

# **Nomenklaturocracy, or what exactly was Orwell right about**

Ivan Daraktchiev

## **Introduction to Nomenklaturocracy**

Several years back I've realized representative democracy had in fact evolved into a degenerate form that suits better the label "Nomenklaturocracy." Such point of view accounts better for the realities in all, and the countries of the "developed world" in particular: the ideological vacuum in the Western world, the disgust by the general public with its "political elite," the mistrust towards the entire "upper class," the growing discontent with the impotent, counterintuitive and mostly damaging to traditional moral values "neo-liberal policies," the incessant decline of average disposable income... As a logical next step I've suggested that we will have to switch to true direct democracy: without Nomenklatura and its favorite manner of running "the business of politics," with compulsory electronic voting – typically from home – by qualified electorate, and by Government hired upon the principles of recruiting corporate directors.\*

Nomenklaturocracies are not damaged to the same extent, by their professional politicians. Or, should I say, the plight of common folk, at any point in time, is not the same, from country to country. The principal initiator triggering public discontent being the state of the economy, two factors play key role: the situation at the starting point and the rate of Nomenklatura's damaging activities. Taking 1990 as a starting point in time is a fair pick since the decay in the West during the existence of Soviet Block was slower, and in addition before that time one could still find some professional politicians who were "in the business" for the ideas, not just because they could not make a decent living otherwise. If we'd accept above boundary conditions for the sake of analysis of prominent versions of Nomenklaturocracy – or what I'd otherwise call phase 2, the degenerate, downhill bound representative democracy – it becomes easier to comprehend the true origin of all variations. More often than not, such approach can result in a reliable predictor as to when – unless a peaceful democratic reform to direct democracy is undertaken – popular revolt tantamount to a fully blown revolution can be expected.

First of all, the mechanism of the damage wrought by the Nomenklatura is quite straightforward: 1) it does spread like cancer, and it grows as such, thus consuming in the process ever larger portion of its nation's GDP, for its very existence and conduct of activities; 2) it inevitably gets involved into corruption schemes – starting with the now officialized "segment of its market" called "lobby;" going through numerous elaborated schemes to siphon money from the public works; frequently morphing in droves of individual buyers acquiring for pennies former public property, etc.; 3) it readily wastes its nation's money for ideological purposes: for participating into (typically someone else's) war efforts; for showing off, or otherwise as part of exporting ideology – as "assistance" to poor nations, "humanitarian aid," etc., regardless of the fact that frequently the benefactors on the whole are better off than many of their own compatriots; for supporting own or related propaganda machine as well as associated foreign Nomenklatura; 4) in terms of intangibles it causes immense long term damage to its national cause by indiscriminately embracing and enforcing the implementation of any and all postulates of neoliberalism regardless of the clear evidence that in many

aspects – such as traditional values; and the effect on national industrial and agricultural infrastructure, for the countries lacking economy of scale – it brings, together with the globalization usually associated with it, plenty of detriment.

In somewhat more scientific language I would describe above mechanism as follows: the Nomenklatura assigns to its activity an inflated, ever growing added value thus boosting the non-productive part of the economy (while the overall effect of its very existence is clearly a deep negative). With this process unchecked by the system, it's only a matter of time before such arrangement begins to falter. When the economic base is eclipsed in size by the socio-political and administrative superstructure of the nation, changing the system, in order to avoid collapse, becomes a necessity; in fact, it's inevitable.

