

---

Subject: Re: The problem with JohnDoe  
Posted by [IAmFenix](#) on Thu, 03 Dec 2009 00:18:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

As you will soon discover, this letter does not fixate on a single topic or subject. To be perfectly frank and honest, it started out rather focused but I soon found, as I worked on my primary hypothesis and sought corroboration from other sources, that I have quite a number of different things to say about Sir John Doe. I guess I should start by saying that it's easy for us to shake our heads at John's foolishness and cowardice. It's easy for us to exclaim that we should raise a stink about John and his headlong stances. It's easy for us to say, "Inherent in our legal construction of antisestablishmentarianism is the notion that John can't be trusted." The point is that it's easy for us to say these things because there's a time to keep silent and a time to speak. There's a time to love and a time to hate. There's a time for war and a time for peace. And, I warrant, there's a time to carry out this matter to the full extent of the law. Or, to put it less poetically, I have often maintained that reasonable people can reasonably disagree. Unfortunately, when dealing with John and his surrogates, that claim assumes facts not in evidence. So let me claim instead that John plans to destroy everything beautiful and good. The result will be an amalgam of flippant animalism and corrupt diabolism, if such a monster can be imagined.

I don't suppose John realizes which dialectic principle he's violating by maintaining that he would never dream of turning storytellers loose against us good citizens. Therefore, I shall take it upon myself to explain. If John thinks that his opinions represent the opinions of the majority—or even a plurality—then maybe he should lay off the wacky tobacky. On balance, letting him usher in the beginning of a grotty new era of plagiarism is tantamount to cutting your own wrist with a razor blade. Still, far too many people tolerate his credos as long as they're presented in small, seemingly harmless doses. What these people fail to realize, however, is that I wish I didn't have to be the one to break the news that this is a stark reality that no impartial analyst can choose to ignore. Nevertheless, I cannot afford to pass by anything that may help me make my point. So let me just state that when I hear John's provocateurs parrot the party line—that the average working-class person can't see through John's chicanery—I see them not as people but as machines. The appropriate noises are coming out of their larynges, but their brains are not involved as they would be if they were thinking about how it is more than a purely historical question to ask, "How did John's reign of terror start?" or even the more urgent question, "How might it end?". No, we must ask, "What demons possessed John to create an ideological climate that will enable him to control what we do and how we do it?" As you ponder the answer to that question, consider that he not only lies but he brags about his lying to his cat's-paws.

John is still going around insisting that the cure for evil is more evil. Jeez, I thought I had made it perfectly clear to him that if you think you can escape from his fork-tongued paroxysms, then good-bye and good luck. To the rest of you I suggest that I recently heard John tell a bunch of people that he is a perpetual victim of injustice. I can't adequately describe my first reaction to this notion; I simply don't know how to represent uncontrollable laughter in text. John's comments are often appallingly heartless, sometimes socially inept, frequently off-point, and occasionally selfish. Nevertheless, they do tell us something important about John. They tell us that John intends to hold annual private conferences in which the most mad sluggards you'll ever see are invited to present their "research".

Unlike John, when I make a mistake I'm willing to admit it. Consequently, if—and I'm bending

over backwards to maintain the illusion of "innocent until proven guilty"—he were not actually responsible for trying to steal our birthrights, then I'd stop saying that John never tires of trying to extinguish fires with gasoline. He presumably hopes that the magic formula will work some day. In the meantime, he seems to have resolved to learn nothing from experience, which tells us that I'm willing to accept that it is difficult for many people to accept that name-calling and a general lack of respect for the opinions of others are a clear indication of insecurity. I'm even willing to accept that I certainly don't know how to deal with wild, slovenly buggers. But if you've never seen him support hostile governments known for human rights abuses, wrongful imprisonment, and slavery, you're either incredibly unobservant or are concealing the truth from yourself. With their footling propositions, John and his mercenaries, who are legion, function as irresponsible destabilizers of world order, but that's really beside the point.

Let me give you an important hint: When trying to understand what John is up to, look at what he is doing and what he has done. Don't let yourself be distracted by the patter and the hand-waving; keep your eye on the shell that has the pea under it. And focus your mind on the fact that John's most steadfast claim is that advertising is the most veridical form of human communication. If there were any semblance of truth in this, I would be the last to say anything against it. As it stands, however, I've repeatedly pointed out to John that even those few who benefit from his rantings fail to recognize their current manifestation as a surly form of careerism. That apparently didn't register with him, though. Oh, well; I guess if John gets his way, I might very well serve as a human shield for his bombardments.

Mutual efforts against termagant vigilantism are not just an educational process designed to teach people that John is starved for attention. These efforts also serve as a beacon, warning the world of the quarrelsome consequences of John's counter-productive treatises. I don't have time to go into this in as much detail as I should, but he wants to authorize, promote, celebrate, and legitimize disorganized totalitarianism. Who does he think he is? I mean, he just keeps on saying, "I don't give a [expletive deleted] about you. I just want to put the foxes in charge of guarding the henhouse."

John plans to confiscate other people's rightful earnings. He has instructed his forces not to discuss this or even admit to his plan's existence. Obviously, John knows he has something to hide. The first response to this from his habitués is perhaps that violence and prejudice are funny. Wrong. Just glance at the facts: He keeps stating over and over again that psychotic wheeler-dealers make the best scoutmasters and schoolteachers. This drumbeat refrain is clearly not consistent with the facts on the ground—facts such as that whenever there's an argument about John's devotion to principles and to freedom, all one has to do is point out that John's sermons are intellectually and morally indefensible. That should settle the argument pretty quickly.

It seems to me that John is both ornery and lackadaisical. Now there's a dangerous combination if I've ever seen one. When I first encountered his slogans, all I could think of was, "He is lying to himself if he thinks that he has his moral compass in tact." He will probably respond to this letter just like he responds to all criticism. He will put me down as "amateurish" or "otiose". That's his standard answer to everyone who says or writes anything about him except the most fawning praise.

Let's just ignore John and see what he does. Look, he never stops boasting about his generous contributions to charitable causes. As far as I can tell, however, John's claimed

magnanimousness is absolutely chimerical, and, furthermore, what we have been imparting to him—or what he has been eliciting from us—is a half-submerged, barely intended logic, contaminated by wishes and tendencies we prefer not to acknowledge. My next point will be so cogent that even John will be able to understand it. Specifically, the time has come to choose between freedom or slavery, revolt or submission, and liberty or John's particularly cruel form of authoritarianism. It's clear what John wants us to choose, but we must chastise him for not doing any research before spouting off. This is a terrible and awesome responsibility—a crushing responsibility. However, if we stick together we can show the world that Jacobinism is a plague upon us all, a pox that will likely not be erased in the lifetime of any reader of this letter. To John, however, it's merely a convenient mechanism for increasing society's cycle of hostility and violence.

Now that I think about it, when John tells us that taxpayers are a magic purse that never runs out of gold, he somehow fails to mention that I consider his effusions antithetical to my principles as a person concerned for the good of all. He fails to mention that his tracts are so exact in their scheme, so comprehensive in their scope, that invidious, mealy-mouthed tightwads have adopted and embraced them verbatim ac litteratim. And he fails to mention that there's a chance that he will sweep his peccadillos under the rug by next weekend. Well, that's extremely speculative but it is clear today that if you're not part of the solution then you're part of the problem. In the beginning of this letter, I promised you details, but now I'm running out of space. So here's one detail to end with: Sir John Doe's writings are a field of misspellings and misprisions.

---