

The Replacement

Samuel Levy

One of the important issues of modern society (and not only of the Bulgarian) is the replacement of civic social activity with a system of social networks (commercial media) that operate on their own dynamics, fully controlled by economic, corporate and/or oligarch interests. Thus, the citizen can follow the political performance from the 'first row', but is practically excluded from direct or even indirect participation therein. Although he is considered the protagonist, he is no longer even in the cast.

This did not happen quickly. It happened slowly, consistently, systematically and the society of citizens barely felt it. The financial and economic lobby saw that the potential of a free civil society was so influential that it could change the policy of the political forces in power so as to radically change their political direction. So a process of symbiosis began between the structures of civic activism and the politically involved business. Civic activism needed the resources to achieve its goals, and the business needed to promote its views on political focus. Accordingly, the political forces needed more active funding. Practically, a process of taking over NGOs 'from within' began, and where this was not possible, businesses built up their own non-governmental organizations or social groups of obedient activists ready to defend one thesis or another, to protest against one thing or another, to write petitions and organize subscriptions, even referendums.

A typical example of this is the dozen environmental organizations defending radically opposite goals, depending on who the donor is. Furthermore, the arguments have nothing to do with the real environmental needs of the region. Suffice it to recall the cases of *Dundee Precious Metals*, *Borotours*, *Vitosha Ski* or those of waste processing. The protests were organized according to the donor's preferences. For or against - according to the market orientation.

Let's look at a key issue for the country. The epidemic of COVID-19 caused great damage to both politicians and businesses in our country. As early as four months ago, there was talk of a new peak in October (2021). Mathematicians and epidemiologists have accurately predicted the scale of the new peak. That is - the authorities knew, and businesses (in the area of alcohol, gambling halls and nightclubs) were warned. Due to incompetence, the authorities did nothing. Businesses didn't too, especially since they relied on their close ties and influence over the government.

The new peak of diseases started. And a process of crisis PR began, organized in interaction between circles of oligarchs and the authorities. The government announced crisis measures affecting businesses. The latter reacted strongly - with prepared protests organized by civil society organizations. The government adjusted the measures by reducing them by one hour. Businesses

continued to disregard them. The authorities organized a spectacular police raid, fining people inside the restaurants and not the management. The reason - they were not to blame, because customers did not want to leave at the appointed hour. The business was cleared of not complying with the measures. It continued to make profit on the back of the growing pandemic. But the authorities also needed an excuse. To this end, several polling agencies published surveys, which showed that 43% of citizens did not want to be vaccinated. The government wanted, but the people did not. This may be true. But as of today (September 25, 2021), the vaccinated in our country are below 19%, and according to the above surveys 65% would like to be vaccinated. What is going on and why the other 46% have not been vaccinated? And why did the government not launch any awareness campaigns on the benefits of vaccines? Is it because more than 21,000 deaths have reduced the deficit in the National Social Security Institute? And who does it really benefit?

Did this happen by accident on grounds of incompetence, or was it a pre-arranged game between the oligarchs and the officials, using the media and hastily trumped-up non-governmental organizations to organise protests and the media to exaggerate their real existence?

At first sight, everything seems normal. A civic organization protests against a government decision. Typical of democratic countries. Then what betrayed the backstage of the deal. A stupid mistake. The President, who has nothing to do with the decisions of the Ministry of Health, met with the protesters and they got along. The protesters commended him before the media, promised him a shoulder for a second term, and he, in turn, apparently insisted that the inspections in the entertainment establishments be stopped. Something that is a fact - after the first night of media coverage, suddenly there was silence. Although the restaurants and bars continued to operate after midnight.

The deal is obvious; business and the authorities have never been of different opinion, but the President and the executive needed the show, using a quasi-civic organization of workers in drinking and entertainment establishments, as well as well-funded media. Both parties (actually the same party) are satisfied. As a result, in just one week the incidence rate of 8.9% is now 12.4%. But this is only a problem for the citizens.

