

The New Totalitarian State:
How the United States has Eliminated the Difference between Ends and Means
by Clarence A. Crawford

It is a tired old truism that America is deeply materialistic, and the common assumption is that this is a moral failure, though accepting that assumption doesn't lead us to change our behavior. Hence we have steadily become more intensely materialistic, particularly since the ascendancy of free market economics; and as our materialism intensifies, moral suasion has been increasingly ineffective, virtually non-existent. We are all grossly materialistic: Christian, Jew, Mormon, non-believer; the guiding principal that trumps any religion is economic materialism. This is the viewpoint that dominates our culture. This is The New Totalitarian State, a State that permeates every niche of not just our public life but our private lives.

The foundation of culture is myth. Myth embodies the archetypes that underlie our personal psyches and hence our community lives. Sometimes we perversely use the word "myth" to indicate a false fiction. This itself is false. We value myth because myth is true. Though we can invent false myths too; or rather, false fictions that we value as if they were mythical.

The United States, a relatively new nation, is short on myth. We have imported European mythology, primarily Greek (and Roman, and Biblical) but we have few of our own, sometimes elevating simple folktales to mythical status (Paul Bunyan, Johnny Appleseed, Pecos Bill). These tall tales cannot constitute myth, nor can the movieland equivalents, of cowboys and bad men.

We have also attempted to elevate foundational stories to the level of myth: Pilgrims, frontiersmen, mountain men, overland trekkers. Our foundational stories trend east to west (largely bypassing the southeast—there is little in impoverished mountain people or slavery to inspire an heroic ideal).

The Spanish and French were in the western hemisphere early on, the Spanish pushing north from Florida and Mexico, the French into Canada, the Great Lakes, and the Mississippi Valley. We discount the former because they were transient and impermanent in the north, the latter because their influence in the long term remained north of the St. Lawrence River; and we discount both because the English, though latecomers, came to dominate what came to be the United States by defeating the French in the Seven Years' War (once confusingly called the French and Indian Wars), and the descendants of the English taking what is now our Southwest from the Mexicans in the Mexican Wars. But in spite of the north

and south movements of the Spanish and French, and the English and American response to those movements, we have clung to the idea that our destiny is West. Our mythology is directional and spatial.

In my opinion the idea of Puritan Pilgrims as founders lost its appeal long ago as we came to understand that their idea of religious freedom was severely restricted to themselves. We respect their toughness and discipline, but find their narrow intolerance repugnant. They are inadequate heroes in a secular nation. We cannot accept them as the subject of myth. They do not offer a mythical or heroic ideal; there is no archetype there that we embrace; though the seeds of religious rigidity still sprout in many places, they spring from desperation and cannot be sources of inspiration.

That leaves us with our primary foundational story, the American Revolution. This story does not bear retelling. My concern here is with the Seven Years' War and its frequently overlooked consequences. My primary source here is Fred Anderson's superb *Crucible of War*.

The Seven Years' War (1754-1760) was a global conflict between England and France, of which North America was one theatre. English resources were stretched thin around the globe, and they were challenged to find resources to put into the North American theatre. The northern colonies desperately needed help. French and Indian depredations stretched from Maine through Ohio, a vast distance, and were horrific. England and its colonies were on the defensive and experienced years of military failure, but were of course victors in the end.

Here is the source of our most important foundational story, from Washington serving his military apprenticeship in western Pennsylvania to Wolfe eventually defeating Montcalm at Quebec. Here is where the Revolution started. Because: from the English standpoint, the Colonies benefited enormously from the victory while bearing a fraction of the cost, yet when England attempted to recoup part of the cost by taxing the Colonies, the Colonies rebelled. Accept that "taxation without representation" is a just claim; accept that the means of taxation were poorly conceived and ineptly administered; yet the Colonies owed the mother country something, but instead saw themselves as the victims of tyranny.

