

Chapter 6

The Bureau Zone

Bureaucracy is the quintessential psychopath/drone symbiosis. It is the heartland of the drone because bureaucracy is the instrumentality of power. As Farrington wrote, bureaucratic instrumentalities were a feature of the ancient cultures that relied upon a monopoly of resources and a monopoly of knowledge, backed by a monopoly of force. These tyrannies crumbled before the Milesian mutation but rather than chance change the Greek aristocracy chose stasis and decline. This poverty of spirit passed the chalice of change to the ever practical Romans, who in turn became the victim of their own success. As Gibbon says, the fall of the Roman Empire was caused by the hubris of the Legions but beneath this power play, the sheer size of the empire created a vast bureaucracy. This bureaucracy survived the fall off Rome, as it had largely transmogrified into the Catholic Church, the state within the state, so the Roman Empire never really ended, it just changed its stationery. The Roman Empire became the Holy Roman Empire. In this guise the drone state lasted nearly 1000 years and permeated Europe with its poison. The Holy Roman Empire was shattered by the Reformation but like Isidur's ring, though severed from its master, the instrumentality was retained. In this new world the instrumentality was weak, as its scope was limited so it hid behind the triumphant principalities, who sought to wrought its power to their ends. Monarchy is a myth perpetrated by bureaucrats. One man can scarcely control a minor bikie gang, let alone a nation. Even the toughest guy has to go to sleep sometime. Bureaucrats have always been the power behind the throne. Content with the exercise of power, the queen drone left the trappings for the vain, and passed unnoticed to history.

The survival of the drones was also obscured for some time by the fact that the preeminent post drone age technological power, England, was the most democratic and hence the least bureaucratic. There is an inverse relationship between democracy and bureaucracy as in a democracy power is dispersed, whereas bureaucracy is the means by which power is centralised. The English

political system was tri-polar, with power separated between the crown, the big-men and the commoners. This meant that the exercise of power was shared, and subject to jealous oversight. For much of this three cornered fight the big-men and the commoners strove to prevent the crown obtaining arbitrary power, and they were successful in this, at Runnymede, as the Roundheads and in routing George III's purchase of Parliament with American taxes. Then came a sea change too complex to elaborate here, but was fostered by the crown's assiduous corruption of the big-men, in allowing them to gobble up the commons, and strongly influenced by the threat to the established order by Jacobins of the French Revolution and the Jacobins of revolutionary socialism. The new alliance was the crown joined with the big-men, against the commoners. The enclosures created a monopoly of resources. The herding of the commoners into the big-men's "*dark satanic mills*" was accomplished by the crown declaring resistance, such as that of the Luddites and Chartism, treason and establishing a monopoly of force. EP Thompson, in his classic 'The Making of the Working Class', rails against the Methodist mentality, for helping eradicate the famous ebullience of the English with a monopoly of sterile morality. Having crushed the commoners and bought of the barons the crown drones now rule in their own right, wearing the Windsors as the scantyist fig-leaf.

To ensure dominance the new Imperial order seeks to crush autonomy.

*"Wherever you are," said Cicero to the exiled Marcellus, "remember that you are equally within the power of the conqueror."*³³

This is the driver behind mass identification programs as these and mass surveillance programs are all about creating a relationship of subservience to overwhelming authority. They are the recreation of a sense of omnipotent and omniscient power such as the Roman Catholic Church engendered at its height.

³³ History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire Chap III p82.

For these programs to work, they have to be implemented on a mass scale and for data to be reliable it has to be reliably entered. The bureaucratic drone as instrumentality, rejoice in the trickle down of power. As drones are ciphers, so they make us all ciphers. Mass identification/surveillance programs may well be designed to ridicule the concept of freedom but there is an obsessiveness which demonstrates a pathological element. Bureaucratic drones are obsessive about identity as they do not have one. Surveillance is the most popular reality TV show for drones as like all reality shows it is a primer for people who do not have a life.