Before continuing on the aspect of economics, let me address another side of the Nomenklaturocracy, by which it could be characterized as single-party or multi-party one. Which suggests the only criterion whereupon some distinction could be made: in all other aspects Nomenklaturocracies are predictably the same. Hence now one can easily see why this model fits better the political spectrum of the present as well as the past. Let me give you the demo: what would you suggest the political system in China is, Communism or Capitalism? Or some other of all them "isms"? Well, do not bother to answer, please – it is neither; it is just another Nomenklaturocracy. Historically one party managed to seize control of the state and – based on some fancy ideological justification – mandated that it is entitled to rule in the name of bringing bright future for the country and prosperity for everyone. When it became apparent even to the kids that ideology is excellent food for the brain but it doesn't bring the chicken to most but Nomenklatura's tables, let alone prosperity and bright future, the original philosophical postulates of the basic theory were quietly dropped, so now the Nomenklatura is entitled to the power just because it is the Nomenklatura, and that's what Nomenklatura does: controls its people today and claims the right to control its future as well. End of story, or so do they think – but we'll revisit that aspect later.

Signals that something was not quite right with "democracy" appeared into international media several decades back (i.e. by the time information flow was still almost truly free, unbiased, mostly out of political control). Among the pioneers of dissent, those who first signaled loud and clear the mismatch between reality and the claims of Free World's propaganda, the most prominent is undoubtedly the former Soviet dissident Alexander Solzhenitsin who once delivered in the US a damning speech – and never again was he invited – in which his disappointment with "Western values" clearly transpired; he later simply returned to Russia. In the ensuing years, while the media gradually became increasingly subservient to the Nomenklatura, the number of voices dissatisfied with "democracy" multiplied: among the most vocal critics of late are acclaimed Reaganite Paul Craig Roberts, Lew Whitehead, Harold Pinter, Noam Chomsky, Vladimir Bukovsky, and many others. The latter, another Soviet dissident, coined the best fitting tag for the European Union: EUSSR (it would appear that those of us who have lived under "communism" and defected to "democracy" are much more sensitive to any difference between ideals and reality – or simply had too high expectations and consequently too little tolerance for such deviations)... Recently, Chinese dissident Ai Weiwei commented "US is behaving like China." Of course it is: Nomenklaturocracies mimic each other all the time.

Interestingly, we have observed criticism within the “inner circle” – the eurosceptics, typically British MEPs who expose the undemocratic substance and method of EU and its Commissars. However, none of them addresses the national political system at home. The only new phenomenon of late is the motion by Belgian MP Laurent Louis who has blasted the hypocrisy of the national establishment, as well as that of the EU cockpit. Needless to say, none of these critics have gone to the core of the problem – per our view – nor have they tried to define the new stage in the evolution of representative democracy, let alone propose the remedy for the now obvious for many huge problem at hand.

Meanwhile the Nomenklaturocracies that have suffered considerable damage start feeling the pain. In the US we saw the formation of Occupy movement. I do consider this the beginning of their revolution; a fact in support of such view is the preparation by the current Administration for a civil war on the territory of the Union: no other explanation could better fit the reported US\$ 2M order for targets depicting civilians for the feds to conduct shooting exercises, the reported order of 2B hollow point rounds, the Patriot Act and the follow-up legislation that allow detaining of US citizens for indefinite time without court order, the free hand of DHS to register or/and listen to phone calls and to have access to the servers passing most Internet traffic, the “litmus test” for Army officers as to whether they would obey orders to shoot at US citizenry, the regular exercises on US territory of the infamous drones that exterminate human targets...

To the best of my knowledge the reason why no American intellectual has yet suggested a system change is that they all believe in their system being the best: they all revere their Founding Fathers and venerate the beloved tandem US Constitution-Bill of Rights – the presumption is that Democracy enshrined therein IS the best and should never be touched, because it can not be improved! To me that follows almost word for word the justification I’ve heard from a very intelligent, very scientifically advanced, and very devoted Muslim friend of mine: the Holly Qur’an has never been altered, and the Faith has never been altered, and that’s a proof of its divinity. Well, I’ve heard similar statements by Christian and Jewish scholars as well, hence my question then is: how many Gods do we have at hand, actually? And if indeed it is just one, why is He allowing to be called by so many different names, and that while following so many different rituals, most of them totally alien to each other? Now, until I get them religious folks to answer, my question to my American friends is: you have already accused the last two Administrations of disregard of – in court that sounds more like “hold in contempt” – your Constitution; when would you open your eyes to see that the current model does not work (otherwise we would not be where we are), and that it’s time to start calling the cat a cat, and to start thinking about the next stage, for example an improvement that is called direct democracy?