I think that rebelliousness is something that we can vaguely call part of the American character. We can truly say that that character has strong elements of courage, determination, risk-taking. We can also justly claim that it includes a propensity for violence and wrong-headedness. Our founding myth, as it survives today, emphasizes the former and omits the latter.

It is worth noting that other English colonies that were inhabited by European migrants primarily (that is, excluding Africa and India, among others) felt no need for revolution. Australia, New Zealand, Canada did not see a need for revolution. India eventually devised its own methods of ridding itself of Great Britain. Only

the American Colonies preferred violent revolution to historical evolution. (I am intentionally omitting rebellions such as the Mau Maus in Kenya or the Afghans before 1919. My thinking concerns the offspring of the British rejecting the British.) Is the American Character therefore superior to the Australian, New Zealand, or Canadian Characters? I think not. But the American Revolution lives on as our founding myth and model of behavior.

Our mythology is severely selective. We claim to be dedicated to religious freedom, liberty, equality, and social justice. Yet we manage to ignore the Puritan persecution of Quakers and other sects; we make little of our violent persecution of Mormons; we endure the bombing and burning of hundreds of churches, almost all of which are African-American, and synagogues; we delayed voting rights for women until 1917; we systematically and ruthlessly reduced Native Americans to remnant populations; we postponed any effort to grant full civil rights to African Americans for a full century after the conclusion of the Civil War; and, most shameful of all (with the possible exception of native American genocide) we refused to deal with the original sin of slavery until 1860, and only then because a large section of the nation was determined to preserve it *and expand it*, so determined that the Confederacy was willing to fight a terrible war on its behalf.

Yes, our history books do record these events. We know of them. But we do not *feel* their significance. I am not arguing for moral outrage, which is easy to produce. I am arguing for a *felt* history. We must know our history; we must feel our history. I know this emotional connection, this empathy, is lacking, because I hear our national leaders say, in reference to religious or racial intolerance or other forms of injustice, "That's not who we are as a nation." Wrong. That is precisely who we are, or a large part of who we are, though we are much else also.

This is not a plea for guilt. This is a plea for empathy. It is also a plea for truly trying to grasp cause-and-effect relationships. The past is not dead. The past lives now.

Our attempts to invent the past we prefer are exemplified by today's "Tea Partiers," who are no better than re-enactors who play act a caricature of history. There is an American Character which we have inherited, like it or not, part of which includes publicly initiated and sanctioned violence, part of which includes violence initiated by the individual. We can't move forward constructively until we understand the past, tell the truth about our nation and our selves, and fashion the future accordingly. If we don't do this we simply continue as we have been, concocting unnecessary wars and continuing to murder each other.

Why discuss our thin mythology when my subject is The New Totalitarian State? Because we all model ourselves after some larger vision that we inherit

from our culture. We are the outcome of the foundational stories that we inherit. We must examine those stories if we are to understand our selves.

We insist, again and again and again, that we are a peace-loving nation—this nation that was born in warfare. Let us list the unprovoked wars that were initiated by the United States of America.

The innumerable “wars” against Native Americans.

The two Mexican Wars.

The Spanish American war and its extension to the Philippines.

Proxy wars in Nicaragua and Panama.

Viet Nam and its spillover into Cambodia and other parts of Southeast Asia.

Grenada, El Salvador.

Iraq I.

Iraq II.

“Dirty” wars: Chile, Argentina; actual number unknown.

