

Democracy In America and the Misdemeanor of Culture

Rahsaan Simon

September 2025

Prologue

Coming into the new quarter millenium of the United States, it is important to reflect on the ideas of what it means to be American. This meaning changes heavily within time, as is all familiar to us; the practices of our forefathers and their fathers were radically different from our practices now, even more so than we'd believe them to be. Yet we have never seen the American identity so lost as it is now. What is it that an American does now? What is it that an American is supposed to do now? Diversity, in all regards, has brought both unparalleled joy and unparalleled confusion.

Wisdom does not always come with age; this is true for all things, including the great experiment that makes up this country. Despite America's age, democracy as an idea has not been able to properly reconcile with the thoughts of new generations. What was once the new and bright idea of the times has now, itself, developed age and has nearly faded into obscurity. The Democratic model was intended to allow for incredible flexibility, yet a commitment to liberty and democracy itself. Yet, this incredible flexibility has proved to be at the model's own detriment. Conflicting opinions rip and tear at this country until it may eventually reach the democratic model itself, and this too may be trained.

It is wrong to say that people must be forced into sharing certain beliefs, that diversity must be taken out of the democratic model. Diversity itself is not the issue; rather, it is the egregious and numerous processes of handling this diversity that tend to affect democracy the most. People of all creeds have begun going through extraordinary measures to unite themselves with others; this unison is often not in democracy but in violence and adherence. This is the issue with free politics, not that it exists, but that it cannot be handled responsibly under human influence; it is, in essence, too idealistic to bear for the fragile person.

And now we are presented with a conundrum. There are too many who have reached a fragile state, their minds able to be tainted and run through via false ideas in seeking retribution. Why? Through a lack of guidance and leadership. Democracy was not designed to be self-governing; it was designed to be headed

by a capable, courageous, and actionable leader. Twice this, it was designed to be headed and protected by a large group of even more capable leaders, the congress. When the system which we once had recognized as foolproof goes awry, and the populous of both the congressional and the executive branches are headed by those who do not fit the requisites needed to fulfill a democracy, we are left without the personality which keeps an American politically secure, and they are left not broken but able to be broken by not a strong political force, the type which would indoctrinate a politically secure person to their way, but a decisive and strategic one. This is to say that they, in this state, are able to be guided not by leadership, but ideology alone. Democracy rips apart halfway with the people themselves, in compliance with the methodology of strategic political warfare.

This is the current state of democracy, and thus, the current state of the United States. It is filled tip to tip with people who have experienced years of disappointment and, torn in just about every aspect, have been subjected to intense political warfare from the organizations that seek to grow their power by absorbing the politically insecure. They are aided, in part, by their assets, which they have already accumulated in the process of developing (as is natural for an organization), and the people whom they have already indoctrinated, for one reason or another, who may work on their behalf to propagate the division even further. It is, in brief and honesty, the most monumental attempt at the acquisition of power via singular entities (or groups of entities which act as one) the world has yet seen; it is no different than the medieval monarchy which once held the world by a firm and steady grip.

I

In god we trust was not only meant by the founding fathers in a metaphorical sense, but a literal one. The nation was born by chance and opportunity, and they knew that, in agreement with the nature of permanent tradition, it will continue to exist by chance. This is to say that, in its existence and structure will forever rely more on the perception of the people, whatever that perception may be, and thus, for good or for worse. It is trusted that the population, in collection, will make good decisions which may advance the state of the country, or abolish it in its entirety should need be.

Relying on human perception and judgment, especially en masse, is objectively the human experience's closest analog to relying on god. Each person is the expression of "god"¹, yet, when in collection, they are required to be subject to a being of a "higher authority", that is, one who is president above them. This authority is the expression of the entities and objectives that they hold as being common among them and yet potentially so disillusioned as to provide no real value; one could imagine all of the passion and genuineness that is lost in the process of translating power from a collection to one of two candidates.

¹In this way, the meaning of god is to be interpreted by the reader; it can refer to a literal god or god as in the expression of one's nature, depending on how you choose.

The broader shifts of ideology and judgment hold but a fraction of the power that the individual beliefs that make them up do. One could find that they are unique and special in thought whilst alone, yet, when arriving at the ballot, find that the only truths they have in common with either candidate are the facts that they are human and ideate in the first place. That is to say that expecting people to push an entire country forward meaningfully when in collection is incredibly idealistic.

Moreover, when one finds themselves stumped at the ballot by a sheer lack of similarity between them and the person who is to hold a certain authority over their lives, they tend to not let their own personal ideologies guide them, but instead the superficial things which, in the end, may or may not have a say in the matter of the country's advancement. One could find themselves voting for someone they know to be charismatic, funny, and potentially eccentric, but they may just as well find in their right minds that the country requires someone who is serious in attitude, careful, and decisive. Yet these characteristics are not immediately persuasive (at least, to a massive group), and so we find ourselves not guided by our rightful judgment but the superficial commonalities, the broader shifts, which themselves may be manufactured by careful rhetoric or entirely artificial.