While they think, I’d revisit Europe. The shadow of Orwell is already above the heads of our American friends; however, on the old continent Big Brother is – as always – much farther in advance. That political correctness is a requirement, a *conditio sine qua non*, for a publication to appear in the mainstream media, is trivial. The ugly truth is, for delivering what is labeled “hate speech” or for making statements of denial of whatever the EC has declared as THE ultimate judgement on certain issue, one can be prosecuted and get heavily fined, and in some instances even locked into prison. This GULAG-like

approach has prompted V. Bukovsky to relabel the EU into EUSSR; it has prompted me to label USSR a single-party Nomenklaturocracy.

**Nomenklaturocracy: public enemy in disguise (as savior)**

All Nomenklaturocracies claim to rule “in the name of the people.” The fact is, anything a Nomenklaturchik does is for his/her own benefit, and by definition his/her activity hurts the public interest, at least by the negative impact on the treasury of whatever position he/she holds. Hence not even taking into account the negative effects of Nomenklatura’s deeds – most of the time orders of magnitude larger than the overall compensation itself – it does hurt the Nation by its very existence. Ergo, we are much better off without it: “left,” “right” and “center” altogether.

Intuitively though, the “political elite” – as they love to be called, in order to fight the stigma by the true Intelligentsia and thus to cure the associated inferiority complex – strives for tooling the society into easily satisfied dummies (the perfect consumers, attuned to “Bread and Circuses” mentality). That has been facilitated by the launch of the “neo-liberal thinking” of late, and this drive has brought about speedy reformation of education towards minimizing requirements and devaluation of any and all degrees. The phenomenon was easier to observe in Eastern Europe: after some 20 years of “brain drain” on top of accelerated “reform” – as the demolition of all those near-perfect national education systems was called – the qualifications, skills and knowledge of the new generation, and respectively its performance, do not even remotely measure up to those of their predecessors. Ironically, due predominantly to (erroneous) presumption of higher average computer literacy the perception by the young generation resides at the opposite pole.

This phenomenon has tragic consequences, for any nation concerned, and it would take generations to reverse the trend: we see at least lip service in some places, the US for one, yet it could be just a populist move, as is most of the time when Nomenklatura speaks out. Among the exceptions Russia stands out, and that is perhaps the result of the realization by Vladimir Putin of the detrimental effects associated with “Western style democracy” – or fully blown Nomenklaturocracy based on “Western values” and discarding the traditional ones, as I would define it – hence most of the idiotic reforms the infamous “pro-democracy activist” Boris Eltsin began introducing were halted on time. And so Russian educational system has survived the tumultuous times of transformation from single- to multi-party Nomenklaturocracy almost intact.

Authoritarian-flavored variations of Nomenklaturocracy often do offer somewhat better form of governing, in terms of preservation of national identity and protection of national interests. Besides the current best example in Russia, in the past there were a number of similar cases, like e.g. Charles De Gaulle’s France. Still, inevitably the succession problem kicks in and everything goes back to normal: the standard Nomenklaturocracy Almighty comes in like a bulldozer and levels everything off. Hence President Putin of Russia needs to worry as he undoubtedly is aware of the intrinsic vulnerability of his achievements. Elsewhere the warning signals – like the horrible Breivik mass-murder case in Norway and the suicide next to *Notre Dame’s* altar in France – are either quickly put under the carpet by the Nomenklatura, courtesy of its servile media and well-lubricated state machinery, or designated as “activities by xenophobic groups/parties” and the alleged members ostracized, if not outright

prosecuted. In that regard, a formidable casus stands out: After 5 cases of self-immolation within a month, as part of massive protest movement in Bulgaria, there was hardly more than a handful of reports in the West European mainstream media – all typically muted, none invoking the parallel with Jan Palach's self-sacrifice in Prague in 1969. Worse, the only report in the US I'm aware of was tantamount to mockery\*\*. So, how much more warning do we need? I claim we missed the wake up call a long while ago... meaning we may not have the time to prevent street fighting!