When we go down the list, omitting the Indian “wars,” which I will discuss later, we find that our leaders have consistently initiated wars on false pretenses. The Mexican War of 1846 was concocted after a minor skirmish in south Texas (which was Mexican territory). The Spanish war was “provoked” by the fire aboard the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, though historians have trouble finding evidence of a Spanish attack. That the war would occur was already fixed in Americans’ minds. The Viet Nam war was based on a claimed attack on an American ship in the Gulf of Tonkin that likely didn’t happen. The crisis in Grenada was laughably overblown. Iraq I at least had the evidence of Iraqi expansion as a plausible justification, but Iraq II was based on patent falsehoods. Our military influence in Central America was concocted for economic reasons (Nicaragua) or political reasons (recall the Iran-Contra scandal). The United States is almost certainly responsible for assassinating Chile’s elected president, Ferdinand Allende. (Always keep in mind that the CIA is virtually impenetrable.) Our current suspicions of Iran omit that Iranian antagonisms are based on the fact that the United States (CIA again) removed a popular leader, Premier Mohammed Mosaddeq, in 1953, and replaced him with an oppressive dictator, Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlevi, who promptly turned forty percent of Iran’s oil fields over to United States companies. When the Iranians took the American hostages during the Carter administration, did the American public know that; that is, understand their resentment? If the Iranians had somehow reached into our government to remove Eisenhower, would the Americans ever forgive and forget?

This depressing list gives the lie to the claim that we are a peace-loving nation.

The term “Indian Wars” is certainly false. The two conflicts that I can find between Americans and Indians that qualify as war are, first, the Indian allies of the French that plagued the northeastern colonies in the 18th century, on the one hand, and on the other the Six Nations of the Iroquois, who eventually supported the English in battle. Second, the depredations of the Comanches in Texas and Oklahoma in the 19th century was indeed war. For the rest, the “warfare” was for the most part conducted by well-equipped and supported soldiers or militia, on the one hand, and family groups on the other hand. These family groups, often organized as tribes, needed to support themselves by traditional means of hunting and gathering, take care of daily needs, go through child birth and child rearing, support old people...and also fight against men whose only obligation was to fight. Andrew Jackson’s reputation was made in part by fighting the Seminoles, because they harbored runaway slaves, and the slave owners wanted their slaves returned; and while we’re at it let’s just remove them entirely. His removal of the Cherokees from North Carolina to Oklahoma on the infamous Trail of Tears is doubly shameful because the Cherokee were, of all Indians, following the stated American goal of assimilation—but they were removed anyway. Thus we honor Jackson on our twenty dollar bill.

The conquest of the Plains Indians was equally shameful. By 1864 the Union army was the best, most hardened army on the planet. Most officers were well educated in warfare, having served an apprenticeship in the Mexican War and further honing their skills in the Civil War. Weaponry used by the Federals was increasingly sophisticated. The Union army could count on being well supplied at the end of a long supply line. The family groups and tribes, hunters and gatherers all, who faced this juggernaut held out heroically in a losing cause.

The speed and thoroughness of the American expansion to the west is astonishing, but we may look north to establish an interesting contrast. The Canadian expansion to their west did not require a great army, but was accomplished peaceably, for the most part, with a few hundred Mounties, who mostly kept the peace. The only Canadian Indian wars I can find are the Red River Rebellion of 1869-1870, in which no battlefield lives were lost, and the North-West Rebellion of 1885, during which “hundreds” of lives were lost during some days of desultory fighting (canadianencyclopedia.ca). Both rebellions were initiated by Metis who wanted to retain control of ancestral lands. Those seem to be all the Indian wars we can find in Canada.

(Another interesting contrast is that between Alexander Mackenzie and Lewis and Clark. McKenzie crossed the continent not once but twice, first reaching the Arctic Ocean in 1789, and later the Pacific Ocean in 1793. Each goal was

accomplished in one season. Lewis and Clark's one crossing went from May 14, 1804 to September 23, 1806, nearly two and a half years.)

I am not attempting to write history. I am selecting from our history the areas and events that Americans consistently elide from their minds. Why? Because our founding stories must be maintained regardless of their accuracy, and because our belief in our transcendent goodness must be maintained in spite of our actions. Americans are famously unhistorical, even anti-historical, which makes national amnesia easy.

The feisty American who overcomes tyranny, and the intellectually superior individuals who chose and justified independence and then wrote a "sacred" Constitution, are the foundation of our first powerful national myth.

