healthy and alive. The blood that flows through the body of the political systems that keeps it alive is made out of money, its easily seen that when one is part of the political food chain for as long as possible it works beneficial for the system. These systems can be kept intact because of the tax payers, but to get the people crazy enough to give away part of their salary's these systems have to offer something in return. It works the best when what the system gives in return, motivates the people to be part of the food chain as long as possible. That's why healthcare isn't only there for our basic human rights; it's there too to power the system. That's why education is often public or subsidized; it carries the promise that its user will once pay back the money they cost, preferably with interest. Of course this functions differently in dictatorship that in democracy. As democratic leaders and everyone in the democratic system earns wages, the dictator can take whatever he wants. This raises the question about who controls the leader? There's justice; but it's also arranged by the system itself, we see the same in dictatorship. There are the people, but they only bear power in collectives that are not that self-evident because people also serve their own interest. And there is morality. When one raises morality to the base of every action, a good man will prevent himself from doing bad things to others. But as Nietzsche already explained is god dead, and according to Freud we only serve our own drifts and needs making it very hard to start 'believing' again.

<sup>40</sup> Speaking in 'We' or 'I' are great ways to visualize the context which within one is talking. The dictator spoke in I, taking responsibility of his words onto himself. It does also implicate a kind of selfishness, not thinking about the other; and thinking about the other is one of the key parts of being a leader. Talking in 'we' is almost the other way around. Though it implicates a kind of social vision, regarding what others could think, it does also shift the responsibility of ones words from the self to the others that you claim that back you. Eventually it's one person speaking, not a country, not a group, not even two people.

<sup>41</sup> Being honest is a very difficult task for any politician. There's a general consensus that people can't bear or don't deserve the truth, that's the reason there are so many confidential files. It's generally categorized under safety with 'other' countries in aim. But mostly it stems from the fear that the leader's people might find out or know something about the leader or his regime that could be harmful to himself or his reign. People in dictatorships know they are being oppressed and are clearly fighting or struggling with it. People in democracies don't know they are oppressed. Consciousness, in the Freudian sense of the word means that one can treat it, because one knows it. When something is in the unconscious we do feel it, but can't place it, making it impossible to treat. Freud developed a technique to get information, trauma's and other suppressed things to the conscious mind to be able to face them. This is called psychoanalysis. Maybe we should perform psychoanalysis on our own societies, to be able to find the underlying problems.

<sup>42</sup> The very famous case of Eichmann who personally was responsible for trafficking millions of Jewish during the Second World War, underlines this phenomenon. Hannah Arendt posed that he wasn't such a devil as everyone thought. He was just a man doing his job; a subject of bureaucracy. Though the problem is that - as Foucault's quote states<sup>(9)</sup> - that he didn't question himself and he didn't question what affects his actions could have. He wasn't a subject of bureaucracy, Eichmann was an object of his leader; he was used as an object, he had a clear function that was not to be questioned (have you ever seen a vase questioning if it was a vase?). Hitler has used indoctrination and control to such an extent that 'his subjects' apparently stopped questioning themselves and became objects. Or was it just fear for being killed when one did not do what was asked. Or is it the fear of being responsible for one's own actions or the fear of having no function, meaning that the leader has to delegate his subjects? It's dangerous when subjects of the state question their leader and even more dangerous when they question their own function because this will give the people the chance to become their own subject again; to be able to question and reason. This will eventually make the leaders grip loosen. It will generate some sort of public awareness, which eventually can lead to the downfall of the leader. So a leader tends to keep his people occupied; the leader gives the people no resources to start questioning his reign. For your consideration: Do we live in a society where we're ought to think for ourselves? According to Arendt the greatest evil is to take someone's function away. When a refugee has no nationality that protects him or provides him with the basic human rights this person will become a thing, because he will never get a chance to develop as a person, to delegate oneself; therefore we need a state (to get a job, schooling, healthcare etc.). When one is stateless one will never have the opportunity to move freely, literally and figural. But on the other hand the state defines within what boundaries one can move, and apparently, no boundaries make it even harder to move. It's a great contradiction. An object is always a creation of mankind; it's something with a clear function. It's a useless thing without the interaction of a subject. A hammer is used to hammer nails, a chair is made to sit on, and they can only fulfill their function through the interaction of subject. So when an object loses its function it will become a thing; like it's impossible to drink from a broken drinking glass. An object needs the interaction with a subject to have a function; a subject always has to project a function onto a thing to make it an object. But this also works that way on persons, on the subjects themselves; when a person has no function it will become a thing. Arendt states that one needs a purpose, a function to be treated as a human. The only one that provides the necessary climate to delegate oneself is the state, so to have a function one always relies on a state. This makes people the subject of their state. When we retranslate it to objects and things, we're objects of the state. We're tools used by a state to achieve certain goals: teach next generations, build new buildings, and generate tax money and so on. So according to Arendt, the worst evil in the world is to not be an object of the state; but to be free in some sense. The evil according to Arendt is to be a functionless thing. Translated to our context evil is to be exiled by a state, to not be oppressed, to not be a puppet. So actually a leader is doing good, on moral basis, to steer and oppress his people – according to Arendt.