The detrimental effect of Nomenklatura's rush for the spoils of its nation is truly omnidirectional: it starts with the domain of traditional values, moral and ethics, goes through damaging, spoiling or outright wasting of national assets that happen to be readily available for grabs, and in the process inevitably affects the collective psyche as gangsta methods and corruption get installed throughout, affecting society's every fabric and every institution, including the judiciary... Eventually, national unity becomes at stake, wherever suitable conditions arise. Here pertain the splits by Russia, Belarus' and Ukraine (not dissimilar to the split by India, Pakistan and Bangladesh); the Czech and Slovak; the one by Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and FYROM... – all were entirely Nomenklatura-related (too many of those "party animals" aspire for presidential inauguration as a means to veil their own vanity, insignificance and mediocre personality). The phenomenon will be with us as long as there exists Nomenklatura: national unity of several other European countries is at stake – splits by Scotland, Catalonia, Flanders, etc. are currently being contemplated. The emergence of the opposite trend would be a signal that the key Nomenklaturchiks have been straightjacketed: when you hear about unification of Bulgaria and Macedonia, for example, it will be in fact a briefing that the Bulgarians on each side of the border have trashed their "professional politicians" out.

With limitations of our liberties – and control of our minds – ever multiplying, the time has come for all free-thinking individuals to decide what do they want: the true Orwellian state, which is the current destination of all representative democracies that we call here Nomenklaturocracies, or the only alternative, direct democracy. Ironically, for me personally the route starts with accomplishing a round trip: defecting from Belgium to Bulgaria, after defecting from "Communist" Bulgaria to "Democratic" Belgium 32 years ago. Of course now I know a bit better: I will be swapping one Nomenklaturocracy for the other, just like I did before. This time, though, Bulgaria is the better choice not because it is lesser evil; it is closer to the revolution of sort, which will be bringing People Power, a true Democracy free of Nomenklatura of any kind, denomination and color.

The realization of this surreal Orwellian state of affairs in our contemporary world forces me to call in some of the old champions of human thought. At this point I'd paraphrase Marx: Intellectuals of the world, unite (because the present day ignoramuses have become too dangerous, and almost out of control)!!!

A short remark is due, in order to avoid confusion in the minds of some folks, mostly Americans: I've seen repeatedly statements that republic and democracy are different animals, and elaboration further on. Well, republic is a synonym for democracy, folks. The two are the same thing said in two different languages, Latin and Greek, and mean "governance by the people" – People Power, if we'd take John Lennon's favorite. Both the

republic and democracy of their current version are set up in such a way that we label them “representative” ones, because – at least theoretically – a given number of voters empower one parliament member who should represent their wishes in the respective National Assembly. “You put in one bag US, a republic, and UK, a monarchy, because it is a democracy, too: according to your definition we should call UK a republic as well!” – some would object. “How much of a monarchy is a state in which a Parliament is in fact dictating to the monarch what to sign as law and what not?” – I would argue – “The European monarchies are such only on paper, the arrangement is for them to be called ‘democracies’ instead of ‘republics’ and the position of Head of State is preserved for the ‘monarch’ and thus is being inherited.”

If you think about it, European monarchies are extinct. The myth that the national monarch provides unity while serving as Head of State is just a convenient tool for the politicians’ rhetoric. The very office of Head of State is a thing of the past, the function is largely ceremonial, and in the modern times – especially under enormous and ever rising economic pressure – should be executed in a rotating manner by members of the State Council or equivalent. Swiss state arrangements give since a long time the quasi-perfect example in that regard. And the fact that the French and US model of Presidential Republic – or was it Presidential Democracy – stipulates that the same person be both Head of State and boss of the Executive branch, suggests that at least one of them is not a full time job...