Our second powerful myth is usually referred to as The American Dream, which has a number of facets. This is familiar territory for the reader, and a list will suffice.

Go West, Young Man.

Americans can invent and reinvent themselves by moving through space.

The ultimate goal of The American Dream is the attainment of wealth. For some, the attainment of middle class comfort is sufficient. For others, only vast wealth (and status) will suffice.

The attainment of wealth is open to anyone.

One succeeds through effort and perseverance, not luck or unfair advantage.

Every generation starts its struggle afresh.

Society is vertically organized. When we pursue The American Dream we climb a ladder. The fittest climb the highest.

Since one is solely responsible for one's success, so is one solely responsible for one's failure.

The American Dream is mutable in its details. For example, this solitary individualistic migrant will likely have a family, and "family values" are often extolled, as is a sense of community and "community values." We are atomized individuals, we are attached to families and community; we are solitary strivers, we "pitch in" to help each other; we love the common man and despise aristocrats, we want to be aristocrats.

The American Dream is buttressed by numerous images: the wagon train on the Oregon Trail; the frontiersman; the prospector; the pioneer, ax on shoulder; the hard working farmer; the strong industrial worker, sleeves rolled up; the cigar smoking fat cat financial manipulator; the ingenious inventor; the immigrant software genius. We accept that each of these clichés has an historical correlative.

What does The American Dream not include?

Spiritual development.

The idea that leisure is valuable (except as an opportunity for self-improvement, which is either a moral imperative or something marketable).

The idea that cooperation should extend beyond immediate family or community.

The idea that one should struggle to control one's egotism.

The conviction that success should exclude dishonest behavior.

That there is any measure of success beyond wealth and status.

The idea that humans should not be measured by success, or measured at all.

I ask, Is there a Norwegian Dream? A Mongolian Dream? A Chilean Dream? (I asked my son-in-law, a Mongolian, if such exists; he was amused.) Why is there an American Dream at all?

The most important part of The American Dream is its deep commitment to materialism. Strip away the often empty rhetoric: clichés about religious freedom, liberty, equality, social justice, individualism, etc., and we are left with one core idea: success in the United States is material success, the more the better. This is our controlling idea. This is the core of our national myth. Travel the world and categorize living myths, from ancient Greece (they're still alive), northern Europe, India, and the numerous aboriginal peoples, and we find complex stories that are rich in symbolism, psychological depth, spiritual significance; stories that span the full range of human experience and meaning. (Wade Davis' *The Wayfinders: Why Ancient Wisdom Matters in the Modern World* is a particularly rich resource on this subject.) What are we left with in the United States? Human development through the acquisition of wealth.

Lest you, dear reader, accuse me of a sour negativity, a narrowness of view, let me refer you to one of our very best novels, F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby*. Fitzgerald condenses many important ideas into this small novel, one of which is how people can build an illusion of beauty and meaning upon a base of gross and corrupt materialism. (Oh, those beautiful shirts! And the man has such charm, old sport!) And much else. We see in the novel the apparent beauty of The American Dream, and its ultimate poverty, and, in the eloquent final paragraphs, how the entire corrupt edifice is the result of our Original Sin, the corruption of Paradise.

The narrator of this essentially American story, Nick Carraway, reflects at the end of the novel, that "I became aware of the old island here that flowered once for Dutch sailors' eyes—a fresh, green breast of the new world. Its vanished trees, the

trees that had made way for Gatsby's house, had once pandered in whispers to the last and greatest of all human dreams; for a transitory enchanted moment man must have held his breath in the presence of this continent, compelled into an aesthetic contemplation he neither understood nor desired, face to face for the last time in history with something commensurate to his capacity for wonder....

"Gatsby believed in...the orgiastic future that year by year recedes before us. It eluded us then, but that's no matter—tomorrow we will run faster, stretch out our arms farther....And one fine morning—

"So we beat on, boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past."