Thus, gradually and imperceptibly, the real civil society organizations were replaced by the convenient ones. Practically, civic activism, which was supposed to be at the forefront of each country's democratic governance, was liquidated, or at least pushed into the rat hole. Some NGOs became institutionalized (became part of the corporations, banks or state institutions that 'feed' them, and others simply disappeared). The *Occupy Wall Street* movement has been shouting desperately since 2011 that the replacement is in full swing. The aim of the movement was to change the decision of the US Supreme Court, allowing no ceiling on political donations from corporations. The majority of

voters felt that this made the political system completely and openly corrupt and financially dependent on corporations. We all know how this movement ended.

Two months after its start, on October 17, the New York police forcibly dispersed the protesters. Journalists were not allowed. The protest died of suffocation due to the silence of the media, which preferred to broadcast the paid reports on the polluted park. However, the media self-finance their activities and depend on big advertisers. The one who pays, orders the music.

The replacement of civil society by technology media was a fully controlled and well-conducted operation in which not only did citizens have no involvement (other than as cast or passive observers), but it was imposed on them that their opinion was exactly what social networks imputed to them. Thus, the government was obliged to comply with the 'civic public opinion' presented by the social networks, which in turn were totally dependent on economic and oligarchic groups. This is how the government became completely dependent on the staffing and management decisions of the oligarchy.

I have already written that what is happening in our country is a consequence of the open war between economic and financial groups seeking to replace the current circles of oligarchs with a new one. That is, we are in the process of replacing the oligarch, not the governance model. Therefore, as a necessity a political crisis, economic crisis, inflation, social tension, impossibility to conduct any dialogue at any level was imposed. In practice, the division of the parties is not by systemic (ideologically bound) and anti-systemic (ideologically anarchic), but by parties of the status quo (supporting the previous oligarchs) and protestors (supporting the new oligarchs). What is specific, however, is that both the new and the old oligarchs are genetically identical and even the same in their social nature, attitude and goals and only different as persons. But that is another matter.

More importantly, the change of one oligarchic entity with another is accompanied by a change in the political model, and now the model of political governance is being intensively replaced from totalitarian (under Borissov) to authoritarian - under Radev. This change is the basis of the purposeful collapse of all state systems, the devaluation of power structures and the imposition of a new myth - about the Hero-Saviour, who is initiated and sacralised by killing the Dragon (the old Hero-Saviour). Thus, in the form of a show, the oligarchic structures are being replaced, well disguised by the political performances (the bare breasts of the protest, the President's *Rot front*, the suffering with the arrests before the Council of Ministers and the public court for Rosenets). And the replacement of the oligarchy is going quietly, behind the ministerial decisions of the Caretaker Government. Through redistribution of influence and financial resources.

Inflation from 0.1% in March, with the advent of the Caretaker Government jumped in April to 3.0%, in July was 5%, and in August is expected to be over 6.0% (according to NSI). However, the prices of basic

consumer goods show something else - an increase of 60%. Increased VAT revenues for the state reduced NSSI deficit, due to the very high mortality rate from COVID (over 4% - the highest in Europe and in the top ten in the world). These social and economic problems had to be covered with an intriguing show, broadcast in full on television, so that they do not become major problems of society, the leaks in the energy sector, the games with BDB, the fraud with the financial update of the budget, etc. not to be seen. Thus, again it was necessary to think of the strong hand, of the good Leader-Saviour, and of the acute and inevitable need for him.

This led to a conscious and intentional erosion of the political party system and its replacement with a quasi-political one, where the parties are not political parties, but liquefied (volatile) movements, without ideological system of values, without clear visions for the country's development, without any characteristic. They are for everything (if it is new, even if pointless) and against everything (if it is old and not protest). Thus, their ideological reception today may be left-wing, tomorrow conservative, the day after tomorrow anarchistic, then nationalist-chauvinistic, and later on cosmopolitan. This hotchpotch has the exceptional ability to be such at this moment, at the next – potato pie, a moment later - a pheasant with truffles, and then - İmam bayıldı with grapes.