A subset of the bureaucratic drone is the regulatory drone. These are the drones that promote and draft legislation. They are the most destructive of all the bureau drones, as legislation controls the social order and is the operating system of society. As drones have no practical wisdom they despise principle and seek to replace overarching principles, which can relate to a multiplicity of circumstances, with a set book of rules. Black and white rules are much loved by drones as drones are not merely colour blind but are unable to discern shades of grey. It was for this reason that the book '50 Shades of Grey' was so popular. It was largely brought by drones thinking that they could fake it. The substitution of principle can only be effected by endless regulation. This of course is our old friend the make-work drone busy at work. It is the sheer volume of this regulation which clogs society and renders it less efficient. Substitution of principle is compounded by intentional obfuscation. The purpose of intentional obfuscation is to elevate the actual complexity of the task. It is a means by which drones feel self-important. In one of my legal cases a particular section of a statute was at issue. This section was so obtuse that I struggled over its meaning and in my written submissions so I provided an interpretation. When I came to this point in my oral submissions I advised the Judge of this. The Judge, a senior, intelligent and very hard-working man said, a trifle condescendingly, that he had the statute in front of him and he would take

a look at it. He turned to his screen for a minute or so and then said “*it's perfectly clear to me what this section means, it means that whoever wrote it should be shot*”.

More recently I read a legal article from England in which it was related that a leading English judge, commenting on the torrent of regulation, had said that it was getting to the point where lawyers increasingly did not know the law, that even Judges could not keep up and that it had to stop. To state the obvious, Judges are very able people. They are generally the best of the profession, bar those who value money over public service and those for whom the burden of having to judge others does not sit well. If lawyers of this rank cannot easily understand or keep up with the law something is very wrong. It is one thing that valuable legal resources are wasted trying to unravel the complexity and extent of this drone diarrhoea but far worse is the effect it has on the law. A basic principle of the law is that ignorance of the law is no excuse. However this principle is itself founded on the law being knowable. The less the law is known, the more unfair it is to punish ignorance. The more unfair the law becomes, the wider the rift gets, between law as a consensus and law as coercion. Once law becomes more coercive than it is consensual it is on a slippery slope, as coercion vitiates consensus in a downward-tending spiral.

At the upper end the bureaucracy merges into government and it is here that upper-class drones can cause a lot of damage. I have an example from my own family. One of my uncles came from a working class background but rose by dint of talent and providence to become a senior career diplomat. When he retired he was asked if he wanted to take up a position on the Meat Board. Being a patriotic civil servant who thought that his experience as a diplomat and his worldwide contacts would be of assistance to his country he accepted this post. Before he took up the position, the offer was withdrawn. He was told that young so-and-so had got his BA and so would be taking his father's place on the Board. It is simply

not possible that a pimply youth, fresh out of university, could be more competent in a position which involved the direction of one of New Zealand's primary export industries, than a man who had been one of New Zealand's senior diplomats and so had come to know a wealth of people around the world. Now it is true that this was an unusual contest, as clearly this young drone was a member of the landed aristocracy and part of his entitlement would have been his right to take up his hereditary seat on the Meat Board. Of course it cannot be expected that even the most competent could compete with a drone of this rank. The point is that the drone's entitlement was not even delayed, while it was sent of on an OE or whatever, for a time, in the interests of the country.

While national bureaucracies are somewhat checked, by what is left of the democratic process, international bureaucracies pose no limits for drone infestation. The euro-zone drones have drained out and choked up one of the most developed and productive parts of the world. The European planned economy is in worse tatters than the wreckage the wild west banksters have made of America. The drones have achieved one thing though, the union of overweening arrogance and complete incompetence.

