

### ***10.17. The social question as a cultural question.***

E.O. CF 01.

#### ***Social reason.***

By this term we understand reason as far as it concerns the social question, “social question” meaning the fact that since the dawn of time mankind has sociologically upheld the idea of “social justice” as an axiom of coexistence, yes, in the struggle for its own rights and interests uses or even pushes it through, but on the other hand never actually gets around to creating truly just situations.

So that the intersection “idea (social justice)/actual situation (social injustice)” becomes a lingering task, i.e. an “issue.

**Note.--** With Platon of Athens we note that also in the field of social justice people somewhere grasp the idea, the high indefinable idea, as light that precedes light but never succeed in making it true in the brutal facts through that not reason (the little man as Platon says) but the passions (the great monster (implantation, sexuality, economic prosperity) and the lesser lion (honor), as Platon expresses it) eclipse the idea.

#### ***Samples (chips)***

The texts that follow are not a system of propositions on social welfare and prosperity. They are, however, a set of chips that represent samples, since no one - not even the most encyclopedic sociologist - can treat the subject exhaustively.

With Platon (and his master of logic, Socrates) we therefore proceed reductively: from samples we try to generalize (i.e. classify) on the basis of common characteristics and to generalize on the basis of collective characteristics.

Without lapsing into a system that would like to be encyclopedic in some way. But in this way we get a view of the system of the social question and general characteristics are immediately exposed.

**Note.--** With K. Marx, but not so exclusively, we argue that the economy is the meeting point par excellence of the social question,--a kind of substructure about which it is in danger of being repeatedly discussed.

Therefore, we present some samples regarding economic reason - reason insofar as it deals with economics first but in such a way that only a general education (not an economist specialization) is required for this purpose.

E.O. CF 02.

***Elements of social theory.***

A social theory is a set of concepts, judgments and reasonings that attempt to capture the idea of “social justice” in human terms. One also speaks of “social ideologies.” This is to emphasize the axiomatic (at the expense of the factual) in them.-- We list the elements of the main ones.

**03/14.--** Economics.

**15/19.--** The social question seen modern.

**20/28.--** Liberalism(s). - Physiocracy. A. Smith, Social liberalism.

**29/53.--** Collectivism(n).-- Communism/socialism. Saint-Simonism, state socialism.-- Anarchism(n). (32/36).-- Marxisme(n).(37/53).

**54/60.--** Social criticism().-- Ecological movement. Underground. Beat Generation. Hippies / Yuppies. The silent majority.-- Critique of Marxist and capitalist reason,

**61/63.--** Populism(n).-- New judges,

**64/74.--** Nationalism(n).-- Communot. ident, Chinese triads.-- Nat. - Socialism (67/74).

**75/87.--** Communitarianism(s). -- Charles Taylor (Communitarian Network). Sectarian culture.-- Pluralism. Laicity.-- Multicultural liberalism (Kymlicka).-- Aristotle on the subject. Walzer’s “community tolerance Secret services (one-sided). Internal. law.

**88/100.--** Comprehensive - social theories.-- Gide’s solidarism. Walzer’s solidary civil society. Personalism. Christian solidarism (94 100).

Behold what “modern reason” intake social justice has figured out.-- All theorists put forward the elusive but very decisive idea of “social justice” either explicitly (e.g., social platonism) or adversely (e.g., the social nominalists).

From that one all possible justice encompassing idea they articulate their ‘sample’. So that they all represent logical value but a one-sided, gap-ridden value. Whoever lets them all speak, nevertheless arrives at a globalizing insight which, on a daily basis - if only to better understand the (social) politics coming at us via the news - has useful value.

E.O. CF 03.

**Economics.**

**Bibl. sample:** R.Kühn, *Leben als Bedürfen (Eine lebensphänomenologische Analyse zu Kultur and Wirtschaft)*, (R.Kühn, *Life as Needing (A Life Phenomenological Analysis of Culture and Economy)*), Heidelberg, 1996.

‘Life’ is interpreted in this work as the encompassing axiom that governs all cultural phenomena : it is in all cultural elements but reaches beyond them.- Thus life encompasses needs. Yes, life is need (given). Phenomena like labor, exchange, consumption are the solution,-- need satisfaction (demanded).

**Three capital stages.**

With *Alvin Toffler, La troisième vague*, (The third wave,), Paris, 1980, we can more or less distinguish three phases in need satisfaction. At first there is the agrarian, agricultural (arable and livestock) phase. Then comes the industrial phase as e.g. *J.P. Rioux, la révolution industrielle (1780/1880)*, Paris, 1971, describes it.--

Agriculture and modern industry made up the first two “waves. Since around 1950 we have been living in the informational phase, the third wave. The criterion is above all the mode of production to satisfy needs -- family and school, social situations, politics, indeed the whole culture evolves through the ‘waves’.

**Definition.**

A simple but lemma-functioning definition of the economy as a form of need satisfaction reads: given the available wealth (however small); demanded or sought : ‘rational’ satisfaction of needs.

**Note --** “Rational” in the economic context means, first of all, applying the economics or economy axiom. Since Petrus Aureolus (+1322), this principle has been: “With a minimum of data, achieve a maximum of results”.

*Paul A. Samuelson/ W.D. Nordham, Economics*, McGraw Hill, 1985-12, 4, defines. “Economics is the study of the ways in which individuals and society decide how to use scarce resources that could otherwise be used, with a view to producing all kinds of useful things and distributing them among all kinds of individuals and groups in society for consumption now or in the future.”

One can see that this definition denotes the economy as life in terms of process,--a process or course that includes producing, exchanging (selling and buying) and distributing for consumption. This is why the definition appears so complicated.

E.O. CF 04.

**Economics.**

**Bibl. sample:** Al. Guénette, Maurice Lagueux et la méthodologie in: *Journ. d. Geneva / Gaz.d. Laus.* 01.12.1994, 8.

Lagueux is prof in philosophy and economics at the Université de Montreal (Can.).-  
- He is interested in the type of rationality in economics. He distinguishes two strands.

**1.-- The physics thrust.**

Here the paragon is current physics. Milton Friedman (Chicago school) e.g., stands for this: a true economic science must be able to predict, as he expounds in his *Essays in Positive Economics*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953.

**a.** Economists can argue endlessly about the axiom of “rationality.

**b.** prediction comes into play because that is what makes science. Central to this is that the actors in economics make decisions as perfectly rational people who maximize an economic fact (so e.g. their profits). Friedman is convinced that economists can handle “interesting predictions” with their primarily mathematical methods.

**Note.--** Alexander Rosenberg, *Economics (Mathematical Politics or Science of Diminishing Returns?* ), Univ. of Chicago Press, 1992), argues that, in physics, predictions are of impressive accuracy (think of predicting a solar eclipse)--that, however, in economics, such a precision is absent such that one can argue that an entrepreneur with ‘flair’ will do just as well without economic science. In the ‘positive’ (mathematically sound) economics of a Friedman he does not believe. However, he does accept the possibility of “qualitative predictions” (gambling).

He believes that if rationality is called for, it should be expected from cognitive sciences (“philosophy of mind”) as well as neurobiology (which he believes are still too little advanced however).

**2.-- The humanities thrust.**

Here one speaks of “social science”: Adhered to by e.g. Friedrich Hayek (the Austrian school). Human behavior is central here, involving beliefs and objectives, influenced by certain events (take a series of strikes). Strict predictions are unfeasible here, unless ex post” (in retrospect one does see the rationality of the economic fact). As historians do with past facts. The disadvantage is that presuppositions and purposes can be so vague and stand in the way of rigorous science.

E.O. CF 05.

***“Economist’s Flight from Metaphysic”.***

This is the title of a work Lagueux is preparing. Here is what he says about it in the Q&A.

1. The economists - especially the neoclassical ones - have, by relying on an over-complicated mathematical analysis (who does not think of Benoît Mandelbrot and his thirty-plus years of searching for a mathematical representation of stock market shares and options?), founded the theory that prevails today. But - as Rosenberg rightly says - this achievement is above all a new branch of mathematics.

2. What Lagueux adds to Rosenberg’s view is that the economists have brought about a science without ontological foundations.

This means without regard to the actual reality of the economic data. In particular: what concrete fact does the economist study? The market. But what is the real market? The place where barterers meet. But what is a barter?

Jevons and the neo-classics first put the psychological data first, only to let it slip. Pareto put utility value first, basis of preferred economic choices (the more useful, i.e., profitable, the more “economic”),-- something that -- if made abstract, i.e., thought apart from the actual reality of any utility -- seemed easily treatable mathematically.

In other words: manifest is the will of such theories to get rid of ontology and flee into the world of mathematical formulas. What could have been worked out into a very concrete - understand: reality-neutral - science is a set of mathematical theories.

