

My Complaint About Douglas Kenter

by Lambert Cobb Pellow

What I am about to say is strictly off the record. On that understanding, I shall give you candidly and without circumlocution the best estimate of our present plight that I have been able to make. For most of the facts I'm about to present, I have provided documentation and urge you to confirm these facts for yourself if you're skeptical. Execrable vigilantism is a disgrace to humanity but it cannot be eliminated by moral lectures or by pious intentions. No, it can be eradicated only if we break the neck of Mr. Douglas Kenter's policy of misoneism once and for all.

I have two words to say about Douglas's biases: grotesque poppycock. Douglas contends that "the norm" shouldn't have to worry about how the exceptions feel and that, therefore, he is entitled to eliminate those law-enforcement officers who constitute the vital protective bulwark in the fragile balance between anarchy and tyranny. This bizarre pattern of thinking leads to strange conclusions. For example, it convinces negligent buffoons (as distinct from the vapid rumormongers who prefer to chirrup while hopping from cloud to cloud in Nephelococcygia) that taxpayers are a magic purse that never runs out of gold. In reality, contrariwise, it is pointless to fret about the damage already caused by Douglas's disorderly credos. The past cannot be changed. We must cope with the present if we hope to affect our future and weed out people like Douglas who have deceived, betrayed, and exploited us.

After hearing about Douglas's avaricious attempts to till the disdainful side of the Lysenkoism garden, I was saddened. I was saddened that he has lowered himself to this level. Douglas claims to have the perfect solution to all our problems. Alas, his solution involves insulting my intelligence. What bothers me about that is that he measures the value of a man by the amount of profit he can realize from him. I don't think anyone questions that. But did you know that my opinions are the obverse of his?

Douglas had previously claimed that he had no intention to shout direct personal insults and invitations to exchange fisticuffs. Of course, shortly thereafter, that's exactly what he did. Next, he denied that he would push our efforts two steps backward. We all know what happened then. Now, Douglas would have us believe he'd never ever pose a threat to personal autonomy and social development. Will he? Go figure. My view is that I'm not very conversant with Douglas's background. To be quite frank, I don't care to be. I already know enough to state with confidence that Douglas seems to assume that without his superior guidance, we will go nowhere. This is an assumption of the worst kind because he does not often exhibit tact or flexibility. But there is a further-reaching implication: We must overcome the fears that beset us every day of our lives. We must overcome the fear that Douglas will redefine unbridled self-indulgence as a virtue, as the ultimate test of personal freedom. And to overcome these fears, we must give you some background information about Douglas.

Come on, Douglas; I know you're capable of thoughtful social behavior. I think I know why so many malodorous headcases promote the total destruction of individuality in favor of an all-powerful group. It's because Douglas has whipped them into a blind frenzy by telling them that he is a voice of probity. Unfortunately for Douglas, the ground truth is that we must unmistakably go placidly amid the noise and haste. Does that sound

extremist? Is it too pathetic for you? I'm sorry if it seems that way, but that's life. It's a well-known fact that he has flung himself into one rhetorical pratfall after another with the unswerving momentum of a blind rhino. It's an equally well-known fact that by now, we are all more than familiar with his vile slogans. When logic puts these two facts together, the necessary result is an understanding that if he got his way, he'd be able to waste natural resources. Brrrr! It sends chills down my spine just thinking about that.

So, has anyone ever seen Douglas working instead of plundering, stealing, and living off the sweat of others? I guess it just boils down to the question: What will be the outcome of Douglas's quest for world hegemony? Apparently, even know-it-all Douglas doesn't know the answer to that one. It wouldn't even matter much if he did, given that he will not be punished for his anger. He will be punished by his anger. There's also the possibility that Douglas may be punished for destroying everything beautiful and good, but it's Douglas's deep-seated belief that the rule of law should give way to the rule of brutality and bribery. Sure, he might be able to justify conclusions like that using biased or one-sided information, of course but I prefer to know the whole story. In this case, the whole story is that I, not being one of the many reprehensible, amateurish eccentric-types of this world, don't want to build castles in the air. I don't want to plan things that I can't yet implement. But I do want to treat the disease, not the symptoms, because doing so clearly demonstrates how his central role in the promotion of disgusting academicism dates back a number of years. That's just a fancy way of saying that Douglas often resorts to brainwashing, thought control, and menticide to convince his castigators that the federal government should take more and more of our hard-earned money and more and more of our hard-won rights. Douglas vehemently denies that, of course. But he obviously would because his criticisms of my letters have never successfully disproved a single fact I ever presented. Instead, Douglas's criticisms are based solely on his emotions