The UN is even worse, in its 60 plus years of existence it has promised much but done little. Mike Moore, in an article titled Multilateral Meltdown wrote: *“Two generations of institutional contamination and tenured self-interest ensures this deadlock continues.”*³⁴. Analyzing this statement bit by bit, first is the time frame, ‘two generations’. Two generations is too long for too little. There will always be conflict between states and no organization can be expected to change this as there will always be conflicts of interest. Gross inequality and the preventable death of millions is another thing. The UN has the resources to prevent this but does not. This controlled genocide is drone

³⁴ Mike Moore “Multilateral meltdown” Foreign Policy March/April 2003 p75.

enhancing. Neo-conservatives will argue that it is natural selection but it is actually racist preferment; white drones prosper from the loot of the third world while your chances of starving to death go up with your skin colour. Next is the term ‘institutional contamination’. Institutional contamination is another word for drone infestation. Drones will always be attracted to institutions but infestations occur when there is no governance. There is no governance in the UN as the UN is an undemocratic sham. The plutocrats who actually run the show have decided that the world is overpopulated. Rather than being honest Nazis they prefer to pretend, a la Augusta. Money is poured into the UN, as a salve for the national consciousness but nothing is meant to be done. Recently members of the British parliament were shocked and surprised that Britain gives millions of pounds of aid to China. When asked to explain, the bureau drones said that Britain had agreed to give a certain percentage in aid and that nobody had bothered to update the list of recipients for the last 40 years. In a world of suffering they just don’t care. Now if the UN was actually doing the job would they not have gathered up this money long ago and put it to good use? No, they are all partied out and more concerned about whether they are going to need plastic surgery for their next kidney replacement. Finally there is the term, ‘tenured self-interest’. Tenured self-interest simply means that this parasitic empire of drones has no intention of ever sorting things out as that might slow the gravy train rolling along. Going back to Moore’s title, Multilateral Meltdown, the term ‘multilateral’ refers to the phenomenon of drone consultation. Consultation, consensus and the like are powerful means of arriving at good outcomes, if they are authentic. The problem is that they are not. On a macro scale this is the grand whining of drones. Just as in national or regional squabbles self important drones waste time pretending to be involved in decision making, so too in the UN. Notice how the UN now rotates a seat in the Security Council. Does anybody really believe that Luxemburg decides the

fate of nations? The deadlock Moore speaks of is caused by the vanity of drones and the collision of inflated egos. Unbridled vanity is the mark of the bureau drone.

In September 2011 U.S. ambassador for UN Management and Reform, Joseph M. Torsella, revealed that after concerted pressure by the US for fiscal accountability, the UN proposed biannual budget of US\$5.2 billion would scrap only 44 jobs, a miniscule 0.4 percent reduction. This is bad enough but by a typical UN exercise of false accounting, the budget was actually an extra 2% or US\$.3billion more, and would actually fund an increased number of drones. Incredibly Torsella said that personnel was the “largest and most important driver of long-term costs,” and that those expenses increased to US\$2.4 billion in the 2010-11 budget, up from US\$1.4 billion a decade earlier. This means that nearly half the UN budget is spent on feeding its drones. At a billion dollar a decade increase in the money these drones pay themselves, in thirty odd years the UN will do nothing but consume its entire budget on itself. There are 10,307 drones in the UN, whose average 2011salaries were US\$119,000 a year. That placed the average UN drone’s income at about the income of the top 5% of Americans. (top US 6.1% earn US\$100k+) In total drones drain US\$1,226,533,000 every year out of the UN. Putting to one side the 900 million people who go hungry and the 32% of the population of developing countries who are stunted by malnutrition, every year at least 5 million children die needlessly and painfully of starvation and causes directly related to starvation. This is about 570 children an hour. An emergency daily food ration from the World Food Programme costs US\$0.29. Twenty nine cents x 5,000,000 = US\$1,450,000 x 365 days in the year = US\$529,250,000. This is less than half the endless free lunch money the drones gorge themselves on, with the cash given to the UN, for the starving millions. Looked at another way by snatching the money meant for the poor, each UN drone personally starves 485 children to

death a year. If they just took a pay cut to feed these children their average income would be US\$67,651pa, which would still put them in the top 15% of American earners.

