

3.2.2.3.2.95 Destruction-preluding corruption

Legislative hyperactivity is a pest, and at least, corruption softens it's impact. Corruption undermines organized government, and organized government is restrictive.

Corruption also precludes destruction, and thus, anybody banking on destruction has a good reason to view corruption positively.

Anybody of sound reason is in favor of corruption in political systems towards which one is hostile, for example the USA.

The function of governments is to provide safety by limiting violence. Much of what goes beyond is unwelcome limitation of freedom.

The US is the exemplary country of legislative hyperactivity. Before elections, everybody campaigns on a platform that something that hasn't been regulated needs to be regulated. The result is a flood of new laws and ordinances on any level of government. There is no doubt that no other country in the world has as many laws and regulations as does the US.

Laws and the police are needed to prevent members of a society to physically harm each other. Apart from that, we want personal freedom, and as Thomas Hobbes famously noted: "Liberty dependeth on the silence of the law."

And because the federal US government passes an ever increasing number of laws that deal with matters that happen on the soil of others countries, communities even on the other side of the world find themselves in a situation where they are regulated by US law.

In many cases, government laws and regulations are simply an usurpation of authority. But at least, as long as there is corruption, the absoluteness of this usurpation is undermined.

Like most people in the world, I am firmly against the government messing in my personal affairs. But isn't it funny that we don't have a political home?

Traditional leftist parties unfortunately are also not an inviting

alternative because they over-emphasize regulating people's everyday lives, which is unproductive and a nuisance (though one has to admit that the Chinese Communist Party has newly defined the Leninist agenda by giving people broad personal freedom while maintaining a tight control over reactionary ideologies).

I have, for a short while, considered the Libertarian Party of the US as a potential home. But while their absolute respect for personal freedom sounds promising, their opposition to strong or even just central government is illusionist.

The question of legitimacy is of secondary importance. If we want a better social system, then we need men and women (or revolutionaries) to implement it, and to show the world that it is indeed the better option. Anyway, the Chinese model already proves that a country, which is led by an elitist political party that does not rule in accordance to the principles of Western democracy, can be highly successful and enjoy widespread support by the people, in spite of the international propaganda intended to sow dissatisfaction.