“That economic theory is helpful to us in discovering and understanding the real world is an untruth.” Behold what Lagueux explicitly says-

a. It is true that without such forms of economic theory it is not possible to “understand” (i.e., to express mathematically) the functioning of such things as the market, the currency system, the effects of credit, crises, etc.

b. But such theories of retrospective clarity (“ex post”) do not allow them to be predicted exactly.

***Conclusion.--*** However beautiful in its mathematical structures, yet concerning the really real economy they resemble the history-scientific explanations that “explain” the facts after the fact.

E.O. CF 06.

***The sectors of economic activity.***

With a view to the treatment of the social question, we will dwell for a moment on the “sectors”. The general population can be divided into some forty sectors. But the economists themselves summarize this mass into three major sectors.

**1.-- *The primary sector.***

Fishing, agriculture (arable and livestock), mining and quarrying.

**2.-- *The secondary sector.***

Twenty-two subsectors. Summarized in manufacturing and construction.-

***Appl. model.***-- The textile sector processes raw materials (from the primary sector) into e.g. clothes (manufacturing industry).

**3.-- *The tertiary sector.***

Eleven subsectors that include trade and services.-- ***Appl. model.***-- Education, public services, medical and health sectors are subsectors. Not goods are produced; however, service is performed.

***Note.***-- ***Tourism.***-- Tourism is a part of the tertiary sector that is steadily increasing. This “industry” creates many jobs (“jobs”). After energy extraction and automobile production, tourism ranks third in terms of jobs.

***Economic sectors.***-- We go over them briefly.-- With a view to dealing with the social question.

**a.-- *the families.***

‘Family’ in the economic sense is what works together in the same building. Thus, a person living alone is ‘family’ .

**b.-- *the companies.***

A collective that produces goods and services. To market them on “the market”,-- Depending on the sector in which the Enterprise operates, it is primary (a mine, a farm), secondary, (industry), tertiary (a store, a bank, an insurance company, a hotel).

***Note.***-- Legally, it is notable that, especially since recent globalization (the whole planet one economic space), corporations are exhibiting concentration (merger of corporations) and multi-nationalization (rooting in many countries).-- What “anchoring” actually breaks down.

**c.-- *the administrations.***

Non-saleable goods or services are traded. National income is distributed.

**d.-- *the financial institutions.***

Savings banks, stock exchanges, etc.

E.O. CF 07.

**The pedigree of economic science.**

**Bibl. sample:** P.A. Samuelson/ P. Temin, *Economics*, Tokyo, 1978-10, 921.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| The Bible (-800/+99):                           |  |
| Artistic philosophers (-600/+600)               | Practitioners,   |
| Aristotle of Stageira(-384/-322)                | Businessmen; pamphlet writers                            |
| Medieval scholasticism(800/1450)                |  |
| H. Thomas Aquinas(1225/1274)                    |  |
| Physiocracy                                     | Mercantilism (Colbertism,                                |
| Francois Quesnay (1694/1774)                    | Cameralism) (XIIth / XVIIIth e.)                         |
| La physiocratie (1768)                          | Classical ('liberal') school                             |
| Thomas R.1 Malthus(1766/1834)                   | Adam Smith (1723/1790)                                   |
| An Essay on the Principles of                   | Wealth of Nations (1776)                                 |
| Population(1798)                                | David Ricardo (1772/1823)                                |
|   | On The Principles of Political Economy(1817)             |
|   | John Stuart Mill(1806/1873)                              |
|   | The Principles of Political Economy                      |
|   | Socialism (1848) Karl Marx (1818/1883) Das kapital(1867) |
| Neo-classical (Neo-liberal) school              | Vladimir Ulyanov (Lenin (1870/ 1924))                    |
| Leon Walras (1834/1910)                         |  |
| Alfred Marshall (1842/1924)                     |  |
| John Maynard Keynes (1883/1946)                 | Russian communism  |
| Theory of Employment, Interest and Money (1936) | Chinese Communism  |
| Post-Keynesian Economy                          | New Left (The radicals)                                  |

**Note --** An addition urges itself. Especially regarding post-Keynesian theories.

**1. The "monetarism,**

Milton Friedman and the Chicago School partially reject Keynes where he makes the economy depend on demand and immediately state intervention. According to monetarism, the money supply rather controls the economy, i.e. the quantity of money in circulation.

**2. The cyclical theory** (Real Business Cycle Theory). - This claims that "random shocks" -- wars (e.g., the Gulf War), strikes, embargoes, technical novelties, political conclusions -- control the economy, -- mainly because the confidence of economic actors (investors, consumers, banks, etc...m.) evolves with it. **Note --** J. Lajugie, *Les doctrines économiques*, Paris, 1982-13 105ss., gives a list of economists who do not belong to any school (J.K.Galbraith e.v.)

E.O. CF 08.

***The recent triumph of liberalism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** P.Garcin, *Economie (Le bon marché)*, in: *Journal de Genève* 29.06.1989. Garcin is an economist.

**1. *The facts.***

where once, in our West, the church determined the axiomatics, it is the market, the economy, that “in the essence of all the questions of our Western society” as a premise determines everything.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, a multitude of experiments have been set up in the (former) communist countries---Russia, China, Hungary, Poland--to replace the state-run economy.

In the Third World, although inhibited by outdated structures, liberalization is advancing in the industrial, commercial, and monetary fields.

***Note .-- Even the socialist international.***

More than eighty socialist parties from all over the planet were represented in Stockholm on June 19/24, 1989, to celebrate the centennial anniversary : the judgments on the market economy were unanimously positive; the role of the state in particular the nationalizations -- received adequate criticism. The French socialist party as well as a number of socialist parties from the Third World were rather reserved,-- as an undertone.

**2. *The value judgment.***

**a.** Insofar as the triumph of the market economy represents reason, it deserves our endorsement.

**b.** To the extent that it represents a monopoly position that is no longer open to challenge, it is a cause for concern. And this is due to the very rules of the market economy, which are anti-monopolistic.

***Historical model.***

The risk is less imaginary than one might think.

Recall the reverse situation of the decades after World War II (1939/1945). The success of the social democratic model - the command economy is its core - was thunderous then. Drunk with general consensus, the state was assigned one role after another. The result was the inflation (generalized, sustained, cumulative price increases) of the sixties and seventies. Well, recently, the market economy has typically for the liberal system an analogous consensus.

***Consequence:*** learned by history, our appreciation of the market economy must be tempered by serious reservations.

E.O. CF 09.

***Institutionalism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** *G.M.Hodgson, Economics and Institutions (A Manifesto for a Modern Institutional Economics)*, Oxford, 1988.

***Given:*** the current (neo)liberal system (think of *F.A.Hayek, Individualism and Economic Order*, Chicago, 1948, e.g., which hypothesizes: within the free market space the economically active person - a patron, a housewife e.g. - has not only necessary but also sufficient information at his disposal so that he/she can make the right rational decisions.

***The question asked:*** is this hypothesis, when tested against the actual information available to economically active people, correct?

**1.-- No.**

The economically active person is not omniscient! Knight states that in terms of risk (an entrepreneur dares to market a product as if there were sufficient demand for it) and other uncertainties, it rarely happens that the information is sufficient. It regularly becomes an adventure.

However, if there is a serious information gap, then the economy cannot be an “autonomous”, purely rule-free, eventually deregulated market.

**2 -- *The need for institutions.***

The hypothesis is: there is a need for information supplementing agencies, for gap correctives, for ‘institutions’. These market correctives of an informational nature justify regulation to begin with, i.e., the imposition of rules from outside the mere market. ‘Regulation’ is not to be interpreted purely pejoratively but also melioratively.-- Some models.

**1.-- *Ethics.***

“They don’t cheat you there.”-- A firm, led by conscientious leaders/leaders, is in itself the fundamental information regarding the product or service it markets. It is extra-economic but economically extremely valuable.

**2.1.- *Private settings.***

Private firms can vet a product or service and make the information available.

**2.2. -- *The state.***

A government can control “wild price increases” thanks to regulatory, calculating, measures that are in themselves informative, “We know that they will not (may, dare to) charge us too high prices” by government action.

**2.3.-- *Supranational institutions***

Things like the World Bank, the I.M.F. have information that can be made available.

E.O. CF 10.

***Economic revolutions.***

We briefly mention the biggest traits.

Leading the way is the mediëval industrial revolution.

***Bibl. sample:*** *J.Gimbel, La révolution industrielle du Moyen Age*, (The industrial revolution of the Middle Ages), Paris, 1975.

From the XIth to the XIIIth centuries, western Europe experienced an epoch of intense technological activity. An epoch of the most fruitful inventions. “The first industrial revolution” should be the proper name. Between the Seine and the Rhine and in northern Italy, the bourgeoisie emerged, typical precursors of today’s businessmen.