In other words, the idealistic nature of the constitution is both a gift and a curse to the people. It both gives them power and allows for this power to be taken away, not at the hands of the deserving leader but by the conniving of a conspirator.

*

How does one make something which, in trying so hard to be democratic, has perceived itself to be forever democratic, undemocratic?

In old times, monarchs were the ones who prevented democracy within America. They actively opposed democratic ideals via the exertion of a strong and unwavering influence upon the population, which they were sure to abide by. Now one sees this state as impossible and unfathomable. Written into the fabric of our new country was the expectation of continuous democracy, in spite of circumstance, identity, or one's other ideals; even the formal disenfranchisement of the country would be left to a democratic convention.

The idealistic nature of the constitution reveals itself in these measures, however. In the ignorance of one's wealth, character, and perhaps their destructive nature, one finds that the constitution ignores people's power to pervade others in ways that are akin to the traditional monarchy.

In one's circumstance, they may find, in the extraordinary case, that they may be better persuaded by the better circumstances of others, and, in the other extreme, one may find the ability to persuade others with merely wealth. In our current state, we find this circumstance gaining incredible momentum, as the population is ever more so divided in wealth, by straining the economy by those who already find themselves wealthy, and thus, they use their circumstance to

persuade the poor, which has become the moderate, into their endeavors. This does not reveal itself in flashy displays, but rather, the wealthy slight their hand on the minority in promise of greater circumstance and, in doing so, find themselves, the minority, able to properly and utterly control the minority.

In one's character, they may find, in the extraordinary case, that they may be able to use their better identity to gain advantage of a certain susceptible group of people through methods of emotional persuasion and manipulation. The way in which a person identifies, by their creed, religion, or gender, may greatly influence a person's attitude towards their causes, and when such causes are in opposition to another group, which has forged itself as discernible by any of these characteristics, one will surely find themselves controlled via an unshakeable human need to see themselves as superior to these alternative groups, and therefore succumb to whatever principles their leader instills within them, regardless of their soundness.

In one's principles or ideologies, they may find, in the extraordinary case

The significant and concerning point here is the sheer number of cases that have seen themselves evolve from tidbits to the extraordinary. It is an outbreak of opposition and division that seeks to tear in two, three, four, or whatever number of divisions are necessary, to gain a better hold on a select few, for the sake of harvesting their character, circumstance, or ideologies, and assembling them into one, which is much easier to control than many.

II

The facilitation of the failure of democracy is not the organizations that seek control, for we cannot help their bloodlust, but rather, our own culture is what commits the greatest offense to its members at the discretion of these organizations, in an organic and seemingly harmless way.

Society has never been more connected than it has now, and as was seen earlier, connection brings a certain susceptibility to control. In this way, all members of the society become vulnerable, since through digital means, we may be able to be in contact with each other and foreign, perhaps dangerous ideals, for extended periods of time.

Human nature dictates, in an exceptional case, a certain interaction with ideas that is either overly dissenting or overly corroborating. We find that, if unprovoked and when overwhelmed by a deceptively higher influence, it is often better to completely dissociate from an idea or to do the opposite than to really interpret them. That is that some form of interpretation would find that the idea is expressed in a relevant way in a person's mind, such that it becomes remade and is personally relevant to them; rather, the idea is swallowed whole by the person, and in doing so, they find a new type of association that is absolute and unwavering. When one allows for an idea to maintain persistence like this, it inevitably governs them and, in effect, it swallows them whole just as they have done to it.

This extremist case is the method through which we also see the new monarchy flourish. Our connection to each other has made it so that we are incessantly exposed to new ideas without our opinions on the subject matter being explicitly provoked. In this way, these ideas function more as commands than ideas, and do not create conversation but forced governance. This is worsened by the media landscape, which filters the ideas of those who are already powerless in favor of those ideas that come from high-standing influence. In this case, the ruler continues to rule while the dissenter is cast in their shadow. When we do not hear the voices of others in our anguish, one is quick to presume that this sentiment is unfounded. Even more natural is the feeling to immediately accept or believe an idea without genuine thought, without perceiving it, in anguish, and it is through this that we imitate or recount these ideas without understanding them fully and without making them our own. This, above all else, is control.

*

A lack of equal voice among all members of a society forms the foundation of a culture; a unified voice, through which the opinions of the individuals are amplified through their expression in ensemble. In the past, we have seen cultures in which individuals still hold their identity accountable for their actions, people who still see their identity as being a living and necessary part of the ensemble that forms the culture. Now, we see people abandon their individuality for the sake of becoming a culture; there is a significant shift in the purpose of a culture and one's own sentiment, inherent personality, and beliefs. Through this shift, we see people absorb culture without its benefits, since the voice that they choose to contribute ceases to be their own.

Who will be left to fill the role and significant gap that is creating a new culture when it eats itself alive? The advantageous see this opportunity as a gaping defenseless area in an otherwise castle-like society, from which they are normally excluded, and pounce on this opportunity. Not, of course, for the benefit of society, since this society, which they seek to influence, is not their own; rather, it is for the sake of controlling people that the advantageous institute new ideas, and subsequently, iterate new cultures through a massive sphere of influence that engulfs the society in its entirety.