<sup>43</sup> Well almost every society, regardless of form of government, has some basic rules that conclude laws about crime, citizenship, housing and so on. Maybe he tries to say that democracy, as any from of government is just a reformulation of other types of government, as dictatorship is too. I think he suggests that the problem is not in the fact that democracy or dictatorship is good or bad, but that the whole structure we've once created which bonded people in a society is wrong. This emerged when man started exploiting agriculture instead of being hunter-gatherers. Since they didn't have to wander to fulfill their basic needs, they had to learn how to live next to a neighbor, with total different culture, norms and values, instead of living in a familial context. They'd sit together and made up that they should make rules which framed one's own property, one's own rights and so on. The big thing I think went wrong is that this is dialectic. It's based on the fact that there are always two opposing parties who, polemically, fight about their

own rights and thoughts. Instead it would be a lot more constructive and peaceful if we just accepted that we're neighbors, living in the same society, admitting and respecting others' thoughts and ideas instead of trying to change or frame them. It would be more constructive if we didn't fight for our own personal interest and rights, but for the interests and rights of the community, the combined metaphysical needs of the society instead of our own.

<sup>44</sup> Any form of excess can be dangerous; it breaks with the laws and shows others that it's possible to break the laws. As a leader you don't want this to happen, you want people to obey. But leaders know that men will naturally resist when a lot of rules are applied. So leaders and governments have to open channels in which men can express his excesses. Otherwise men will express them onto the oppressor. As I already described with Bataille <sup>(22)</sup> one has to transgress. As impossible as it may be due to all kinds of regulations and laws that are there because transgression can be dangerous, it has to be done. But as individuals have to transgress, collectives and communities have to transgress too. The dictator says that democracies tend to force this aggression onto others, outside of their democracy. Maybe this is one of the reasons the USA has been part of so much wars. Funny fact is that the USA have supported and placed multiple dictators around the world. Maybe they did this because they wanted to be dictators; they wanted to honestly shout it from the rooftops. But they couldn't because nobody in the USA would freely accept to live in dictatorship. So they forced this need onto other countries.

<sup>45</sup> He thinks that by oppressing one can actually liberates or motivates. In the counteraction to the fact that people were oppressed I can imagine that it fire's up an anger inside people that makes them fight a regime.

<sup>46</sup> The power of mass democracy, the dictator says, is that it keeps the people in a coma like state. Why would democracy cause that? Maybe because of the fact that every individual has a voice, and it's impossible to hear them all. As democracy is the 'rule of the people' people have the feeling that their leaders should listen tot hem. For a leader it's very revulsive to do that because it will close the intentional gap between the people and the system, causing leaders to become 'normal people' what will make them loose their judgmental ability. One has to be in the tower of the panopticon the watch over the prisoners<sup>(7)</sup>. One can't be a prisoner and a watcher at the same time. A dictator doesn't have to listen to his people; he does have to look at what his people do, for his benefit, and for his reign.

<sup>47</sup> Although democracy is a group thing, there's no form of trust and community, the dictator says. He complements this by saying that the other could be your savior but also your biggest enemy. As we live in an individualistic society and people generally act from a self-centered perspective, helping others has to complement the self, discarding others has to happen when one wants to complement the self. Though I wonder how this would be different in dictatorship. Because one is busier fulfilling basic needs as in democracy, you could say that they would have no time or mindset to help the other. Though when conditions are so harsh, people do need each other to stay alive, they have to help each other. The farmer helps out the teacher by feeding him while the teacher, in return, teaches the farmers kinds. But the big difference between democracy and dictatorship in this example is that helping each other is a must in dictatorship, and a choice in democracy.