Creating a stable government with such formations is impossible. This is extremely convenient for the founder of the Caretaker Government and especially for the corporate interests of the oligarchy. He - President Radev, initiating such structures – is the main reason for holding three consecutive parliamentary elections without electing a political government. And the motive is that the oligarchic replacement (not change) is not over. Thus, the President is the only legitimate political institution. And the only one functioning is that of his magical assistants - the ministers. We saw the functions of the Interior Minister Rashkov during the elections - blocking the activities of all political opponents through the resources of coercive power. This affirms the authoritarian power of the President, behind which stand the corporate interests of the oligarchy. The principle of intolerance is towards all those who do not accept the personality of President Radev as worthy of this role. The fact is that he does not play it because he does not understand it, does not realize its unifying, calming and even appeasing role, but accepts it as a stick he can swing.

This is one of the issues that led to the imminent powerful attack on that part of the judiciary that is not yet under the wing of autocracy. Attacks on the Public Prosecutor's office have a threefold purpose - to lower its integrity, to replace the inconvenient Prosecutor General, to impose the autocrat as a mentor – this one can be accused, the other cannot. Thus, the work of the Prosecutor's Office is blocked, it is put in an explanatory mode and its real functionality becomes zero. I.e. this confirms the original thesis - it worked for the old oligarch, so now it does not work. This does not mean that I consider the work

of the Prosecutor's Office to be particularly successful. Rather, the opposite is true. But undermining the prestige of the Prosecutor's Office is part of undermining the prestige of statehood in the country.

The overthrow of all these institutions - parliament, the executive, the prosecutor's office, and the glorification of the only power - the presidential - is a gross violation of the constitution, which has given the president only representative power and that of Uniter. It must be recalled that the debate over the president's power was long debated before the adoption of the constitution in 1990 for this very reason. Moreover, the president was originally the 'chairman of the Republic' (something the UDF and MRF insisted on), precisely because of fears of attempts at autocratic rule and shattering the role of parliament and political parties as leading factors in the formation of authority in the country. After all, the primary power is that of the parliament, the place where the people are represented.

In fact, in the new-old scheme - the replacement of the totalitarian regime with an authoritarian one - there is a strict hierarchy and systematic order. Just the opposite of what the new party movements are presenting. There is really no ideology - it is not clear what is on the left, what is on the right, is there a centre, etc. But on the other hand, it is very clear that the figure presented as the first is not behind the authoritarianism of the regime - the interest (not the person) of the financial, corporate or economic group that finances everything comes first. That is - money comes first.

That's why the movement was called *Occupy Wall Street*. For the uninformed, the offices of the largest financial and economic groups in the United States are located on Wall Street. Let us recall that this movement had followers in over 950 major cities around the world - through London, Paris, Berlin, Brussels, Sofia, Athens, Vienna and all European capitals. Everywhere it had the fate of his New York counterpart. Drowned in the silence of the media.

In the system after the money come the political interests of the funders - they choose the leader of the party-movement-coalition-union-organization-league-group, or whatever it is called. His/her powerful presentation as a personality, the bearer of a modern civil society, takes place through the constant media inflation of the personal qualities of the leader (or leaders). They (or he) are highly educated, civilized, competent, young, ambitious, proven businessmen, creative, responsible, honest, successful individuals. They are ready to abandon their super successful business ventures and clean the cesspool of the existing political reality. In fact, they are *Knife-like, Flower-like, Like Nothing at All in the World* (based on the short story by William Saroyan). That is - they are everything that citizens dream of, and exactly what they want most. They are brilliantly packaged air that we can fill according to our personal preferences - with a European standard, with personal well-being they bring for us, with brilliant social services in healthcare, pensions, trade opportunities, business ventures, even if you like family happiness.

These two levels of the oligarch-political power scheme need magical helpers. We come to the so-called volatile movements. They are part of the tools needed for replacement. They have the exact characteristics of a leader as described above. They are exactly his copy and are open to anything and everyone; all around and everywhere. They can fit in a matchbox, but they are bigger than the world ocean, they are wiser than every philosopher from Socrates to Habermas, but they are also on the mental level of the outcast sleeping on the bench in the park. Thus they can 'swallow' any ideology, as well as any anarchistic 'morality'. Therefore, they are convenient, easy to control and manipulative. It is no coincidence that each of the protest formations runs away from clear and precise formulations of their ideological values (because there are none), or from fixing a precise place in the normal political system.