To those still unconvinced, here’s another angle to look at this: Monarch means “one before others,” “one above others” – i.e. somebody who is above any and all of the rest. Monarch is the King of Saudi Arabia: try to find anybody who would dare – uninvited – to tell this monarch what to do or what to sign, and what not! The European kings and queens are monarchs only on paper: all countries in Europe are in fact republics (or democracies, which is the same) but those with the royals still “actively employed” are labeled “democracies,” with the often offered substitute of “constitutional monarchies,” in order to avoid mentioning the word “revolution” which would make most people panic – the full spectrum of the concept behind this term is unknown to many. Hence they avoid the use of “republic” and calm reigns. But effectively monarchies – constitutional or not – do not exist in Europe: you can’t make me accept that just because the politicians label a state whatever they please, and it then becomes that thing. As if for their convenience, however, Nomenklaturocracy passes well to all of the above, hence no source of disagreement here, I presume?

### **Economy, the mother of all answers**

Many would have it that the policies by Ronald Reagan – some would add Maggie Thatcher to the picture, too – have brought down the Soviet system. To me, that’s nonsense: ultimately everything is defined by the economics, and the collapse of the Eastern Block was the first major example of the detriment the extensively Nomenklatura-manpowered superstructure represents to even a well developed economic base of a given state or Union. The rest is trivial; for the outsiders, the newcomers and the hitherto heavily biased by the propaganda, a couple of simple facts about the then-calling-itself-Communist Nomenklaturocracy: (i) the concept of borrowing current prosperity at the expense of future generations was not yet born, at the time, (ii) cheating – I don’t know whom – by indiscriminately printing money was considered below the dignity of the nation, (iii) bankers were straight (in every single

aspect!), and (iv) many a top Nomenklaturchik have figured they would be much better off personally if they could execute a swap of power due to ideological justifications for power based on financial reasons, provided the process would be conducted through a mechanism ensuring the former “elite” would lay hands on the juiciest chunks of the nation’s assets.

The implication of all this is that a truly democratic state (People Power’s Paradise) ought to be run as a Corporation – say one where each citizen is a shareholder with a single share. For successful governance a corporation needs capable managers, not politicians. Capable managers climb the directors’ ladder by merit; incapable ones are parachuted owing to either internal politics or personal connections. Whichever way it is, too high a concentration of inept managers – typically an indication of too much internal politics – inevitably leads to the demise of such corporation. If you recall now that any and all Nomenklaturchick are incapable (many a time lacking professional education/training whatsoever), it will become clear that we can expect the failure of a Nomenklaturocracy by definition, sooner or later. And it becomes clear as well that we have to do away with “professional politics,” in order to see progress in state governance.

Today the world is at a very peculiar stage whereby the beginning of the transition to Direct Democracy will coincide with the demise of the last Empire relying on military effort. With three major wars in the timespan of quarter of a century – all fought far overseas, all for no good reason, all essentially lost – the US has no chance whatsoever to recover economically (unless globalization is recalled and foreign debt is unilaterally cancelled), nor to reverse its image of international villain (here, a multitude of other smaller scale wars and interventions added insult to injury). Hence we can expect uniquely economics-based conquest to underpin the Imperial expansion of the near future and beyond...

### **Revolutions underway**

“A phantom haunts the world, the phantom of revolution.” Never ever have I dreamed I would make this – slightly modified – Marxist statement: this is the last thing one could expect from a defector from Communism. Yet that’s the reality: not only am I voicing that statement; I do claim we have already several revolutions underway!

Some six or seven years back, when I’ve sweated over my book, I have entitled a chapter “The basic economic considerations underpinning the upcoming revolution in Bulgaria.” Mid February of this year we all witnessed a wave of mass protests in various corners of the country: initially sparked by different reasons, within a week or so they all converged into one movement, with one demand, “System Change.”