<sup>48</sup> Helping others is one thing, almost emphatic. 'The other' is yet another different thing. The other has more to do with difference and trust. First is difference something very scary; we're afraid of everything that's not the same as us or that doesn't correspond to our concepts of being normal. As example you could address mental illnesses. Because we don't understand crazy people he have to put them in a special place for crazy people or reeducate them, if possible, to make them correspond with the norm. I don't really see how this is different in dictatorship, maybe the institutes we have which overlaps these kinds of discourses like nursing homes for elderly, shelters for the homeless, institutes for the crazy aren't found in many dictatorships. Maybe the family is forced to take care of the people suffering from mental illness. Forcing them to understand and respect differences.

<sup>49</sup> The artist Beuys once said that he'd believed that anyone could be an artist. I think anyone could be a leader. And that's something that happens. A leader is not just the leader of a country but also your boss, the head of the family, your landlord and the bosses of the companies you buy your product from. Even the more dominant partner in a relation are leaders. As anyone can an in fact is a leader, the only question is what kind of leader are you, and what do you lead?

<sup>50</sup> With this beautiful end the dictator touches with something I've mentioned before. Namely that Kant said that we're lazy and cowards. We don't take responsibility for our own actions, according to Kant we have to grow up, we have to become adults and be responsible for all the misery and injustice in our world, and it's our fault too, not only the fault of one person or a group. We are all part of the problem. But Kant also says that these drives to laziness and cowardice are not only our own fault, they are abused and stimulated by our superiors. They proclaim that independent thinking is not only very hard but also very dangerous. Our superiors, democrat, capitalist or dictator, have interests in keeping us ignorant and lazy. They want us to be sheep's, that are ought to be herd. We have to keep the political and economical food chain running while they will examine the real existential questions, or are just fulfilling their drift for power. A conflictual society is not profitable; a predictable, stable, calm society – remember McDonalidization – is profitable. We should, as the people suffering from dictatorship, become emancipated slaves. We should be conscious about the political and social environment we live in. We can't escape the society we live in, we are part of it

## Direct Sources:

The number of the source corresponds with its footnote.

- 1  
- Icarus: Pinsent, J. (1982). Greek Mythology. New York: Peter Bedrick Books. ISBN 0-600-55023-0.
- 2  
- Erasmus – *Lof der zotheid/the Praise of Folley* – ISBN 9789025300432 – Athenaeum – Polak & van Gennep – Amsterdam 2013 – a translation from Latin to Dutch by Harm-Jan van Dam – p. 13 a. 5 (donkey in a lion's skin)
- 3  
- Cornucopia - David Leeming, *The Oxford Companion to World Mythology* - Oxford University Press 2005 - p. 13; Robert Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* - Oxford University Press, 2005 - p. 422  
Hermes - Brown, Norman Oliver - Hermes the thief: the evolution of a myth - Steiner Books 1990 - pp. 3–10
- 4  
- Sigmund Freud – *Civilization and its Discontents - The Century of the Self* – Adam Curtis – BBC 4 2002  
- Sigmund Freud – *Civilization and its Discontents* – ISBN 978-1578988594 – publisher Martino Fine Books 05-02-2010  
- *The century of the self* – Adam Curtis – BBC 4 2002 – quote Stuart Ewen – Historian of Public Relations - *Eight People Sipping Wine in Kettering* - 07-04-2002  
- *The century of the self* – Adam Curtis – BBC 4 2002 – *There is a Policeman Inside All Our Heads: He Must Be Destroyed* – 31-04-2002  
- Edward Bernays - Propaganda
- 5  
- Frank Karsten and karel Beckman – *De Democratie Voorbij/Democracy and beyond* – Aspekt 2011 – ISBN 9789059114524 – In Dutch – 5 p. 24-25 a. 2-3
- 6  
- Plato's allegory of the Cave – Conversation documented by Plato with Socrates and Glaucon. Published by Plato in the collection of conversations and discussions with Socrates and many different figures: *'The Republic'*
- 7  
- *Discipline and Punishment: the birth of a prison* - Panopticism – Michel Foucault - ISBN 9780679752554 – 1977  
- *Foucault; a very short introduction* – Gary Gutting – Oxford university press 2005 – ISBN 9780192805577  
- <http://foucault.info/foucault/interview.html> - Foucault on polemics - R14-11-2014 - "Polemics, Politics and Problematizations." In Essential Works of Foucault, edited by Paul Rabinow - Vol. 1 "Ethics" - The New Press - 1998
- 8  
- *The dictator's Handbook* – Bruce Bueno de Mequita and Alistair Smith – ISBN 978-1-61039-184-9 published in 2011 by PublicAffairs
- 10  
- see 7
- 12  
- *The dictator's Handbook* – Bruce Bueno de Mequita and Alistair Smith – ISBN 978-1-61039-184-9 published in 2011 by PublicAffairs.  
- Frank Karsten and karel Beckman – *De Democratie Voorbij/Democracy and beyond* – Aspekt 2011 – ISBN 9789059114524
- 13  
- Kant – *Answering the Question: what is enlightenment* – Essay 1784  
- <http://www.filosofie.nl/nl/artikel/42140/volwassen-worden-volgens-kant.html> - Translation by Menno Grootvelt of an lecture by Susan Neiman – 24-11-2014 – R27-01-2015
- 14