On the contrary, they deny the existing political system and claim to create a new one of their own. What, on whose basis, based on what moral values - for them this is a meaningless question. Rather, it is a question to which they have no answer. For them, these are questions for after the 'revolution', i.e. the protest victory in parliament (with at least 121 MPs), the beheading of systemic parties or their marginalization. Do you remember how the French Revolution ended and what happened to Maximillian Robespierre? Or how did the Russian revolution end, and what happened to Lev Davidovich Trotsky? How would theirs end? By proclaiming a new, postmodern democracy, with new volatile moral values different from those we have known since the dawn of humanity? With a new morals in which morality is immoral?

Doesn't that remind you of that smartass standing in front of the giraffe's cage at the zoo as he commented, 'Well, there is no such thing as an animal and there can be no such thing'. The denial of the obvious and the initially established is the *modus operandi* of these formations.

The formation of volatile movements also 'fooled' part of the systemic political forces so that they turn their backs on their system of values and act in accordance with the conjuncture of set-up public attitudes (BSP never adopted the Istanbul Convention, although its MEPs accepted it). This upset the status quo, so that it further destabilized the already unstable whole. It has previously included movements and parties without a clear ideological essence (NMSS, GERB), as leading political forces at that. I.e. - the system as a whole has been at risk. And postmodernity brought new technological challenges for which systemic parties were not ready. The reason is that the systemic parties are not as mobile (as the movements) so that in an instant they can turn the hotchpotch into bird nest soup, at least in the voter's head.

The problem now is that the old forms of communication between a party and a voter have been completely replaced and the door-to-door principle now functions as 'e-mail to e-mail', or party structures have been replaced by social networks. The formation of the so-called 'protest parties' became not because of the presence of a significant group of citizens with similar ideological views, but

because of specially created social Internet groups, imposing on citizens certain views suggested to them from outside.

Such groups are usually small, consisting of several individuals. Thus, the 'hard' electorate of thousands was replaced by an electorate (or rather was created) of 3-5 people with a 'liquefied' (volatile) ideology, which can take any form - from communism to fascism, without causing any problems. The old forms of party communication do not work, and the systemic parties still (or rather in general) fail to compete with the new ones (in their information and technological advancement). The latter are much more mobile, more attractive and much more informative than the 'classics'. And thus they win. Not through pragmatic policies, but through imposed suggestions over social networks and dependent television channels (on the principle of myths formation).

That is how the candidates for members of the parliament in their entirety remain anonymous, representing themselves through the popular party leaders (the 3-5 people in question). The vote is actually for the popular media leader, not for the qualities of the candidate from the region. I.e. - even the small part of a purely majority element in the choice disappears, most candidates are completely unfamiliar. What an irony - the parties that screamed their heads off about the majority turned out to be the most non-majority. The fact is that they did not rearrange the candidates in any case. Thus deception becomes reality, reality becomes deceptive. This, as well as the total and rapid replacement of each of the advertised values, is the dominant beginnings of the new political system suggested as postmodern democracy.

Last in the hierarchy - as authority, but not as a function are the media. The meaning of such systemic manipulation - creating a psychological environment for the perception of those in power as smarter, more educated, more knowledgeable, more capable than us. An absolute prerequisite for us to perceive obedience as our natural state. The socio-psychological factor for the possibility of mass influence is key to the conquest of the media by any government. Moreover, by the not very democratic and totalitarian.

In practice, the media replace the dialogue, but with one-way communication - the reader, the viewer, the listener does not have a direct opportunity for a different opinion - they can only hear, and what is repeated many times is quickly perceived as true. One example - it is said that the sun is yellow. Look at it - it is white, glowing, it shines in white. The action of the media is similar - what is often repeated is perceived as credible. In this way, the genuine is replaced by the plausible, by the untrue, the improbable. The media can do just that with its endless mass irradiation.