***1.-- The first industrial revolution.***

***Bibl. sample:*** *W.W. Rostow, Les étapes de la croissance économique*, (The stages of economic growth), Paris, 1962. The voyages of discovery and the professional scientific revolution (Coppernicus, Tycho Brahe, Kepler, Galilei) - the modern natural sciences get off the ground - with in its wake the modern technical achievements play a leading role not so much in Holland, the first capitalist country, but in England.

***A new economic growth process emerges between 1780 and 1800.***

According to *J. Peperstraete, Employment in the information society*, in: *Our Alma Mater* 1987: 2, 67/79, the characteristic is the share of automatic labor in raw material processing and energy consumption:.

1. Premodern, it was animal and human muscle power - the farmer with the horse, for example - that was central.

2. Since e.g. the steam engine it has been mechanized labor. Products, services become more widely possible and affordable by the masses.

***2.-- The second industrial revolution (the post-industrial era, the information society).***

Muscle power and machine primarily provide energy. The mechanization of human knowledge, information, places the control of data at the center. Communication or information theory puts the transmission of a message at the center. Information processing provides three courses: microelectronics, telecommunications, and computer science. The latter deals with the technical-mechanized processing of “data” - data - in mass quantities.

Well, the machine of the first industrial - revolutionary era (1780+), in one with these information techniques, gives a new economic growth process.

***As an aside***, “economic growth” is an increase intake production and service that is sustainable.

E.O. CF 11.

***The concept of purchasing power***

Let us begin with a definition: “The ability or possibility, based on the availability of means of payment, to acquire goods or services by an act of purchase is purchasing power. Means of payment are usually natural money, but the purchasing power of a sack of wheat or a bar of gold also exists.

*As an aside*, the purchasing power theory of J.M., Keynes (1883/ 1946) states that -- incidentally following the great crisis of 1929 wage increases, -- by putting money into circulation, business is strengthened. Because investments are made and consumption increases (thanks to the atmosphere of confidence).

In other words: the state is given a firm place in his thoroughly liberal theory. Until +1970 this theory had great influence.

*Note --* What money actually means in terms of purchase value can be seen from the comparative table opposite: it shows that 100 Swiss francs falls in purchase value. Why is this? Because we all - not just the Swiss - live “rich”: paper is the sign of goods and services (which are decreasing from 1957 to the present (1998)).

***With 100 French francs one bought:***

***In 1957:***

185.2 liters of milk  
181.8 liters of premium grade gasoline  
166.6 kilos of bread  
100 packs of cigarettes

***In 1976:***

89.3 liters of milk  
86.2 liters of gasoline  
41.6 kilos of bread  
52.6 packs of cigarettes

***In 1998:***

65.8 liters of milk  
79.4 liters of gasoline  
29.8 kilos of bread  
24.4 packs of cigarettes

E.O. CF 12.

***The economic crisis of the 1970s.***

***Bibl. sample:*** R.Colonna d'Istria, *Initiation à l' économie*, Allier, 1989, 73/88 (*Les crises et leurs solutions*).

Let us begin with the definition of inflation. It is not the fact that some prices rise, but rather the fact that the general price level is rising, that creates "inflation", i.e. a sustained and even accelerating rise in prices. The measure of this is the index, calculated from the point of view of the average family paying for all the goods and services. The index summarizes a series of macroeconomic (large-scale) mechanisms that can cause inflation, such as any increase in wages (which are, in fact, passed on to others), the currency rising too quickly or circulating too easily, the state appropriating wealth without quid pro quo and thus resorting to budget deficits, the permissive lifestyle that spends a lot, and foreign countries (think of the rise in oil prices).

Deflation.-- That is the totality of countermeasures (deflationary policy): reduction of state expenditures, fiscal pressure (to limit the income available for spending), control of credit interest rates, wage restraint, price freeze. In other words: everything that curbs the demand for goods and services.

***The crisis of the seventies.***

'Crisis' is all that calls into question economic growth.-- The crisis of the 1970s has two phases.

**1. 1973/1980,**

High inflation; rising unemployment; reduction in international barter; state finance deficit.

**2. 1980+.**

Slowdown of inflation; resumption of international exchanges; sustained unemployment. This crisis of Western economies poses as yet unsolved problems for economists and governments. For it links unemployment and inflation.

***One looks for the reasons:***

1/ In the oil crisis (autumn 1973: price increase brutally implemented by the oil countries) which generates stagflation (stagnation of the economy with inflation),

2/ in the international currency system (the currencies become unstable),

3/ The excessive prosperity of the fifties and sixties with over-investment and saturation of demand

4/ The numerous newly industrialized countries (Southeast Asia (the Tigers), Brazil) etc.

**Note --** Today we are still experiencing the after-effects of this within globalization.

E.O. CF 13.

***Interaction between stock markets and economy.***

By “stock exchange” is meant “the public building where commercial matters are discussed and pursued. Metonymically, “the trade conducted there” (“the market”).

It is not our intention to set out the detailed structure. However, we do wish to provide an insight into one main mechanism: the “financial markets/economy” interaction.

***Introduction.***

***Bibl. sample:*** *R.Etwareea/ InfoSud, Malaisie (Le tigre malade qui défie le docteur FMI)*, (Malaysia (The sick tiger that defies the IMF doctor)), in: *Le Temps* 21.09.1998, 25.

Malaysia is one of the “Asian tigers” that made an unparalleled economic progress for a decade. With Indonesia, South Korea, Thailand and Hong Kong. Recently, however, a deep recession has set in. For Malaysia, the ‘elements’ of this recession include: economic growth (the collective sustainable increase in the economy) has fallen from 7.8% to -2%. The currency (ringgit) depreciated by 40%. The stock market values experienced a fall of 70%. Dozens of banks and companies failed.

The number of unemployed rose from 230,000 in 1997 to 600,000 in 1998 (6.7% of the population), while a 500,000 foreign worker was sent home. Per capita income dropped from \$5,000 in 1997 to \$3,000 this year.

Add to that the International Monetary Fund’s (IMF) confession that its recovery plans in Southeast Asia are failing,

Now we see how the fall of the Asian tigers is reflected, along with other factors, on the stock markets.

***Bibl. sample:*** *Th. Meyer, Des marchés égarés, (Lost markets)*, in: *Le Temps* 18.09.1998, 1/2

The author links up with the shock that the European stock exchanges in particular suffered the day before (17.09.1998). They reacted violently to “some signs of economic slowdown which aroused suspicion”.

**1.** The speech of Alan Greenspan, President of the U.S. Federal Reserve, to the U.S. Congress: “No concerted decline in interest rates - expected by the stock markets is on the agenda of the most industrialized countries.” A first cold shower!

**2.** The announcement by Michel Camdessus, Managing Director of the IMF, of a reduction in global (world) economic growth. Instead of 3.75% (“foreseen” in the spring of this year) I expect only 2%.

E.O. CF 14.

3. The report of Serge Tchuruk, patron of the Alcatel Group (the fourth largest company in the world in terms of telecom equipment): on the one hand, he presents a record half-yearly profit, but on the other hand, he expected a reduction - contrary to the expectations of the stock market people - for the second half of the year.

“Essentially for the reason of the Asian crisis (the Tigers already mentioned and Japan going through a severe recession).”

The distrust that followed caused Alcatel’s stock market value to drop by 38% and immediately dragged all of Europe’s leading telephony firms down with it.

*Note.--* Which amounts to reasoning along the lines of, “If already Alcatel is expecting reduction, then so are the other firms in that sector.

***The verdict.***

The author talks about “a hysterical stock market reaction” with severe - possible - consequences. His value judgment can be structured as follows.

a. ***The economic recessions*** in Southeast Asia (Tigers + Japan),-- in Russia (where a “liberal” economy is headed for disaster),-- in Latin America (suffering the repercussions) cannot be blamed on the stock markets. According to the proposer, these economies have “lived beyond their means.”

b. However, ***the unbalanced reaction*** in the stock markets will provoke profound changes in the economies. Anecdotally, a boss who was highly regarded at the head of a firm is forced to resign. Dramatic’ (understand: large scale): the pressure on firms to reduce costs and increase ‘productivity’ will lead to massive job losses.

“Then the markets will not reflect the state of the economy but the opposite : the chaos of the global (world) economy will be the result of “the aberrations of the financial markets”.

*Note.--* Among other things, mistrust inhibits investment.

*Note.--* All this shows that the cyclical theory (Real Business Theory) which claims that “random shocks” determine the economy, at least in part, is not wrong.

When, for example, banks, investors and consumers lose confidence, at least part of the entire economy comes to a standstill (which is logically a “generalization”).

E.O. CF 15.

***The social issue modern seen...***

***Bibl. sample:*** J. Aengenent, *Textbook of Sociology*, Leiden, 1919-4, 14/ 22 (*The social question*). Aengenent's definition is still valid. We summarize them. 'Issue' is called "a difficult problem to solve". This in view of the over-complicated nature of the data.

***Social issue.***

Some understand this to mean only the labor issue (ouvrierism). But the social question has a farmer, a middle class and even a woman part. In other words: all workers are involved because society is a system.