---

and we should accept and praise that, and not deny or escape it; that's just a confirmation of the problem. Therefor we have to emancipate, yes we are slaves, but slaves that aim to play a fundamental, conscious part in society even though we're starting from a disadvantaged position. Actually this disadvantaged position gives as all the recourses and reasons to emancipate. We should be slaves that don't just do what's imposed, we should reason and question about what's opposed, who opposes it and what we do with what's opposed and how what we do and how we do it contributes to the problems we experience.

- Frank Karsten and karel Beckman – *De Democratie Voorbij/Democracy and beyond* – Aspekt 2011 – ISBN 9789059114524 – In Dutch – 14 p. 54-56 c. 12
- 15
- Frank Karsten and karel Beckman – *De Democratie Voorbij/Democracy and beyond* – Aspekt 2011 – ISBN 9789059114524 – In Dutch – 15 p. 52 a. 2
- 16
- Frank Karsten and karel Beckman – *De Democratie Voorbij/Democracy and beyond* – Aspekt 2011 – ISBN 9789059114524 – In Dutch.
- *The dictator's Handbook* – Bruce Bueno de Mequita and Alistair Smith – ISBN 978-1-61039-184-9 published in 2011 by PublicAffairs.
- 17
- Edward Bernays – *Crystalizing Public Opinion* – with an introduction by Stuart Ewen – IG publishing reprint from original book from 1923 - ISBN 978-1-935439-26-4
- 18
- Robert Kane Pappas – *Orwell rolls in his grave* – documentary film 2003
- Micheal Moore – *Bowling for Columbine* – Documentary film 2002
- 20
- Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980) – *Nausea* – Penguin books Ltd – 11-2002 - ISBN 9780141185491
- 21
- Sigmund Freud – *Civilization and its Discontents* – ISBN 978-1578988594 – publisher Martino Fine Books 05-02-2010.
- Bruno Latour - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8i-ZKfShovs&hd=1> - Bruno Latour – *The Affects of Capitalism* - The Royal Academy Lecture in the Humanities and Social Sciences 2014
- Bruno Latour – *Politics of Nature* – Harvard university press – 05-2004 - 9780674013476
- 22
- George Bataille - *The Bataille Reader* - by Fred Botting, Scott Wilson – Wiley 1997 – ISBN 9780631199595
- 23
- George Ritzer – *The McDonaldization of Society* – SAGE Publication Inc – 04-2012 – ISBN 9781452226699 – original book published in 1993
- 25
- *The dictator's Handbook* – Bruce Bueno de Mequita and Alistair Smith – ISBN 978-1-61039-184-9 published in 2011 by PublicAffairs.
- 26
- Kant – *Answering the Question: what is enlightenment* – Essay 1784
- The origin of this quote is unknown.
- 29
- Frank Karsten and karel Beckman – *De Democratie Voorbij/Democracy and beyond* – Aspekt 2011 – ISBN 9789059114524 – In Dutch.
- *The dictator's Handbook* – Bruce Bueno de Mequita and Alistair Smith – ISBN 978-1-61039-184-9 published in 2011 by PublicAffairs.
- 30
- <http://foucault.info/foucault/interview.html> - Foucault on polemics - R14-11-2014 - "Polemics, Politics and Problematizations." In *Essential Works of Foucault*, edited by Paul Rabinow - Vol. 1 "Ethics" - The New Press - 1998.
- 31
- <http://www.filosofie.nl/nl/artikel/42140/volwassen-worden-volgens-kant.html> - Translation by Menno Grootvelt of an lecture by Susan Neiman – 24-11-2014 – R27-01-2015
- *The dictator's Handbook* – Bruce Bueno de Mequita and Alistair Smith – ISBN 978-1-61039-184-9 published in 2011 by PublicAffairs.
- 33
- Nietzsche – *The Gay Science – The Madman* – S125 – translated by Walter Kaufmann – Randon House USA - 01-1974 – ISBN 9780394719856
- Bruno Latour - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8i-ZKfShovs&hd=1> - Bruno Latour – *The Affects of Capitalism* - The Royal Academy Lecture in the Humanities and Social Sciences 2014
- Bruno Latour – *Politics of Nature* – Harvard university press – 05-2004 - 9780674013476
- 34
- <http://www.filosofie.nl/nl/artikel/42140/volwassen-worden-volgens-kant.html> - Translation by Menno Grootvelt of an lecture by Susan Neiman – 24-11-2014 – R27-01-2015
- Edward Bernays – *Crystalizing Public Opinion* – with an introduction by Stuart Ewen – IG publishing reprint from original book from 1923 - ISBN 978-1-935439-26-4
- 38
- Frank Karsten and karel Beckman – *De Democratie Voorbij/Democracy and beyond* – Aspekt 2011 – ISBN 9789059114524 – In Dutch.
- 40
- Edward Said - *Orientalism (2003)* - Pre Face (2003) - ISBN 9780141187426