How does this mass irradiation work? On the principle of the atomic bomb. Even where there is no obvious damage, radiation has done its job. For the years to come. But it is invisible, manifesting at a later stage. (Psychological) mutants are born, who in principle have a different system of values, imposed on them almost subconsciously, without their active participation, but as a systemic

irradiation. Imagine such a bomb attacking your mind several times a day everywhere - on TV, radio, the press, on the tram, at home, at work. Dozens of nuclear bombs every day. Doesn't this explain to you, at least in part, the popularization of the *chalga* culture, of the ersatz, of the fake, instead of the original? In my opinion, this is one of the most important factors in our country for not to be able to give birth to a stable civil society. For a civil society to exist, the media must be its ally. And this cannot happen in our country, there are not even such indications.

Dialogue is unacceptable, there is no alternative. The monologue fills all political talk and suffocates the possibilities for any different opinion. It is the job of the media not to allow this, to impose as unnatural to look for dialogue and the opponent, to offer options for choosing between different alternatives. Which media does this in our country? Have you seen a dispute between a politician in power and an opposition politician - at any level? No song like that...

The need for authenticity in the modern political narrative should not be built on the mythological foundations of fairy tales, although pleasing journalism interprets them perfectly. This results in a very specific distortion of time and space, of facts, events and characters. Pure information is modified or even better – is replaced by fictional. The information becomes even more mediocre and therefore more and more helpful. Gradually, the so-called ‘fourth estate’, which in principle should reflect the mood of civil society, becomes a servant of the first authority - the executive (ergo – economic power). Please note, not just a subordinate partner, but a slave dog.

Moreover, a process of consolidation of the multitude of guard dogs in the same hands has begun. The TV commercials are in the hands of two or three people again connected with the oligarchy. Completely dependent on the companies-advertisers, which in turn are completely dependent on the main orders - infrastructure projects, fuels or energy. From banks or pharmaceutical companies. Which of these areas is not dependent on the government? Is it the energy sector – look at Lukoil or Overgas, the banks - on the money of state institutions (do you remember Cibank, CCB or Bulbank?), or the mobile operators - on the frequencies provided by the state? This closes the circle. Although a media is not directly dependent on the executive, it is indirectly highly dependent on it and is therefore inevitably at its service. This is definitely not just a Bulgarian phenomenon. But in developed democracies, there are developed civil society mechanisms that prevent these distortions, or at least correct them at a later stage. But as it turns out, not always and not everywhere this is true. Rather, the opposite is true. *Occupy Wall Street* proved it.

Against the background of all that has been said so far, let's go back to the recent past. In November 2002, a non-governmental organization was established in Bulgaria. Its goals were: ‘The aspiration of the founders will be to turn civil society into a real factor for decision-making in politics and

economics'. The founders were: Tsvetelina Borislavova (banker), Svetoslav Bozhilov (banker), Stefan Popov (political scientist), Venelina Gocheva (editor-in-chief), Levon Hampartzumyan (banker), Krasen Stanchev (economist and political scientist), Sasho Donchev (large industrialist, owner of Overgas), Krassimir Gergov (advertiser), Ivan Krastev (political scientist) Frank Bauer (TV tycoon), Valentin Zlatev (industrialist) and Ivo Prokopiev (industrialist and media tycoon). In total, three bankers, three large industrialists, three media tycoons. What is this NGO, called *Global Bulgaria*, organized for, if not to create a new political project? Otherwise, what can connect media, industrialists, bankers and political engineers?

GERB was their first political project. Prime Minister Borissov himself (a puppet on a string in the hands of the above-mentioned) explained how many ministers each of the members of the above NGO has received. Throughout the entire GERB government, there were ministers nominated only by this circle and 'friends' of the leader Borissov. Another party, Democratic Bulgaria (actually a coalition) is also in the circle of friends - again created by this NGO - , whose leaders are again people from this circle - Hristo Ivanov (Minister under Borissov), Borislav Sandev, Atanas Atanasov (representative of Ivan Kostov, who also created Levon Hampartzumyan, Ivo Prokopiev, Valentin Zlatev). They are the most classic form of government by oligarchy, which has acquired the political character of totalitarianism. Why then did the system of the oligarchy have to be pushed? Who organized the protests in 2019-2020? Why didn't the oligarchs stop this?