The Revolution has started in many other countries as well; it is just that it is not yet recognized as such. For example, in my assessment Iceland was the first one that has already passed stage one. True, the people therein settled for a partial Direct Democracy – or hybrid, you may want to call it – yet it was an accomplishment of a powerful national movement for change. If the Icelanders settle for it in the long run, then it’s their choice, like that of the Swiss: if the majority is happy with it, so be it! In the US we also have witnessed the beginning of massive peaceful public revolt: both Occupy movement and the Tea Party qualify for the initiation, in my mind.

Most people are spontaneously terrified by the very mentioning of the term “Revolution” – so we’ll call it “Dissent.” And now that you have calmed down, let me point out a little known thing: the revolution that everyone is afraid of, is just a picture in their mind that inevitably includes images of barricades, blood, shooting, perhaps a guillotine or two... Well, I would submit to you that societal revolutions take much longer a period than what we are inclined to ascribe to them. For example, the Indian Revolution has started in 1930 with Mahatma Gandhi’s march to the sea in defiance of the salt tax the colonial power has imposed. It took 17 years until Independence materialized, as the necessity that fueled the process. The Great Russian Revolution is dated as October/November 1917 but in fact it has started in January of 1905 with “Bloody Sunday,” and ended in 1924 – marking the irreversible conversion to republican, from a monarchic governance. The French absolute monarchy had even longer period of transformation to republic: the Great French Revolution started on July 14th 1789 with the storming of the *Bastille* prison but it took about 81 years to get to unchallenged Republic. In the US itself, the Revolution has started with the Tax Revolts (the famous Boston Tea Party) and ended when the War of Independence was won over: in all, that makes some 10 years.

Hence I believe we are all heading towards Direct Democracy, whether someone likes it or not, as it is the only fair way of efficient use of all resources available to mankind. Representative Democracy has played its role and it shall fade away as it inevitably becomes – especially in its second phase, Nomenklaturocracy – too heavy a burden to the economy on which its Nomenklatura feeds. The big question is how to avoid the bloody pathway and conduct the revolution through peaceful, democratic means – such as we have proposed it for the casus of Bulgaria, for example. The independent-minded intellectuals of this world must move fast as we do not have much time left: some revolutions are brewing, some are even underway. Besides Bulgaria Greece, Spain, Cyprus, Portugal and even Italy are on the brink. In the US – to my mind, at least – the initial revolutionary phase is on as well: look at the dissent clearly expressed on many Internet blogs and some radio and TV channels, in a respectful and admirable continuum, to the extent that most of them are being targeted by the establishment, or so some do claim. Even more significant, as evidence, is the fact that two successive Presidents – a Republican and a Democrat (by now you would know what I mean by Nomenklatura being all the same thing regardless of slogan) – had their respective Governments bite on the constitutional rights of the ordinary citizen and passed legislation limiting, or even violating, them. You can read these signals as you wish, to me they are clear indication that the process is on. And here we stumble upon the very American block: all their intellectuals firmly believe that their Constitution is the best mankind has produced, therefore it must not be touched. Hence my proposition to convert to Direct Democracy – which will require changing that venerable document, for the US – is a “no go;” I’m risking to be accused of producing writings tantamount to blasphemy. Well, my friends from the great US of A, I’d leave you to ponder it further on; in the mean time we in the rest of the world will have to move, and move faster less we do not care if true revolutionary turmoil breaks out. One last warning signal, though: it’s breathing in our necks!

---

\* See for details “Bulgaria, *terra europeansis incognita*,” ISBN 978-954-91584-3-4

\*\* On Reading the Signs of Vox Populi,

[http://zaedno.mobi/Zaedno/NEWSLETTERS\\_files/On%20reading%20the%20signs%20of%20Vox%20Populi.pdf](http://zaedno.mobi/Zaedno/NEWSLETTERS_files/On%20reading%20the%20signs%20of%20Vox%20Populi.pdf)