***More than economics.***

Some define the social question purely in terms of "economic interests" (economism). But there is a social dimension to it (a societal definition is involved). Without political intervention, it is out of reach.

Christian-solidarity-whether one thinks Catholic, Protestant or Orthodox-there is a moral (ethical, moral) side to it. An aspect that many an unbeliever does see.

Christian-solidaristically speaking, there is also a religious side to it (for example, the Bible has an idea concerning labor and wages, e.g.). This side, of course, is usually put in brackets in modern rationalism, indeed, radically eliminated : "Religion is opium of the people"

***Historicity of the social question.***

Aengenent articulates this aspect by asking, "Is the social question a new issue?" As an aside, "historicity" here means the fact that something reflects subsequent historical cultural eras.

Both in the Bible (Israel) and e.g. in ancient Greece or Rome or in the Middle Ages, abuses occurred that pitted the classes against each other.

Yet, especially since the French Revolution, the social question shows new aspects.

**1. *The pauperism.***

In the XIXth century we see a crowd that suffers uninterrupted want of the very essential and against which charity is powerless. This is pauperism. Let us think of the "fourth world".

**2. *Social unrest***

Strikes and even revolts become from transient to a "continuous war" (o.c., 17).

**3. *The Culture Crisis.***

The very foundations of traditional cultures were undermined by modern rationalism : family, property, authority, -- morality, etc. were subjected to radical criticism.

E.O. CF 16.

**Sexism(n.).**

**Bibl. sample:** G. Walther, *Zum anderen Ufer (Vom Marxismus und Atheismus zum Christentum)*, (To the Other Shore (From Marxism and Atheism to Christianity), Remagen, 1960, 216f..

Gerda Walther (Marxist raised, atheist, became Catholic, great fig. in new Age, occult gifted, saw auras) was a student of Edm. Husserl, the phenomenologist. -- See what she writes.

At one point she was talking with Husserl about a possible habilitation (permission to teach at a university). He responded somewhat shyly, "I am of the opinion that the task of the woman is basically the family, the marriage."

This is also why he had not allowed Edith Stein, a student of Husserl, to habilitate with him. Husserl: "Other professors were free to habilitate women. If necessary, he was prepared to recommend his female students under certain conditions. But he himself had not yet got that far".

G. Walther.-- "Was it possible that "Frau Malwine" (Husserl's wife) was also speaking through his mouth here? The idea that married women could be university professors, as was often the case later on, apparently did not occur to Husserl. In these matters he was after all still locked into Old Testament patriarchal -interpretations (*note:* Husserl was a Jew). This is despite the fact that he had then, as he always emphasized - out of conviction, not for "outward reasons" - switched to evangelical Christianity.

Meanwhile, Husserl was already more progressive than the founders of that Freiburger philosophische Gesellschaft in whose activities women were simply not allowed to participate! It was not until the revolution of 1918 that it was fully possible for women here to embark on a scientific career."

**Note.--** As a phenomenologist, Husserl shows himself here at his narrowest. After all, confronted with a phenomenon, something that shows itself to consciousness,-- in this case: the woman as a human being at the university level, e.g. every tradition on the subject -- here the traditional second-class role in all kinds of fields of the woman -- is 'eingeklammert', (put in brackets).

This suggests that Husserl's consciousness did not possess the necessary openness to a phenomenon that was, after all, already "thematized" (made into a theme) in his time, in the wake of women's emancipation (part of the social question).

Listen to my phenomenological words but do not see my 'phenomenologically' unacceptable actions.

E.O. CF 17.

***Devoutly Catholic and yet abducted.***

**Bibl. sample:** D.Campbell, *Une mère universelle catholique (Dorothy Day et le pouvoir des femmes dans l' Eglise)*, (A universal Catholic mother (Dorothy Day and the power of women in the Church)), in: N. Auer Falk/ R.Gross, *La religion par les femmes*, (Religion by women,), Geneva, 1993, 65/79.

With P. Maurin, Dorothy Day (1898/1980) is the founder of the Catholic Worker movement in the USA in 1933. Spreading Church social teaching through *The Catholic Worker*, opening welcoming homes for the poor and outcast, founding non-capitalist farms were the goals. Dorothy Day saw the Catholic Church as a center of movements for social justice.

*As an aside*, when she died in '80, *The Catholic Worker* still had over 80,000 subscribers.

***Chicago.***

There D. Day got to know the poor neighborhoods “with their endless gray streets” up close but not without the beautiful gardens as signs of hope.

At the age of sixteen she began studies at the University of Illinois (in Urbana). Reads Dostoevsky, Gorky, Tolstoy, among others. Becomes a member of the socialist party.

In 1916 the family moved to New York. There she developed as a “radical” journalist. -- In 1927 she became a Catholic and was baptized.

***Not addressing the authority. Addressing the problems.***

D. Campbell: “D. Day’s method illustrates in all its tacitness that it is wiser and more effective to deal with the problems rather than with those in authority.” “Zu den sachen selbst” one might say!

When the sailors went on strike in New York in 1936, she gave them shelter. When the pallbearers went on strike in New York in 1949, she took their side while Cardinal Spellman openly opposed them.-- In 1963 in Los Angeles she urged the members of the: movement:

“To follow the prompting of the Holy Spirit is a duty. In other words, persevere (...). Seek neither support nor approval. (...). Please, spare your energies to tackle the crying injustices of our time, rather than the Church in the person of her Cardinal-Archbishop”.

G. Wills characterizes them as the universal Catholic mother for the reason of her authority.

Doris Greenbach in 1970 characterized her as “the most liberated woman in the world” next to a Betty Freedan. And yet she was a radical tradition and law-abiding Catholic who supported her church unconditionally!

E.O. CF 18.

***Feminist antipsychiatry.***

Do we pause for a moment to consider *Martine Delvaux, Femmes psychiatisées femmes rebelles*, (Psychiatric women rebel women.), Synthélabo, 1998.

‘Antipsychiatry’ means psychiatry from a non-established scientific standpoint.

***The axiomatics.***

A psy (psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, etc.) has at his disposal, by virtue of his ‘education’ at high institutions, “a certain number of types” (understand: platitudes). Of these he discovers -- so it should be ‘scientifically’ -- the concrete applications,-- in this case “insane women”. Women who are believed in the environment to be “deranged” or who believe it of themselves.

***The requested***

“How in such a situation to disinfect the notion of insanity (when it concerns women)”(o.c., 15). For “one does not become insane anyhow: culture has provided everything” (Fr. Laplantine). For, further: “In the XIXth century, the asylum is there to bring the woman back to the role whose harshness she had not been able to cope with(...). Submission and idleness thereby become synonymous with ‘healing’” (Yannick Ripa).

In other words, since the culture - the established culture - was primarily in the hands of men, the notion of madness regarding women is strongly male colored. This is typically feminist. Immediately, an anarchism is resounding: anything that even remotely hints at submission and passivity is unbearable.

***Curious.***

Great pioneers among psychiatrists all possessed a “sick”, an “insane” patient who, as if she became their muse, led them to discoveries. Thus: Charcot/ Augustine, Breuer/ Anna O., Freud/ Dora, Janet/ Madeleine, Lacap/ Aimée, Laing/ Mary Barnes.

In other words: it is for writer as if precisely those women ‘conceived’ the correct interpretation in a male sense! As subjects! In service!

The book tries to prove by means of texts that the concept of “female madness” is a construction, at home within psychiatric and psychoanalytic as well as literary institutions. It further examines how the patient, by telling the psy her life (autobiography), expresses her (in- or under)conscious resistance to the established order.

However anarchic and even postmodernist: the book provokes serious thought.

E.O. CF 19.

***The social question today: international and massive.***

***Bibl. sample:*** P. de Senarciens, *Les sottises du néo-libéralisme*, (The nonsense of neo-liberalism), in: *Journ. d.Geneva/ Gaz.d.Lausanne* 07.11.1995.

The author, prof at the Université de Lausanne, outlines as follows.

**1.-- *Neoliberal market economy.***

**a.** The “market,” neoliberally organized, effectively organizes production and consumption of goods and services. Creates profits and immediately many rich people.

**b.** But where they are given free rein, i.e. not regulated, there one suffers forms of injustice (‘inegalites’), violence and is subject to the law of the strongest. In the wake of this, urban delinquency, rebellions, fanatical movements (USA, Mexico for example).

**2.-- *The aspect of globalization.***

A main aspect of the neoliberal world order.

Nationally restricted states lose some of their self-determination rights because their inflation rates, debt burdens, currency waves e.g. are co-determined by international-multinational powers.

For example, transnational corporations to a large extent dominate production and exchange across the planet, while in terms of job creation they do very weakly.

***The regulation (regulation) of the capitalist market.***

The order of market economy handed down to (wild) capitalism is regulated in a number of states by the national governments, i.e. subjected to the fairest possible order.