- 41  
 - Sigmund Freud – *Civilization and its Discontents* – ISBN 978-1578988594 – publisher Martino Fine Books 05-02-2010.
- 42  
 - Hannah Arendt - *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* – 1963 – ISBN 9781101007167  
 - Hannah Arendt - *The Origins of Totalitarianism – We Refugees* – ISBN 9780547543154 - Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1973  
 - Bill Brown – *The Thing Theory – Things* – The University of Chicago press – 07-2004 – ISBN 9780226076126
- 44  
 - for examples of placed dictators see footnote 78 – 81 in the added research.
- 50  
 - Kant – *Answering the Question: what is enlightenment* – Essay 1784  
 - <http://www.filosofie.nl/nl/artikel/42140/volwassen-worden-volgens-kant.html> - Translation by Menno Grootvelt of an lecture by Susan Neiman – 24-11-2014 – R27-01-2015

### Indirect sources/literature list:

- Edward Bernays and Mark Crispin Miller – *Propaganda* – 01-2014 – ISBN 9780970312594
- Riccardo Orizio - *Talk of the Devil – encounters with seven dictators* – Vintage U.K. – ISBN 9780099440673
- Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt – *Empire* – Harvard University Press – 10-2001 – ISBN 978-0674006713
- *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise Of Disaster Capitalism* – Naomi Klein - ISBN 9780307371300
- Frans de Waal - *Chimpanzee Politics: Power and Sex Among Apes* - 2007 - JHU Press. ISBN 9780801886560.
- Adorno and Horkheimer - *dialectic of enlightenment* – Stanford University Press, 2002 - ISBN 9780804736336
- Peter Sloterdijk – *Rage and Time: A Psychopolitical Investigation* – Columbia University Press – 2010 - ISBN 978-0-231-14522-0
- Slavoj Zizek – *The Pervert's Guide to Ideology* – 11-2013 – documentary film
- Machiavelli – *Il Principe (De Heerser in Dutch)* – 10-1998 – Athenaeum Polak van Gennep – ISBN 9789025315412 – in Dutch
- Sun Tzu – *The Art Of War* – 08-2008 – Tuttle Publishing – ISBN 9780804839440