Gatsby believed in The American Dream, its roots in appearance, materialism, and status, but he did not understand what The American Dream hid, the lost paradise buried under the grasping turbulence of ceaseless economic striving.

The ideas that inform a culture, and hence the individuals within that culture, are, paradoxically, invisible because they are so fundamental. I think of Catholicism during the long slow centuries of the European Middle Ages. Church doctrine permeated not only the political and social spheres, but the lives of individuals, unto the least detail. Because the power of the church was so pervasive, it was invisible. It was deep within the culture, and hence deep within the minds of individuals. The power of church doctrine was not questioned because the status quo was an innate part of reality, as inevitable and unchanging as the workings of the natural world.

American materialism has the same pervasive force. True, it is recognized and challenged, unlike Medieval Catholicism, but in spite of its critics it is accepted as the major force in our lives—unto the least detail—as if it were a force of nature. Even when we recognize it we are convinced that we can do nothing about it: observe how the prevailing view about global warming is that we must find a way to correct it without changing our "way of life."

Medieval Catholicism eventually came up against the Reformation. Change does eventually occur. Our materialism is due for a Reformation also.

Since the advent of the "1%" people have gradually become aware that some way to redistribute economic wealth is necessary if some degree of economic justice is to be attained. This redistribution is necessary and long overdue, and is consonant with a rejection of gross materialism.

But my concern has to do with something additional to this: that materialism so permeates our lives that we in effect inhabit a New Totalitarian State.

One definition of "totalitarian" is "a form of government in which the political authority exercises absolute and centralized control over all aspects of life...."

(American Heritage). Another simple traditional definition is that it names a regime that attempts to control the total life of each citizen.

One model of such control is George Orwell's *1984*. This classic model carries considerable truth, the most obvious application today in the West being perpetual surveillance. However, in the United States such surveillance is not entirely systematic, and is not carried out exclusively by government. Much is carried out by business, much is performed without video, and much is acquiesced to by citizens; and more importantly, much is self-inflicted surveillance.

It is well known that businesses incessantly track internet behavior, and as internet traffic is ubiquitous, so is such surveillance. Consumers—our modern word for people once called citizens—live with this surveillance with barely a murmur.

Indeed, our soft totalitarianism is based on consumer acquiescence, even active participation. Where Orwell envisioned a camera in every room, and a monitor elsewhere, in some remote location, our totalitarian state places a monitor in every room and the cameras in some remote location. Instead of Big Brother going to all the bother and expense of monitoring each of hundreds of millions of citizens, it is much more efficient, and vastly more profitable, to induce the consumer/citizen to voluntarily watch Big Brother. A few people slip through the cracks, but most Americans have been captured. They are delighted to have been captured. In fact, they truly, deeply love Big Brother. Soma, Aldous Huxley's happy-drug in *Brave New World*, is our metaphorical drug of choice.

People say they fear Big Government. There is indeed a history of government abuse on the civil side (in contrast to CIA intrusions internationally) notably FBI surveillance, particularly during the Hoover years. Government is not necessarily benign, even in the Home of the Brave and the Land of the Free. But our fears should be directed elsewhere. American totalitarianism stems from our allegiance to materialism. Its agents lie in the private not the public realm and the "consumer" is a willing, indeed eager, participant.

We claim correctly that "money in politics" is our main political problem—allegiance to the rich has created an oligarchy out of our democracy—but our devotion to materialism transcends this very real problem. For example, we correctly decry the *Citizen United* decision as an affront to both justice and common sense. But if we look behind this decision, what do we see? More money in politics, yes, but what is that money spent on? Television advertisements and electronic advertising. In other words, we assume without question that in politics too we are consumers not citizens. If we acted and voted as informed citizens, instead of responding to political advertisements as consumers, the additional advertising would be nugatory and *Citizen United* would be also.