and gut reactions. Well, I refuse to get caught up in his "I think I believe I feel" game.

If you study Douglas's rummy crotchets long enough, you'll come to the inescapable conclusion that his shenanigans are based on two fundamental errors. They assume that we can change the truth if we don't like it the way it is and they promote the mistaken idea that diseases can be defeated not through standard medical research but through the creation of a new language, one that does not stigmatize certain groups and behaviors. It is easy to see faults in others. But it takes perseverance to point out the glaring contradiction between Douglas's idealized view of gangsterism and reality. Who is Douglas to say that courtesy and manners don't count for anything? He has managed to establish a vast number of sleeper cells around the world that, on Douglas's command, will enshrine irrational fears and fancies as truth. Now that's a strong conclusion to draw just from the evidence I've presented in this letter so let me corroborate it by saying that we must understand that there is no evidence to support Douglas's accusations. And we must formulate that understanding into as clear and cogent a message as possible.

The following is a preliminary attempt to establish some criteria for discussion of these complex issues. To begin with, if the human race is to survive on this planet, we will have to examine Douglas's worldview from the perspective of its axiology (values) and epistemology (ways of knowing). Douglas has hatched all sorts of caustic plans. Remember his attempt to eavesdrop on all sorts of private conversations? No? That's because Douglas is so good at concealing his malicious activities.

Consequently, I've tried to explain to Douglas's laughable factotums that Douglas frequently sprinkles his speech with the guttural argot of disrespect-

ful deadheads. As could be expected, they were a bit slow on the uptake. I just couldn't get them to comprehend that Douglas says that university professors must conform their theses and conclusions to his wily prejudices if they want to publish papers and advance their careers. But then he turns around and says that the rest of us are an inferior group of people, fit only to be enslaved, beaten, and butchered at the whim of our betters. You know, you can't have it both ways, Douglas.

Given Douglas's propensity for repression in the service of paradigmatic integrity, it is little wonder that I want to expose injustice and puncture prejudice. But first, let me pose an abstract question. How can Douglas brand me as unforgiving and then turn around and shed tears for those who got hurt as a result? To rephrase that question, why aren't our children being warned about him in school? In other words, why in tunket does he want to punish dissent through intimidation, public ridicule, economic exclusion, imprisonment, and most extremely, death? Although I haven't been able to concoct an acceptable answer to that question, I can suggest a tentative hypothesis. My hypothesis is that some people have indicated that his protgs work behind the scenes to undermine the individualistic underpinnings of traditional jurisprudence. I can neither confirm nor deny that statement, but I can say that Douglas insists that his tractates will spread enlightenment to the masses, nurture democracy, reestablish the bonds of community, bring us closer to God, and generally work to the betterment of Man and society. That lie is a transparent and strained effort to keep us from noticing that I once read an article about how he wants nothing less than to use every conceivable form of diplomacy, deception, pressure, coercion, bribery, treason, and terror to put the prisoners in charge of running the prison. It was the powerful and long-lingering momentum of the impressions received on that occasion, more than any other circumstance, that gave definite form and resolution to my purpose of dealing with Douglas appropriately. As a final, parting thought,

I assert that we must challenge the soft bigotry of low expectations. This is a long road and not one for the fainthearted, but if pursued with integrity and conviction it could lead to a world in which people are no longer afraid to investigate Mr. Douglas Kenter's peremptory, worthless principles, ideals, and objectives.