Such regulation does not exist or hardly exists in a serious and just way in the international-transnational field. For the weakening of state sovereignties through e.g. globalization, i.e. the creation not of a market space limited to a state or a group of states but rather of a market space controlling the entire planet, is not updated by new transnational institutions except at the outset.

This is called the author “the transnational social question”.

Social tensions, financial crises, debt burdens, trade-offs, environmental problems, population shifts, massive poverty, insecure conditions, polarizations between centers and peripheries are therefore taking their course without any authority to enforce distributive justice.

E.O. CF 20.

***Mid-century guilds.***

The guilds originated before the XIIIth century but it was only with *le Livre des metiers* (The Book of Trades), (+/- 1250) that they got a solid status. It is Christian solidarism in texts. Here is how they can be summarized.

“In the old guilds we find a happy union of individual and social views (...). Absolutely free trade was not known. Nor was there any completely free production. The guilds restricted all excesses of individual freedom.

No one outside of the examined guild masters was allowed to practice a trade independently. Working on Sundays and public holidays was prohibited as was night work. The number of working hours was determined; different according to profession and time of year. The number of servants was limited and the wages were fixed.

Raw materials were supplied by and under the control of the guild. Prices were set by the government as well as place, time and method of sale. The soundness of the goods was monitored”. (*J. Aengenent, Leerboek der sociologie, (Textbook of sociology), Leiden, 1919-4, 20).*

***Translated into XX-st' century terms:***

Diplomacy, apprenticeship system, prohibition of Sunday and night work, maximum working hours, minimum wage, joint purchasing, inspection, price regulation, compulsory public-law trade union.

The guilds showed in the main features, as regards organization, role and purpose, almost the same character everywhere. “In the Christian Middle Ages, a striking similarity in the regulation and organization of labor can be observed among all peoples of similar civilization. Thus the book of guilds of Cracow in Poland in the XIVth century seems to be a reproduction of *the Livre des métiers* of the Parisian guilds.” (*De-la-tour du Pin la Charce, Vers un ordre social chrétien, (Towards a Christian social order), Paris, 1882/1907-2, 127).* - The main intention was apparently: to provide every worker - master or apprentice - with a decent income.

***Degeneration.***

Like everything else on this earth.

The guilds became conservatism over time. For example, they opposed the introduction of new machines. They practiced nepotism (= favoritism of relatives and friends). They became monopolistic in the XVIII century.

Consequence: liberal reaction! The French Revolution, in March and then in June 1791, abolished them, yes, outlawed them. The revolutionaries confused the economic role with the social role of the guilds.

E.O. CF 21.

***Colbertismca. French mercantilism.***

Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619/1683) was for a long time (except toward the end) the chief minister of King Louis XIV (1643/1715). He was a hard-working and methodical man who over time mastered the entire French state administration. The economy interested him very particularly. To mention just one detail, he founded manufactures, i.e. the precursors of the later large-scale industry.

***Mercantilism.***

Colbert was a mercantilist on economics.

This is an economic theory that favored industry and especially trade as a source of wealth at the expense of agriculture. In the wake of the discovery of precious metals in America - gold and silver - mercantilism believed that precious metals constituted the preeminent wealth of the state.

For example, Colbert was convinced that good economic policy should aim to bring in as much gold and silver as possible.

***The trade balance system.***

The balance of trade is served by ensuring that export trade exceeds import trade as much as possible. Therefore, Colbert favored the production of exportable goods.

***Protectionism.***

The economy that favors national production and eliminates foreign competition as much as possible - among other things, thanks to customs measures - is called "protectionism" (protection of the national economy.) This system is directly opposed to any free trade. Colbert was a supporter of it.

**Note.--** The state absolutism that prevailed in Europe in the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries strongly favored Colbertism (mercantilism, balance of trade).

Louis XIV "le Grand" or "le Roi-Soleil" (Sun King) was a supporter of absolutism. This is a political system in which the one head of state controls all state powers as much as possible. In Louis XIV's case, this was based on the axiom that the (absolute) monarch could and should rule "by divine right."

Frederick the Great (1740/1786) in Prussia, Oliver Cromwell (1599/1658) also tried to push through mercantilism as much as possible.

Mercantilists used the most constricting regulations to such an extent that they provoked a reaction that advocated deregulation, the liberal reaction.

E.O. CF 22.

***Physiocratism: French liberalism.***

“Already in the XVIIth but especially in the XVIIIth centuries mercantilism was frequently criticized. In this the writers of Enlightenment (*op.*: rationalism) had a role. (...); they appealed to natural law”. (*Fr. Van Oirschot, Beknopte geschiedenis der sociale kwestie*, (Concise history of the social question), Roermond/ Maaseik, 1950, 105).

***Natural Law.***

Natural law was grounded purely in human nature. It was “formed” and known by reason. And this was as universal, applicable to all times, law. The earlier theological basis had thus been reasoned away.

***‘Physio.cration’*** literally means ‘rule of nature:

*Fr. de Quesnay* (1694/1774; body physician to Louis XV), in his *Tableau économique*, defended as his main thesis: human nature is good. Immediately the natural inclinations of man are also good. Letting them run individually-free is at once also good.

***As an aside:*** whatever J.-J Rousseau will later advocate.-- Behold the basic axiom.

***Deregulation.***

The constricting regulations of mercantilism must - if not properly - be abolished. More than that: all restriction by the state government is out of the question. - “Laissez faire, laissez passer”.

***“La classe productive”.***

Whereas trade was the central economic factor in mercantilism, now it is agriculture. Trade and industry were not to be considered totally useless but according to the Physiocrats only agriculture produced “un produit net” (a cleanly created product). Only the agricultural class could be called “la classe productive”.

Commerçants and industrialists even form “la classe stérile” (the infertile trade and industry are “dépendance de l’ agriculture” (a dependence on agriculture). In other words: the peasant feeds and sustains the other classes.

When Turgot (1707/1781) became minister of finance in 1774/1776, this was the opportunity for the physiocracy: in 1776 the guilds with their regulations were dissolved. But this radical-liberal decision aroused fierce resistance, especially from the guilds.

Turgot was fired and the decision overturned. But a few years later, the revolutionaries of the French Revolution would push through Turgot’s deregulation.

***Note.--*** That only agriculture constitutes “pure profit” is a mistake because the other forms of labor also “produce” such a profit.

E.O. CF 23.

***The “orthodox” school of liberalism.***

In the same year that Turgot was fired - 1776 - the Scotsman *Adam Smith* (1723/1790) published the work that founded the classical school, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*.

Sometimes the streak is called “French-English school” because it counted its most famous adherents in France and England. The term “Orthodox school” expresses the fidelity of its adherents to axiomatics. The school attests to a strong orthodoxy.

**1.--** As an English deist, Smith maintained that god does not intervene in cosmic and human events but only through natural laws.

**2.--** As an adherent of Scottish moral philosophy, Smith denied the leading the role of reason on human behavior : only natural inclinations are moral rule.

**3.--** As a liberal thinker, he viewed society as first and foremost a collection of individuals. In this sense he was an individualist (nominalist).

***Human, including economic behavior.***

Just as in a clockwork - a machine (mechanical conception) - one may not hinder the movement of the wheels, so also in humanity - created for its happiness by a deistic - unworldly god - one may not disturb the involution of natural tendencies.

**Note.--** The modern natural sciences come through here.

***Self-interest.***

That is the strongest natural tendency. Even state laws should not, in principle, thwart that tendency.--though Smith emphasizes its limits.

**Moderation** is a necessity, otherwise one damages one’s health and property. Justice is also a necessity: behaving in such a way that one does not harm the life, property or honor of one’s fellow man. Benevolence is not the basis of society but its decoration.

**b.-- State intervention** is also necessary in several areas usury control, tariff regulation, national defense, retribution measures (relative to other states).

***The less fortunate.***

“Is it not more than fair that those who provide food for the whole people as well as clothing and housing should receive such a portion of the proceeds of their own labor that they themselves should be properly fed, clothed and housed?” Thus literally the great liberal that was Smith.

E.O. CF 24.

***The total labor of the people.***

Wealth -- the then term for “prosperity” -- is primarily “favorable trade balance” (mercantilism), invested in precious metals,-- agriculture (physiocracy).

Sometimes people call Smith’s system “the industry system.”

1. His book appeared before the industrial revolution.

2. He is critical of the industry. In this sense, he approaches physiocracy several times.

The term ‘industry system’ is apparently “a widely circulated but incorrect conception.”

For Smith, the source of prosperity lies in the total labor of the people. Especially in a correct - preferably scientific - understanding of the labor process. Hence his emphasis on division of labor.

**Note.--** Immediately labor rises as the main factor of the economy. It transforms the products of nature into the cultural products which constitute the “wealth” of the nation. It is tragic that today, ...so many years after Smith, labor is being compromised by scientific-technical progress. Today there are still two kinds of people: those who can still perform labor; those who can no longer find it.