The answer is simple, but at the same time - hold on to the chairs - shocking. The protests were organized and financed by the same circles of oligarchs, again by the same political engineers, again advertised by the same media, again with the participation of their Democratic Bulgaria. The reason for the protests was that Borissov had forgotten himself - he tried and set up his own economic circle, etc. - the 'Tom-cats', who came into conflict with *Global Bulgaria*. He tried and established his own bank, but again with a man of Ivan Kostov – the Corporate Commercial Bank under the leadership of Tsvetan Vassilev. In 2014, it was already the fourth largest bank in the country. This shocked the globalists. The bank sank, but with its money it went outside the circle of the oligarchs.

Borissov's removal became inevitable, and DSB's behaviour in parliament became oppositional, even though they had acting ministers. The schizophrenic behaviour is easy to explain - Borissov was already in the way, but the ministers were working for *Global Bulgaria*. The first warning to Borissov who had believed himself that he was running the process came in a flash. He lost the 2016 presidential election. Radev was elected to be Borissov's opponent both politically and corporately. The war between the two identical (both generals, both former communists, both alpha-males, both not very intelligent) began immediately. Everything else happened before our eyes. A change was

announced, but in fact it was a replacement. Systemic political parties were left with a finger in their mouths, while a dozen new political formations emerged around them, funded by the same oligarchs. All created in one mould, as described above.

Now we are witnessing another political product, *We Continue the Change* of the new yuppies Kiril Petkov and Asen Vassilev. In fact, we have got tired with the topics of yuppies in Bulgarian politics. It has been played out since the time of Simeon's rule and gurus like Ivan Krastev, Krasen Stanchev and Stefan Popov know this perfectly well. Then why play it again. Well, because it works. What could be more attractive than our boys, who shocked abroad with their successes, patriots, who proved their love for their people by giving up their foreign citizenship, graduated from Harvard, left successful businesses in the USA, Canada and South Africa and came to save us, the unfortunate ones? If it looks like the beginning of a fairy tale – you are not mistaken.

The process of creating myths necessarily requires the presence of such characters, which bear something exotic, something secret, something hidden, but carry the power of the future anticipated victory. In this way, they are both unified with the community but endowed with their skills, greater than those of others. That's why the yuppies were chosen again. And the name of the movement, the party, or whatever they call it, is 'We continue the change', the same change that led to inflation, the change of the boards of key institutions. Otherwise, *We Continue the Change* was identified politically by Mr. Petkov (obviously prepared for the protagonist) - it will be both right-wing in ideology, left-wing in results, and centrist in beliefs, but will partner only with the parties of change created among the globalists - Democratic Bulgaria – right-wing, coalition *Stand up! Mafia, Get Out!* – left-wing and if they accept the superiority of those who continue the change, they may admit to power Trifonov's people, but with many reservations. This automatically excludes the traditional systemic parties that form the democratic foundations of the state.

Apparently, Mr. Petkov did not have enough time to learn at Harvard that in the United States, Canada and throughout Europe, including South America, governance is carried out by systemic, i.e. - parties with strong ideological convictions, and not by quasi-civil society organizations looking for the umbrella of an already registered formation, such as *Volt*, to fill them with their own thing, as the already mentioned phrase *Knife-like, Flower-like, Like Nothing at All*. If he had listened carefully in business school, he would have known that in almost all of Eastern Europe there were attempts (somewhere quite successful) by the oligarchy to seize power - there were in the Czech Republic, there are still in Hungary, and the corruption index is too high in Romania, Poland, Slovakia, etc. If he had studied carefully, he would have known that *Alternative for Germany* - a typical quasi-movement, coalition, party, etc. of the 'something like nothing' type, was a second political force for

some time and was a model of volatility and anti-systemism, which in the last elections barely attached itself to the Bundestag. It was considered a right-wing formation, only with its attitude towards immigrants, but it was for the separation of Germany from the EU and a series of populist left-wing measures. He would know that such problems existed in Italy, France, and Spain, and they did not bring prosperity. This could be justified for an actor in another political burlesque, which no one will remember only after 2-3 years. But is it a valuable quality for a straight-A Harvard student?

