



## Clanking Chains: Utopia's Delusion: The Discrediting of Democracy by Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn & C. Northcote Parkinson

- 27- In the devil's world you will find many things that can be used for good or evil. Government is near the top of the list. Our Founders were authoritarians but realized from their experiences under the rule of King George the Third that power centralized in a man without integrity with a complicit Parliament resulted in totalitarian policies toward the colonies.
- 28- Consequently, their deliberations in Philadelphia sought to achieve a balance of power in the hope of preventing authority from gravitating to one man or group.
- 29- This balancing act sought to give priority to the people who could alter the government when and if any such shifts of power resulted in a drift toward monarchy or an oligarchy. This was accomplished by establishing a republic in which the people would be governed by representatives chosen directly or indirectly, the latter through electoral checks that Madison referred to as "filtration."
- 30- The Founders were authoritarian in that they subscribed to the principle that men were the traditional heads of households and thus the franchise was limited to adult males.
- 31- This was not considered sexism since responsible adult men were expected to elect to power those who would govern in the best interests of their wives, families, and possessions.
- 32- The worst form of government is a democracy which is the utopian vision of the cultural Marxists. The totalitarianism they despise and seek to stamp out is the ultimate result of any successful advance made toward a truly democratic state.
- 33- In support of this contention I submit three sources of commentary for your consideration. First of all we get an excellent synopsis of good and bad forms of government by Dr. Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn \coo' nelt lay-dean', a man I had the pleasure of meeting and interviewing back in my television days:

**Kuehnelt-Leddihn, Erik von. *The Intelligent American's Guide to Europe*. (New York: Arlington House Publishers, 1979), 66:**

Aristotle declared **monarchy** to be the best form of government, followed by "**aristocracy**" and the **republic**, their caricatures being the three bad forms of government: **tyranny**, **oligarchy**, and **democracy**.

Democracy, based essentially on political equality and majority rule is, particularly in its direct form, one of the oldest and most primitive kinds of government. It disappears when the discovery is made that some individuals are wiser, stronger, more learned, or more experienced than others. Representative democracy is in fact a form of oligarchy, with a time limit. Yet while most primitive democracies eventually waned and vanished, they had a tendency to reappear in a more sophisticated form at a later stage. Democracy turned up in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., where it failed quite dismally. Socrates had to pay with his life for criticizing it. It was evidently not considered a good form of government all through later antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the beginning modern age—until the French Revolution. Having gone down morally with the hemlock cup, it was resuscitated in a forest of guillotines. And the French Revolution with all its derivatives and ramifications unfortunately continues to dominate the Old World scene from Lisbon to Vladivostok.



- 34- The view of democracy from the viewpoint of a Brit is provided by yet another gentleman I had the opportunity to work with while in broadcasting, Dr. C. Northcote Parkinson, who coined the principle that became known as Parkinson's Law: "Work expands to fill the time available for its completion." His evaluation of the decline of England from a monarchy to a democracy is a classic piece of writing that you must have the opportunity to enjoy and from which you will hopefully benefit. I quote extensively from:

**Parkinson, C. Northcote. "Socialism and the Future." Chap. 12 in *Left Luggage: A Caustic History of British Socialism from Marx to Wilson*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967), 181-190:**

Mr. Harold Wilson [British Prime Minister from 1964-1976] claimed at Blackpool in 1965 that he and his colleagues had never lost sight of "the great design of the structure we are seeking to build." Like other democratic leaders ... he is eager to lead the British people "to where they deserve to be led"—"to a new age of fulfillment"—"to an exciting and wonderful period in our history"—to the new Britain which the Labour Party sees itself as creating.

Behind most of the speeches on either side of the House there lies the basic assumption that utopia lies ahead. Strive with renewed purpose, overcome the immediate difficulties, turn the corner and there we shall find the Promised Land. The idea of progress has not characterized every epoch, nor has it been the subject of every exhortation. Talk of the golden age to come has been a feature, generally speaking, of periods during which some further triumphs might be expected. In an age of expansion, with new horizons beckoning, some optimistic talk about the future could be fairly justified. After appalling casualties and the collapse of our Empire, the concept for us has become obsolete. In other countries there may be plans for reaching the moon. Our problem in Britain is one, rather, of saving what we can from the wreck.

The idea of progress, by which Mr. Wilson's thinking is influenced, dates from about the fourteenth century, [prior to which] the western world looked back rather than forward. Just as Indians, Chinese and Greeks believed in a past Golden Age, the medieval Europeans knew of a past civilization superior to their own. The future might promise the Second Coming of Christ but it offered improvement in no other sense. The publication of *Utopia* [Sir Thomas More's description of an imaginary state in which social life is governed entirely by reason.] in 1516 marked the acceptance of a new idea, that the present is an improvement on the past and that the future should be better, therefore, than the present. In the light of this belief it became natural to ask what changes could be expected and whether they might be hastened or influenced by current policy. **All our political theories rest upon this concept of progress.**

We generally assume, then, that our civilization is being improved as well as disseminated, the horizon of the future being bathed in golden light. Revolutions and wars, inconvenient perhaps in themselves, were landmarks on the broad highway of progress. The Golden Age lay not in the past but in the future. The role of mankind was to press on toward its destiny, and few there were who dared ask why. The route lay onward and upward and the towers of Utopia were somewhere ahead. In this confident advance of the western world each nation had its turn of leadership. From the Italian States the torch was passed to Portugal, to Spain, to Holland, to France, to Britain, and now, in the present age, to the United States. Each successive nation has had its period of greatness, with cultural achievement linked to a military and political ascendancy. Each has had a rise, a peak of success, a decline of power and a fall to something like its original level. That leadership passed long ago from Britain is now sufficiently obvious.