***Schooling***

Smith’s followers include: *Malthus (Essay on the Principles of Population (1803)); Ricardo (Principles of Political Economy (1807)); Say (Cours complet d ‘economie politique (1828)); Stuart Mill (John (1806/1873; the utilitarian who advocated moderate liberalism, in his Principles of Political Economy (1848))* and others. Much work was done by all such proponents in the field of economic science. The school is rightly called “the School of Classical Economics”.

**Note.--** Very great influence has been exerted especially by the writings of David Ricardo (1772/1832), the evil genius who led the economy in the wrong direction by distorting it into a hard, arid, and inhuman system. His wage theory in particular has had disastrous consequences.

Thus *Fl. Van Oirschot, Beknopte geschiedenis der sociale kwestie, (Concise history of the social question), Roermond/ Maaseik, 1950, 111.* He was a convinced Malthusian.

According to him, wages should be in line with the means to ... maintain. Crudely put: the minimum wage, necessary for the maintenance of the worker, his wife and at most two children.

For a long time, this wage theory greatly depressed the actual labor wage and paralyzed social action. Until workers’ organizations settled with it.

E.O. CF 25.

***John Stuart Mill: social liberalism.***

The British pessimistic liberals and the French optimistic liberals find their synthesis in the liberalism of J. Stuart Mill (1806/1870 who articulates individualism - perfectly - as perfectly as possible (*J. Lajugie, Les doctrines économiques*, Paris, 1982-13, 20).

***Man.***

James, his father, a utilitarian thinker (friend of Jer. Bentham), friend of Ricardo, postulates that upbringing determines individual destiny.

Three years old, John is learning Greek. Eight years old he has already read Herodotos, Platon, Aristotle,-- Ovid. Toys and recreation are not given him. Evenings are for arithmetic. Philosophy and economics are literally administered to him. At the age of twelve he studies Th. Hobbes' logic (1588/1679: mathematical thinking) and reads D. Ricardo, who, at the age of thirteen, slips him his work on economics.

***Travel perfects education.***

Fourteen years old, John spends a year on the European continent. There he undergoes the influence of J.-B. Say (1767/1832), French liberal, known for his *Traité d' économie politique* (1803) which, in the spirit of the time, deals with "the way in which wealth is created, distributed and consumed."

It is the first treatise on state economics, whose subtitle will define the scheme of all subsequent works for a century "production / circulation / consumption."

***In passing***, Say instills in him the knowledge of a "softer" adolescence.

***Jer. Bentham*** (1748/1832)

Bentham is instilled in John at the age of fifteen. The reading of his treatise on law converts him to utilitarianism. From then on he interpreted man as a pleasure machine that allows itself to be led by self-interest and in such a way that all burdens are minimal and all benefits are maximal.

***Th. R. Malthus*** (1766/1834),

Malthus, of whom his father was an ardent supporter, defended birth control in the name of overpopulation in the absence of sufficient economic goods and services. John becomes a Malthusian.

At twenty, after these optimal achievements, John becomes depressed and, during this crisis, questions his father's model of thinking. However, the influence of a woman, Ms. Taylort, lifts him above it and opens his mind to the social question. John will indeed interpret liberalism reformist-socialist.

E.O. CF 26.

***The Theorist.***

His sense of method emerges in his *System of Logic* (1843).-- The breviary of liberalism appears in *On Liberty* (1859), which discusses the rights of the individual: the right to nonconformism, i.e., to go against customs and opinions.

In 1848 - the year *the Communist Manifesto* appeared and von Ketteler gave his speeches in Mainz - his classic *Principles of Political Economy* was published, a book that was not relieved until 1890 by A. Marshall (1842/1924) with his *Principles of Political Economy* (mathematical-empirical).

***Reformism.***

Member of Parliament 1865/1868. As a politician, he defends women's suffrage, -- advocates unionism and the redistributive tax form. Does he stand up against slavery.

Real democracy must prevent "a class - even if it were the largest in number - from being able to reduce to political zero all that it does not like and to control legislation and administration according to its exclusive class interests" (*Consideration on Representative Government*).

Moderately liberal Mill is in the sense that he puts first that the individual is not the sole judge of his interests. Of course, that sounds non-lawyerly! The influence of the state - which according to him - does not equal the game of freedom - should not replace individual initiative : it should educate and stimulate. Again : education of both the ruling class and the masses is the key to progress.

***Freedom comes before equality.***

This education which, together with social institutions, would lead individuals to trade their freedom of action (i.e., their freedom) for a dose of wealth or abundance, sells freedom for equality and robs individuals of the major traits of human nature.

*As an aside*, that theme is revisited in *J. Rawls*, professor at Harvard University, in his *A Theory of Justice*, Oxford, 1971-1, 1990-2.-

Mill reproaches the socialists for not taking into account the natural laziness of mankind. If a person reaches a doable situation, it is to be feared that he/she lapses into inertia, with all the faculties beginning to rust so that he/she no longer even has the necessary energy not to farm backwards.

E.O. CF 27.

***Two views on freedom.***

***Bibl. sample:***

-- I. Berlin, *Two conceptions of freedom*, Meppel / Amsterdam 1996,

-- D. Diels, *The tragic choices of Isaiah Berlin*, in: *Streven* 1997: May, 419/428.

I. Berlin (1909/1997), born in Riga (Latvia) emigrated with his parents to England. He is an ardent admirer of Aleksandr Herzen (1812/1870; militant - revolutionary socialist), who as radically as possible denies all that is universal and argues that all (*note*: nevertheless universal) people have a minimal terrain for free action as a moral need. Something that must not be suppressed in the name of “big words” (as “history”, “humanity”, “the church”, “progress”, “the state”).

1958.-- The Oxfordian that Berlin became in England posits a dual concept of “freedom”,-- in *Two Concepts of Liberty*.

**1.-- *Negative freedom.***

It is situated in that sphere of my life and yours within which I and you can go about our business unhindered by fellow human beings. We call this “the private sphere”. This is the collection of possibilities which are open to you and me: freedom in itself, apart from singular-concrete circumstances which may place limits on my and your freedom. The state must not interfere.

Not surprisingly, Berlin ranks as a liberal by some. Here, big words have no rights.

**2.-- *Positive Freedom.***

Also called “autonomy. Positive freedom of you and me consists in that I and you independently determine what we want to be or do. In doing so, we rely on our own ideas and values. Berlin: “I want to be somebody. Not nobody. A doer, deciding and not someone who is decided upon. Self-governing (...). I.e.: formulating and realizing own goals and strategies.

***Note:*** -- That sounds anarchic, if not anarchic.

***Yet:*** positive freedom pays attention to the conditions under which freedom works itself out.

H. Blokland.

1. Can people, undisturbed by others, make their choices?

2. Do these same people also have real choice alternatives?

1 is negative freedom; 2 is positive freedom. This is how Blokland translates Berlin’s inexplicable terms and finds them extremely important for a cultural critique.

E.O. CF 28.

***Liberal market seen by M. Walzer.***

***Bibl. sample:*** M. Walzer, *The idea of a civil society*, in: *Streven* 60 (1993): June, 483/497.

Walzer, pluralist social democrat, sees the “market” as follows.

***Production.***

Like Marx, the classical liberal sees the economy as the realm of life.-- But very differently.

The enterprising play the leading role in the sense that they indulge in exploiting the opportunities offered by the free market economy. To ‘conquer’ a part of that market in such a way that what the consumer wants is provided and this in abundance. “We can only choose when there is much to choose” (a.c., 488).

Second aspect: the consumer.--. Not helping to run the state as the political democrat wants. Nor producing valuable products as Marx’s future state envisions. But “making individual choices”.

Both the producer - pre-eminently the corporate head - and the consumer - at least those with purchasing power - do as much as possible without the state, which is minimally necessary. Police, yes.

***Walzer’s critique.***

“Unfortunately, in reality we can only choose from the abundance of goods and services if we have the necessary purchasing power.” (ibid.).

In our “dual” society, with its wealthy and its poor, purchasing power differs from person to person. A lot of people even lead a marginal existence. They can often only rely on friends and smaller communities.

***The state then anyway.***

Indeed: as an organizer of the police who prevents theft, for example. As the organizing force of the justice system which controls the fairness of contracts. Also and not little as a planning authority (planned economy). Not least as a guarantee system for the minimum income for all.

***Officials.***

The state with its administration is needed there. But enterprising people circumvent the standards of that same state (by moving to other countries; by working multinational).

True citizenship does not loosen up in the market context. The free “citizen” easily becomes selfish and disengages (nominally) from natural solidarity. Conquering and improving a market position prevails too much.

E.O. CF 29.

***Communism and socialism: collectivism.***

The solutions of socialism and communism, respectively, put forward the same rationalist axiom that also founded liberalism. We limit ourselves here to its economic aspect.