A closer example to us is neighbouring Greece. Six years ago, the situation there was similar to that in our country, in terms of the situation of the political system, intolerance of the socialists and intolerance of New Democracy (right-wing). And exactly such a formation came to power; it won the elections with 36% - SYRIZA. It is something like a party, like a coalition, like a union of an absurd combination of Maoists, communists, anarchists, anti-globalists, and so on. In 2015, Alexis Tsipras (a young yuppie) was elected because he promised the people to 'tear down' the austerity programs imposed on the bankrupt country and not to play the whistle of the financial markets. He called on the EU to know that world civilization had started from Greece and that the world had to pay for the democracy that came from Greece. That Greece was ready to leave the EU and give up the euro and get its drachma back. He appointed another young yuppie from the United States, Yanis Varoufakis, as financial minister. A rocker (at that time, now a professor at the University of Athens) and a great opponent of the European establishment. The revolution had begun. And it was over before it started. The Paris Club of creditors was not impressed by the eccentric postmodernity of Tsipras and Varoufakis. On the opposite. Tsipras had to dismiss Varoufakis quickly. Some claim that Soros ordered Tsipras to do so. Varoufakis claims the same.

Instead, the Greeks had to go to the polls three times in a year, and Tsipras signed a third bailout package with the international creditors, effectively continuing his predecessors' austerity program under much more unfavourable conditions for the Greeks. That was the result of the change. Thus, the left-wing revolution did not take place at all.

Today, Greece is again governed by systemic parties. Only the taste of the bitter memory of disappointment remained in the mouths of the Greeks. And of the political fraud they believed in in 2015. I am sure that the same will happen in our country. Now is the third parliamentary election - just like in Greece. I hope it will not be exactly like in Greece - the murky foam, now at the top of our political system, will drain and what is clear, predictable, with unchanging ideological views will remain. Otherwise the Greek version comes. And the situation of the political party *We Continue the Change* with leaders Petkov and Vassilev is very similar to the story of Tsipras and Varoufakis. The model is the same; the difference is in the messages. Petkov and Vassilev are not left-wing. They are not right-wing either. Nor are they liberals. They are all taken together

and none of what was called stability. This is how Petkov defines his political identity - we are something like a centre, on the right is Democratic Bulgaria, on the left - We are Coming. I.e. - they are the whole political spectrum formed by anti-systemic formations calling themselves protesters. The President is also a protester. Our political life consists of protesters and harmful elements that are subject to decontamination or liquidation. Ideas of a political ignoramus, an anarchist or a National Socialist. I hope I'm wrong, but hardly. My doubts are reinforced by the open support of the president and the *Capital* circle for this formation, which is already behaving as the winner. And it is not difficult to see the political mark of Ivan Krastev and Stefan Popov - the people of Soros in Bulgaria.

At the end of the day, why did the replacement of the same by the same come about? Because there was a split inside *Global Bulgaria*. Because gradually and uncompromisingly, the *Capital* circle took over the other participants. Valentin Zlatev is no longer Lukoil; Sasho Donchev has never been able to be a leader. Thus, the leadership remained in the hands of Ivo Prokopiev and the genetic centre from where he was born - from the so-called 'circle of friends' of Ivan Kosovo, headed by Nikola Nikolov, bearing the remarkable name *Lamb heads*. But about the genealogy of this group - another time. We will only note that it was related to the ideas for economic development of the country, launched years ago by Andrei Lukanov.

And how do the protesters imagine the future of the systemic parties, which, despite the wet dreams of the President, Petkov and Vassilev, will still have a majority in the next parliament. Unfortunately, it is not a bed of roses. The passes of BSP and GERB to the populist phraseology of the protesters are a fact. The return to the normality of modern democracy requires the exclusion of absurdity as a building block of political promises. We saw the painful metamorphosis of Tsipras and the suffering inflicted on the Greeks. Choosing an anti-systemic group that called itself a protest group just because they hung under the President's windows, whistled with vuvuzelas and blocked crossroads, and now claiming to be a party of power is more than nonsense.