Lagging a little behind the United States, just as Europe generally used to lag behind Britain, the Commonwealth boasts its own sort of progress. Our highest achievements are in the past but we can point to our current progress in two directions; first, toward technical perfection, and second, toward democracy. Material improvement is closely linked ... with intellectual ascendancy. It continues, however, after that ascendancy has been lost. For one thing, it is quantitative, the latter railways being merely copies of the first. For another, it is transmissible, people being able to import what they could never invent. With foreign aid they can also import what they could not otherwise afford. Progress of this kind is inexorable.

Democracy is also regarded as a form of progress; as a move toward a loftier type of civilization. The fact is, however, that democracy represents a merely biological trend, a phase in the political cycle. It may prove beneficial in a certain context. It may suit the technical circumstances of a given region or period. It is not, however, an end in itself, nor can it exist except as one phase of a continuing process. In Britain this process is particularly manifest, being spread over something like a thousand years. The first task was to create a national unity, necessary at first for defense and essential later in the period of expansion. This involved a spasmodic effort spread over about seven hundred years. After tremendous planning and labor, persuasion and bloodshed, it became possible (in about 1600) to draw a boundary and say, "This is Britain—the rest is not." It included Scotland, Wales and Ireland. It defined the area of the homeland or base. This, the first and most difficult task, was accomplished by the Monarchy; nor could it conceivably have been done under any other form of rule.

Monarchy and Nobility go together, abolition of one meaning abolition of both. Essential basis of the nobility is the royal family itself. If the Monarch's uncles, brothers and nephews are placed on a level with the populace, the throne is discredited by its associations. A nobility is thus inevitable. It must also become more numerous as the centuries pass. With this growth in numbers the nobility, with its own fringe of relatives, becomes more influential as a body. By the same process the individual head of a noble family comes to matter less. He cannot rival the monarch except as leader of a faction or pressure group. By the simplest of biological processes the nobility turns itself into an aristocracy. Widening its basis of support and rallying the gentry to its cause, the aristocracy begins to demand an increasing share of the central authority. By 1700 Britain had both a ruling aristocracy and a party system. Under aristocratic leadership Britain conquered an empire and established itself as the chief naval, commercial and industrial power in Europe. In the wake of this tremendous achievement came the main British contributions to exploration, architecture, science and art, invention, philanthropy and sport. We look back in wonder at all our ancestors managed to do.

An aristocracy falls through the same biological process by which it rose. It becomes more numerous, its more impoverished members being assimilated into a middle class which thus adds ancestry to moderate wealth. More and more people claim the status of gentry. It is inexorable, nevertheless, and it is accompanied by a slackening of effort. The rewards and penalties become less impressive. Slowly the country becomes a Democracy. Power comes to be vested in a large number of people. They may not constitute a majority and they seldom do, but those ruling may seem fairly typical of the rest. The talk is of an equality which has to be extended successively to the poor, the alien, the female and the adolescent. There is a dwindling difference between employers and employed, between officers and men. As the consensus of opinion comes to matter more, the individual comes to matter less. Power comes to be vested in larger and larger groups, to which process the logical end is the assimilation by one group of the rest. Whether the eventual victors are of the Right or the Left is immaterial to the extent that the final result is *Totalitarian*.



Utopian philosophers from Plato to H. G. Wells have discussed the idea of a perfect Society or State—the moment reached when we can say “Hold it!” and keep mankind thenceforward in a sort of frozen immobility. Whether that state of affairs would be desirable may be a matter of doubt. That it is unattainable is practically certain. Periods of democratic rule have all been comparatively brief and have all ended in dictatorship. Nor is it difficult to see how this must come about. To vest political power in a large number of people means the virtual elimination of the minority groups between which power was formerly divided: royalty, nobility, gentry, universities, church, big business, army and law. The functions of all these groups have to be performed, thenceforward, by the democratic State. All the dignity of kingship, all the glamour of nobility, all the influence of the gentlefolk, all the inspiration of religion, all the vision of great enterprise, all the daring of leadership and all the judicial impartiality is now demanded of the same people at the same time. The result is that momentarily effective rule which we describe as dictatorship. As this cannot last for long—depending as it does on the lives of very mortal men—it has to be replaced by Monarchy. This completes the circle and we can begin again.

- 35- Thus we learn that the worst form of government is a democracy. It is nothing more than the prelude to mob rule. An entire adult population steeped in the philosophies of cultural Marxism demands everything from government but is incapable, intellectually, monetarily, or spiritually to contribute anything meaningful to society. This pampered mob will pitch a wall-eyed fit once the entitlements can no longer be supplied.