Traditionally the word “citizen” denoted a person who was privileged to be part of a community, in ancient times a city (Athens, Sparta, Corinth, Rome), later a larger political unit. In the modern world, with very large political units and very large populations, the term has become diluted, and citizenship, once one’s most valued possession (observe Athens and Rome), is more likely to be taken for granted. In the United States, it may be that the term has the most meaning for immigrants who have obtained the status of citizenship.

But for most of us, the term has been replaced by “consumer.” This was best expressed by George W. Bush during the first of the two recessions that occurred during his presidency, when he admonished his fellow consumers to get out, do their duty, and *shop*. And when he launched Iraq II, he didn’t even suggest that his fellow consumers should pay for the war, at \$1 billion dollars per day surely the least that any patriotic consumer should be asked to do, especially those who hate deficits. The word has become so ubiquitous that we accept it as an accurate description of our very *selves*, when we should be defining our *selves* as *citizens*. I am convinced that most of us haven’t examined the description of our *selves* carefully. For that lies at the root of The New Totalitarian State.

The High Priests—and I do not intend this to be metaphorical—of the new order are the right-wing free market economists. They have provided the theological underpinnings and rationalizations that have converted citizens to consumers. We have absorbed their contentions that *Homo sapiens* is primarily an economic creature, and we have accepted their contentions that all of life must be reduced to markets, and that free markets correct all ills. They have convinced us that the ideology of economic materialism should drive all other human values to the margins of our lives; and so it has. Right-wing politicians have successfully used these assumptions to implement their political agendas, such as the privatization of public functions. But most importantly, their views have formed the basis for materialism as practiced by individuals of every political persuasion and (almost) every religion.

It is a welcome surprise to me that the most important antidote to this destructive ideology has emerged in the upper reaches of the Roman Catholic Church, a long-time protector of the status quo. Pope Francis has written eloquently about the need to reject the “magic” of free market materialism, and he has made it clear that one of its worst evils is that it reduces human beings to means rather than ends in themselves. The great evil of our current political crisis, and our failure to deal with severe environmental degradation, lie precisely in these points. The Pope correctly observes that the problems of economic justice and environmental degradation are intimately linked; indeed, inseparable. Political failure, economic injustice, social injustice, and environmental collapse are at basis one problem.

I wrote above that we haven't examined what "consumer" means. Why are we willing to attach this degrading word to our *selves*? Why don't we feel the insult?

My Oxford dictionary (abridged) offers four primary definitions and a number of synonyms for "consume." In addition to "eat or drink," we find "completely destroy; reduce to nothing...possess or entirely take up," and the synonyms "devour, lay waste, demolish, devastate, exhaust, deplete, squander, dissipate," among others. And of course a "consumer" is "a person who consumes." This is what materialists do. This is what drives The New Totalitarian State. We are this—and little else.

As we watch Big Brother on our large and small screens—and we watch avidly—we absorb the ideology of The New Totalitarian State, and we act accordingly, not precisely in lock-step—though it looks that way on Black Friday, Christmas, Super Bowl Sunday—but in statistically predictable ways, willing, even avid, suppliants in this our New Totalitarianism.

I read in my magazines that robots are becoming increasingly sophisticated. Some writers worry that robots are becoming human, that they may somehow displace or otherwise threaten humans. This worries me not at all. My fear is that humans are becoming robots.

We hear much about the need to achieve a sustainable economy and environment. If we functioned as thoughtful citizens such goals may be entirely within our reach. But if we continue to passively accept our primary role as consumers such goals are not only unlikely now, but increasingly unlikely as time passes, populations grow, and the reach of the New Totalitarianism increases.

The rise of Bernie Sanders may be an indication that a new generation will push us in a better direction.

On the other hand, the rise of Donald Trump may indicate the opposite. There is a profound irony in the fact that a deeply materialistic rich man, intensely egotistical, and a television celebrity at that, has become the representative of a certain kind of populism.