This extraordinary circumstance gives birth to class, a clear and monumental difference between the advantageous and those which they control. In a capitalistic society, class does not always come with money, but rather, money and a desire for some sort of advantageous positioning. This is to say that wealth is not the indicator of class, but the desire to achieve power is.

With the creation of class, we are evermore divided, and such is as was intended by the person who initiated the class. In this way, it is the objective of the person of a controlling class to perpetuate their status. This objective then infests the ideas which institute upon the culture that they have chosen to influence, and they may quickly turn from leaders to monarchs should such an

infestation go unattended.

Those who desire political power are not exempt from this process. First, there comes a time of extraordinary circumstance, from which people relieve themselves of tying their identity to their culture, from which stems an entire culture that is vulnerable to guidance from outside influences. These influences establish themselves by motivating the culture to follow certain procedures, which they claim are inherent to the culture, which the people who find themselves identified with the culture are sure to follow since they find themselves already accustomed to absorbing its ideals. Furthermore, they segregate themselves as being someone uniquely in a position to give out such influence, and in turn, they consolidate more power, with which they may choose to venture into whatever positions of political power they desire democratically, having already secured the votes of many loyalists who identify themselves with the culture. In this way, a politician requires a culture that is deemed as being entirely synonymous with their being; anything less to not be scrutinized or reviewed, for the perpetuation of the culture gives a false security in times of hardship.

This illustrates the misdemeanor of culture. It is not in the original intention of a culture to be an ensemble of identical unreviewed ideas, but similar ones, and yet, in this extraordinary circumstance which is presented to us in the modern day, we find this rule utterly adjusted ever-so-slightly so as to still give the appearance of a genuine culture, which, when taken to a lens, presents the appearance of more or less a cult.

The cause of the extraordinary circumstance that has laid the foundation for the misdemeanor of culture, and thus which has been upending democracy, has been the loss of identity, or its sacrifice in favor of unity. It is the result of a last resort, a desperate attempt to find something similar among each other in the realm of ideation, because there is nowhere else to look for such support.

This is not a sudden circumstance, but rather, one that has, for a long time, been in the making. From a political standpoint, the aforementioned system has been abused so relentlessly that it has evolved from a minute to a gigantic stature. It has caused now and before a desperation in people to find a political culture identical to theirs as opposed to encountering the truth of diversity in political stance; to understand what it means to be democratic in the face of a republican and vice versa. Indeed, even the creation of a political culture itself is an offense to the democratic nation, wherein one is, by design, intended to be granted equal representation, and thus equal opportunity, and to forfeit this to an illusion of a higher congruence requires an astonishing manipulation.

III

The destruction of democracy in American society is then, fundamentally, a sport constructed by those negative influences which seek the nefarious played by those citizens who seek reconciliation and hope. It is a collaborative and mutualistic relationship in nature, which is normally compliant but is thrown

off balance under extraordinary circumstances, wherein, with the detriment of another, who is perhaps sensitive and greatly affected by such a circumstance, the other is able to feed and to grow parasitically so as to desire devouring the other entirely.

This relationship lies at the center of any model that dares to call itself democratic. This is to say that the conditions that create a proto-monarchy from the pains of a democracy will remain so forever. Even further, this idealistic nature of a democracy is what characterizes it; to give humans freedom is to trust that they will do what is right with such freedom, to punish those that don't, but not to prevent all from doing, such a concept can never and will never be disassociated from freedom without destroying it, and therefore it will never be disassociated from democracy without destroying the concept that makes it all

There are no institutions that need to be made, no amendments to the constitution or passed legislation needed to curb this issue; perhaps some would be helpful, but not conclusive, for fear of perhaps destroying the one thing we held so much for granted. We are then left to wonder how this issue might be fixed, how, in times of chaos and crisis, might our exploitation be prevented and our hopes restored. This question is, at its foundation, a personal endeavor. The American must seek to individually regain their identity; to attempt to live faithfully and be hopeful in their future; to see the beauty in things and people even when it is hard to do so; to better cast their judgments so that these are not reciprocated and manipulated in bad faith. What the country needs, then, is perhaps not a unification on the national level, for one should not indulge too much in culture, but rather, a unification at the personal level. To unite oneself with concepts, people, beliefs, landmarks, and so forth, which bring to them a sense of belonging, and an unwavering sense of meaning to what their life is and what their life should be. Only then can one find themselves unexploited, but unmoved by those people that seek to influence them by changing these beliefs which they have established, whilst being simultaneously unopposed to such ideas for their potential personal benefit.

The personal awakening of money will then, in due time, lead to a cohesive unification in all, and united we are powerful beyond those individuals with influence, in spite of this and their wealth and in spite of their malicious desires or tendencies. When encountered with a laissez-faire society, a democracy, the personal benefit of many will coagulate into the benefit of one, which will see to it that the balance between the many and the few continues to exist. To be self-indulgent is to be, in essence, democratic, and to be democratic is to be American.

R. A. Simon