**1.-- *Dirigisme (managed economy).***

All collectivisms, communism or socialism, react against the excesses of the market economy in which the individual (individualism) is, as it were, “sacred,” inviolable -- the entire economic system (production, distribution, -- consumption, if any) must be regulated by a community.

**2.1. *Property Rights.***

All collectivisms react against the excesses of capitalism within which the ownership of production goods and services is private.

1. In communism, all goods are facilitated (socialized) without distinction. Means of production but also means of consumption are withdrawn from the individual: not only land, factories, etc., but e.g. clothing, food, etc. belong to the community.

2. In socialism, however, not all goods and services are facilitated: only the means of production (**a.** land, **b.** factories, **c.** raw materials and semi-finished products etc.) become the property of the community.

Consumables remain private property. “In a socialist state, the individual cannot own land, factories, etc., but he/she can freely dispose of the proceeds of his/her labor and use them to buy or exchange goods as he/she pleases.” (*Fl. Van Oirschot, Beknopte geschiedenis der sociale kwestie*, (Concise history of the social question,), Roermond/Maaseik, 1950, 146).

**Note:** -- In agrarian socialism (agricultural socialism) only private land ownership is abolished, not the rest. Thus in *H. George, Progress and Poverty* (1679).

**2.2.-- *Community.***

Collectivisms diverge sharply once it comes to the concept of community.

1. Marxism posits bourgeois society with democratically elected government (parliamentarism) where it is assumed that the (liberal) state will disappear of its own accord.

2. State socialism (etatist socialism) preserves the state.

3. Anarchism (libertarianism), however, rejects all that is not local community (the commune, the syndicate) : groups of workers represent “the community”.

E.O. CF 30.

***Saint-simonism: an industrial socialism.***

With contempt K. Marx and Fr. Engels looked down on - what they dismissed as - “utopian” socialists. Saint-Simon (1760/1825), among others, did so.

***Eventful life.***

A freethinker, this count refused to celebrate his first communion at thirteen. At nineteen, he participates in the American War of Independence. Is active during the French Revolution.

Does business with a Swiss banker and gets rich but forfeits everything. In 1797 he takes up a transport business (with a deceitful partner) and fails. Once so, he begins his theoretical labor, which revolves around a technocratic planning socialism.

***Industrialists.***

His socialism does not only mean equitable distribution of goods and services: above all it activates productive forces. For, if the supply of produced goods is great, this also benefits the broad popular strata. - That is industrialism.

“An industrialist is a worker who either produces or provides one or more means by which the various members of society can meet their needs or satisfy natural preferences.

For example, a farmer who sows grain, raises poultry and livestock is an ‘industrialist’ (...). A businessman, a hauler who transports goods on his wagon, a sailor on a merchant ship are ‘industrialists’. (...). Industrialists make up three great classes : farmers, manufacturers and businessmen”.

Thus, in his *le Catéchisme des industriels* (the Industrialists' Catechism), (1823/1824), he defines what constitutes France wealth.

***‘Profitariat’.***

If France were to lose noblemen, including princes, ministers, judges, the ten thousand richest proprietors, etc., it would not be a loss as long as it retained its gifted people in sciences, arts, techniques and crafts. As you can see, Saint Simon refers to the economically active man - the worker - as the desired man. In this he is not far removed from P. Smith.

***Influence.***

On some major industrialists (in the ordinary sense) he exerted great influence. His many works were less read but his followers gave great resonance to industrialism but emphasized more the social side. They even grew to become a kind of adherents of a “religion” of brotherhood and utopia.

E.O. CF 31.

***State Socialism.***

Considered the father of state socialism is Karl von Rodbertus - Jagetzow (1805/1875).

The reform of society is done with the help of the actual state. Not by means of the revolutionary movement of a class. Rodbertus even wants to bring the entire production and distribution of goods and services under state control. Also the regulation of e.g. working hours, wages, selling prices. this comes close to state absolutism. Thus Fl. Van Oirschot, *Beknopte geschiedenis der sociale kwestie*, Roermond / Maaseik, 1950, 147.

State socialism differs from Marxism (Sozialdemokratie) first of all in that it wants to preserve the state and not dissolve all of social life into a realm of purely economic relations.

1. The coup on the whole economic system should not be brutally pursued but state power should through strict regulations regulate the economy (dirigisme) over time.

2. The coup d'état on everything that is the property of the means of production and distribution must not take place at once, but very gradually: for a considerable time private property must continue to rule, but the state must introduce state exploitation, piece by piece.

Points 1 and 2 show that this is real socialism.

***Cathedral Socialism.***

After Rodbertus came a whole row of state socialists who, because they were in many cases professors, are called "Cathedral Socialists.

"The identification of cathedral socialists with state socialists is not entirely correct. State socialist is only he who in principle at least accepts the omnipotence of the state in the economic field. Cathedral socialist is also he who advocates a profound state intervention without, on the contrary, endorsing state power". (*J. Aengenent, Leerboek der sociologie*, (Textbook of sociology), Leiden, 1919, 97).

**Note:** -- In 1892, at a congress, the ultra-Marxist Kautsky succeeded in having a resolution adopted: "Sozialdemokratie (Marxism) has nothing in common with so-called state socialism."

This suggests that for the orthodox Marxist, the state must in time be abolished and replaced by all of society conceived of as "a giant industrial enterprise" (with an elected administration, of course).

E.O. CF 32.

***Anarchism (libertarianism).***

Max Stirner (Kaspar Schmidt; 1806/1856), in *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* (The only one and his own), (1842) describes radical individualism, typical of the libertarian, as follows:

“Every education must become something that concentrates on the person (...). It is not knowledge that must be imprinted. However, the personality must come to its own development. The main goal of pedagogy should not be to civilize but to form free (assertive) personalities, sovereign characters.(...)”.

This axiom also applies to morals, society, economics (M. Baslé et al., *Histoire des pensées économiques*, (History of economic thought), Paris, 1988, 221).

***Still a socialism.***

**a.** Dirigisme that regulates the entire economic system (production, distribution) from a community;

**b.** the ownership of the means of production (land, raw materials, factories, etc.) in the hands of a community.

These are the two characteristics that make libertarianism real socialism.

With regard to the concept of property, this is evident from the words of the father of anarchism *P.J. Proudhon* (1809/1865) in his work *Qu’ est ce que la propriété?* (What is property), His answer: “La propriété c’est le vol” (Property is theft).

Proudhon, in France, influenced the working masses perhaps more than Marx.

***Community designation.***

Not the entire society but groups either territorial (the municipalities, communes) or economic (the subjects of economics) make up “communities.

These can federally interconnect as they choose. A central government of the whole society the anarchists reject. For which they differ thoroughly from Marxism.

In France, anarchists are called “syndicalists” as advocates of revolutionary trade unions. Also in Italy.

Mutuality’s, cooperatives e.g. are typically anarchist creations.

***Decisiveness.***

Work strikes (general or not) are the means, preferably as many as possible.- Direct action, consultation not through union leaders but by the workers themselves, is a desirable rule.

The extreme anarchists do not shy away from acts of terror (Ravachol, Vaillant) or even banditry (la Bande à Bonnot (1911/1913)). Which gradually removes the working masses from anarchism to that degree. Behold what the men of “Neither Master nor God” want.

E.O. CF 33.

***Belgian anarchism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** J. De Mare, *Anarchism*, in: *Streven* 62 (1995): 10 (Nov.), 937/ 940.

The author deals very briefly but snidely with J. Moulaert, *Rood en Zwart (De anarchistische beweging in België 1880/1914)*, (Red and Black (The anarchist movement in Belgium 1880/1914)), Davidsfonds, 1995, whose sources are either fanatical anarchist magazines and pamphlets or hostile police reports. ‘Objectively’ neither are....

***Resistance posture.***

Belgium was a liberal state.

On the one hand, a number of old-fashioned “authoritarian” situations had been abolished, peculiar to the Ancien regime such as arbitrary judgments or the influence of local leading figures. From these, the state of the time derived its *raison d’être* (sufficient reason) as liberally founded.

On the other hand, particularly in the economic-social field, new, typically liberal forms of (or not) unlimited authority and authoritarianism had been introduced.--  
Consequence.

“Our answer must be a stubborn and irreconcilable struggle which cannot end except with the wholesale destruction of the foul gang, viz, throne, purse and altar.” Thus the Belgian anarchists in 1887 (o.c., 105).

***Is anarchism definable?***

P. Proudhon (1809/1865), pioneer, defined “Anarchism is something like the absence of all authority or government”. Starting from this axiom, anarchists reject any organization that prioritizes coercion: state, bureaucracy, party, parliament, church.

The radically autonomous individual prevails. So that anarchism is (in a positive sense) “the voluntary association of empowered individuals”. So a kind of contract system.