Real change—that is, a rejection of materialism as one's guiding philosophy—can only come at the level of the individual. It is possible that such change can transform society. But it is more likely that such change will be strictly personal, and people who pursue such change will be social isolates imbedded within the New Totalitarian State.

On the other hand, I recognize the possibility that some powerful institution may intervene to reject materialism and thus lead individuals toward a higher ethical ideal. The likeliest candidate now is the Roman Catholic Church under the

direction of Pope Francis. But I suspect that conservatives, including conservative Catholics, will reject his appeal.

The core ideas behind my complaints and assertions are more than sixty years old.

Josef Pieper's essential book *Leisure: The Basis of Culture* (1952) is a profoundly insightful work that foresaw, in Europe, what I am calling The New Totalitarian State. He observed the emergence of the world of Total Work in the rebuilding of postwar Europe, especially in Germany, and he knew that such a world was and would be a morally and culturally arid place. He knew, as a classical scholar (and a Catholic—see Pope Francis and his encyclical *Laudato Si'*) that great societies of the past had developed their greatness *apart from* work, in the realm of leisure. The world of leisure was not a world of “free time,” but a world of human development in non-materialistic efforts. These efforts were time-consuming, demanding, severely challenging, in the arts and philosophy; were not done “on the clock” or for fame or money; and resulted in some of the finest accomplishments of humanity. This is “culture” in Pieper's specific sense of the word. A modern psychologist might use the term “self-actualization” to identify such activity. This is to be fully human.

B. F. Schumacher, in his *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered* (1973) developed parallel ideas, arguing that economics should entail more than a measure of net profits; that the economic system should encompass larger *human* goals; and, above all, that human beings should not be a mere means to some end external to themselves. We should indeed recognize that humans are ends-in-themselves. The New Totalitarian State disagrees.

The Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega y Gasset included some fine insights on this subject in his book *Meditations on Hunting* (1942). One might think that a meditation on hunting would be an odd place to find thoughts on the subject of leisure, culture, and humans as end-in-themselves. Extensive quotes will be useful:

The fact is that for almost all men the major part of life consists of obligatory occupations, chores which they would never do out of choice. Since this fate is so ancient and so constant, it would seem that man should have learned to adapt himself to it and consequently to find it charming. But he does not seem to have done so. Although the constancy of the annoyance has hardened us a little, these obligations imposed by necessity continue to be difficult. They weigh upon our existence, *mangling it, crushing it*. In English such tasks are called “jobs”; in the Romance languages the terms for them derive from the Latin word *trepalium*, which originally meant a

terrible torture. *And what most torments us about work is that by filling up our time it seems to take it from us; in other words, life used for work does not seem to us to be really ours, which it should be, but on the contrary seems the annihilation of our real existence.* (Scribner's, 1985, p. 24. Italics added.)

The hunter, in contrast to the worker, occupies a place, while hunting, that one can describe as *enchanted*, a transformed world which is, I think, much like the productive world of leisure, and also like the world of the aboriginal (see Wade Davis). That is, a world far from that of Total Work and the all-consuming materialism of The New Totalitarian State. The hunting metaphor may not appeal to my readers, but the point is, there are worlds that are open to us that are not part of the New Totalitarianism. We can develop ourselves as humans by recognizing the value of true leisure, a leisure that is demanding and fulfilling, a leisure that draws upon our own faculties rather than some form of electronic or economic voyeurism, a leisure in which we are ends-in-ourselves rather than means, a leisure that puts us in a passionate relationship with something outside our selves.

As I finish a draft of this essay, I learn that Donald Trump has become president-elect of the United States. More than 62,000,000 Americans, a large number though a minority of those voting, have decided that their leader should be a gross materialist driven by gross egotism. This is living proof that my thesis is correct. He is the perfect man to lead The New Totalitarian State.

It is time to opt out.

Copyright 2016 by Clarence Crawford