Don't watch the circus, see the backstage. There is no fight against corruption. Corruption is a priority and an ability of those in power. And now the protesters are in power - for more than half a year. Whose corruption is it today? Of those in power, right?

The fact is that in just a short period of time (18 months) 3 or 5 protest formations were born. I could not catch their number. Each of them claiming authenticity, originality, uniqueness and comprehensiveness. Each denying everyone else as retrograde, not radical enough and therefore uncreative. However, time has shown otherwise - neither of the protest (I prefer - more precisely - anti-systemic) parties succeeded in building a government, although they had the opportunity to do so. Although they had the helpful hand of the President. This made Radev to create his own party after two unsuccessful

elections - thus the political party *We Continue the Change* was born. This party has a single goal - to become the centre of the union of anti-systemic against the existing political system. A stupid idea, when the whole of the European Union is governed by systemic parties. But given the complex political situation in our country, this is the only chance to strengthen the authoritarianism of government today. The systemic parties are in a state of knockdown. The ideal opportunity for the acting president.

BSP is caught in a trap. Radev was their candidacy and had to be an alternative to Borissov. Yes, but no. Now BSP is wondering how to get rid of the replacement of Borissov with his political brother Radev without losses. This will be a hard work, given that Radev identifies with *We Continue the Change* and not with his political parents. BSP will lose. The question is how much and whether it will be a little enough.

GERB will win more votes, but will lose power. They played rough. They did not get rid in time of the prosperous incompetence they brought to power. They forgot themselves. They chose partners with whom they lost more than they gained. And people got tired of Borissov. The macho man for 10 years long is now a fat old man, with the mentality of a Sofia taxi driver.

If systemic parties do not gather the strength to communicate, to draw up a program with clear, achievable and useful goals for the society, we will go to the polls again. Until the systemic parties realize that ideological and personal intolerances face national priorities that can kill the nation if not resolved quickly and rationally.

MRF has been in opposition for 12 years, but now public opinion is prevailing that it has governed almost exclusively with the support of GERB. MRF jumped against the political purges of GERB, which liquidated the expertise of the authorities. At that time, BSP was pretending to be asleep because it was convenient for them. Now, the wagon's stuck in the swamp.

I think that the impossibility of dialogue requires looking for a more radical way to break the deadlock. Namely - to tell the truth - about the oligarchic war, its goals and the political toolkit through which it is fought. Undoubtedly, this will be shocking and will act like a bucket of ice water for people. And this should be the first and main task of the remnants of civil society, if there are still any in our country. To tell who, how and why is singing in the choir for another fraud?

The narrative should begin immediately. A good start could be a recollection of history and a more analytical account of the current democracy of the generals who seized power and purposefully and deliberately disavowed party democracy and parliament as an institution for personal advantage. It is likely that allies in the narration will appear in the future - this may be expected from *There Is Such a People*, parts of BSP (dissatisfied with the President) and parts of GERB (losing the war) and, of course, MRF. This can happen at a later stage - for example shortly before or after the election. But the story has to start

now. If we want the third parliamentary elections for this year to be the last. The fatigue of the elections is already huge and the patience is completely exhausted. And this is a very dangerous reality for any democracy.

The bad news is that at the start of the narrative, the parties have no allies or supporters. Each party will act for itself. The good news is that the other parliamentary parties do not have allies and supporters. Thus, in practice, in the political system of the country the slogan 'the case of the drowning is the work of the drowning themselves' (after Ilf and Petrov) is implemented. The political system has drowned and it must operate on the principle of Baron Munchausen.

This is also the problem of these elections. Undoubtedly, they will be the battle for Stalingrad of the survival of the systemic parties and the battle for Berlin of the protesters. With no allies and on the principle everyone against everyone. The only winner will be the oligarchy - the old or the new - or rather the old-new. The loser is the statehood and parliamentary democracy as it is in the EU. And the oligarchy wins, the one which now claims that it is fighting against itself. If it wasn't schizophrenic (tragic) it would be funny.