But note that in anarchist eyes, defining is also a form of withdrawing from the radically free individual and therefore “authoritarian. Every anarchist defines his anarchism freely, anti-authoritarian.

***Current Anarchism.***

De Maere argues that anarchism lives without its name.

1. In the minds of many modern young people, the axiom is “Ni maître ni Dieu” (a maxim of the anarchists).

2. The postmodern thinkers who unilaterally engage in “deconstruction” (dismantling) of traditions are another subtle form of anarchism, for there is no foundation that can rationally account for authority and rules.

E.O. CF 34.

***Michael Bakounin, the Russian anarchist.***

M. Bakounin (1814/1876) took on two cultural-historical factors - two fictions, according to him - : God and the state.

“Bakounin was a Russian. He brought the Slavic element into socialism”. (Fl. Van Oirschot, *Beknopte geschiedenis der sociale kwestie*, Roermond/ Maaseik, 1950, 197). Another Russian, anarchist too, was Kropotkin (1842/1921).

Bakounin came into the world in the village of Prjamouchino (between Moscow and Petersburg) from a very old but not very wealthy noble family. In 1840 he studied at the University of Berlin. Already then he often argued with I. Tourgeniev (1818/1883), a Russian writer who rebelled against serfdom (*Tales of a Hunter* (1852)), about the emancipation of the serfs. But he was an anarchist. From then on he had to flee. He became involved in rebellions.

***1868: Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste.***

With this association, founded in Geneva, Bakounin penetrates the First International, where Marx, however, wants to keep the leadership. The result is a struggle and the dissolution of the Socialist International.

***The Radical Anarchist Program.***

Van Oirschot, o.c., 199, characterizes as follows.

The program of the Alliance was radical: anarchy. Thus state bankruptcy, non-payment of state debts, refusal to pay taxes,-- dissolution of the army, the magistracy, the police, the clergy,-- no official administration of justice, burning of all titles of ownership, of all deeds of sale and purchase, of all legal documents,-- forfeiture of all productive capital and labor instruments in favor of the labor(st)ers' association which must collectively initiate them; confiscation of all property of state and church.

A commune will be set up to provide all the singles with what they need.

Like the Paris Commune of 1871.

***Foreboding bureaucracy of state communism.***

Marx's Sozialdemokratie did not trust Bakounin at all. - Marx and Lassalle prove that the pseudo-popular state will be nothing but the despotic system of rule of the proletarian masses under the leadership of a new and very closed “upper class” (...).

Wonderful “liberation” of the people. This is how Bakounin writes about etatist communism.

E.O. CF 35.

***The West is implementing anarchism.***

**Bibl. sample:** J.J.Gandini, *Chine (La dette idéologique du communisme chinois envers l' anarchisme)*, (China (The ideological debt of Chinese communism to anarchism), in: *Le monde libertaire (Hebdo. d.l. Fédération Anarchiste)* 835 (1991: été), 10.

**1. *The beginning.***

On May fourth, 1919, an anti-Japanese demonstration degenerated into the rebellious “science and democracy” movement, which resonated with all social classes in China.

**Note:** -- Science and democracy was still the slogan in Beijing (Beijing) in 1989 (Tian' anmen) at the student revolt that proceeded in a rather anarchic atmosphere.

**2. *The elaboration.***

**Note:** -- Bertrand Russell (1872/1970) arrived in Beijing -- via Moscow, where his anarchism was reinforced -- as no thinker exerted his influence on the young Chinese intellectuals. In the wake of the Fourth of May, at the instigation of the anarchist Wang Guangqi, the Groups for mutual aid between students and workers came into being. Member was “a certain Mao Zedong” (= Mao Tse Toeng), the later Great Agitator (1893/1976), the father of Maoism.

***Other approaches.***

In 1912, the Movement for Labor and Study, had already been launched at the instigation of the anarchists Li Shizeng and Wu Zihui. In Paris, in unison with this, the Association for Students - Workers was founded - uniting up to two thousand students in 1920.

Its purpose: to study sciences and engineering first and foremost while part working part studying.

From this, the Group of Chinese Socialist Youth grew in 1921 and became the French branch of the Chinese Communist Party in 1922.

Among its members: Zhou Enlai (1898/1976; prime minister 1949/1976) and Deng Xiaoping (1904/1997), both later contenders of Mao Zedong.

**01.07.1921. *First Shanghai Congress of the Chinese Communist Party***, among whose delegates was Mao Zedong (vice librarian at Beijing University).

The leadership consisted of revolutionary intellectuals who were both anarchist and Marxist.

***Communist negationism.***

This historically undeniable slant of anarchist nature within early Chinese communism is methodically ignored in the official historiography. Just as, incidentally, the student revolt in Tian'anmen Square was put down.

E.O. CF 36.

**Anarcho-capitalism.**

**Bibl. sample:** P. Lemieux, *L'anarcho-capitalisme*, Paris, 1988.

This direction is considered the spearhead of libertarianism. Gustave de Molinari (1819/ 1912), a Belgian economist, is the pioneer. Main axiom: a society without a state is economically profitable and morally desirable.

**1.-- Capitalism.**

Anarcho-capitalism is a thoroughly capitalist liberalism: the “anarchy” - let the few work out their own interests and the community will gain nothing but good - is extended from the pure economy to all areas of culture. Even the administrations of public interest - police, judiciary, army - must be transferred by the state, “the arch-bandit”, into the hands of corporations and free, private, competitive associations.

**2.-- Anarchism.**

Socialist anarchism is being bipartisanly modified.

a. As capitalists, anarcho-capitalists do not abolish private property. Quite the contrary: it is the axiom par excellence.

b. Although they postulate the radical equality of all people, they find inequality of property and the material and other benefits associated with it “natural” and therefore “good.”

**Forerunners.**

The classical liberals from B. de Mandeville (1670/1733) onwards - with his *Fable of the Bees* (1714): “private vices are the public benefits” and e.g. *Adam Smith* (1723/1790), in his *Wealth of Nations* (1776) - the invisible hand makes that, if every individual pursues his own interest, social welfare immediately arises - pave the way for anarcho-capitalism.

The individualist anarchists from Will. Godwin (1756/1836), M. Stirner (1806/1856; *Der Einzige and sein Eigentum*), P.-J. Proudhon (1809/1864) and others prepared anarcho-capitalism by claiming that “the best government is the one that governs the least” and that “the government that governs the least does not exist.”

In other words: if a government is necessary at all, it must endure competition on its plane.... De Molinari: “The people know how to govern at least as well as the governments.”

For right-leaning liberals, the state is justified by the public security demanded by police, tribunals, prisons, national defense, so that the “wild” liberty of J.Locke (1632/1704) does not degenerate into Th. Hobbes’ “*Leviathan*” (1588/1679). What the anarcho-capitalists deny

E.O. CF 37.

***Marxism.***

K. Marx (1818/1883), along with Fr. Engels (1820/1895), his collaborator who spread Marx's ideas and founded "Marxism," can go down as the critic of established liberalism following the first industrial revolution,--from the perspective of the working class.

***Scientific Socialism.***

Marx and Engels set themselves against predecessors, whom they called "utopians." They do not accept an unchangeable axiomatics (freedom, equality,-- law etc.), product of reason, but put the actual evolution of culture first. Actual capitalist culture inevitably evolves into collectivism.

Marx and Engels did not fantasize a future state but pursued the historical process. They did not venture into the experiments that were to visualize socialism, but considered socialism to be a naturally coming reality, given the necessity of the process.

***German dialectics, English economics, French socialism.***

The method of thinking is dialectics, i.e. watching the course of cultural history through all kinds of contradictions (Hegel), but limited to the materialistic aspect (Feuerbach) and convinced of a limited determinism (Epikouros). So much for the philosophical part.

D. Ricardo (1772/1823), on the value of labor, and Sismondi (1773/1842), on under consumption by the people and crises, are the "classical" (English) economists who inspired Marx and Engels.

P. Proudhon (1809/1865), on mutualism, R. Owen (1771/1858), on cooperatives, and L.Blanc (1811/1882) on "ateliers nationaux" - all "utopian" socialists - instilled the concept of socialism.

***Elaborations.***

R. Hilferding (1877/1941), on theory concerning financial capitalism and imperialism,-- Vl. Lenin (1870/1924), on theory concerning the assumption of power (Russian communism),-- N. Boucharin (1888/1938), on theory concerning the transition to socialism,-- R. Luxemburg (1870/1949), on the theory of world capitalism, maasspontaneity and imperialism,-- E. Bernstein (1850/1932), on reformism (refusal of materialism and determinism)which advocates gradual reforms, K. Kautsky (1854/1938), on the refusal of violence and theory of social democracy,-- all of them elaborate aspects of Marxism.

E.O. CF 37.

***Marxism and the death of metaphysics.***

In 1844 (1845) Fr. Engels and K. Marx publish *Die heilige Familie (Kritik der kritischen Kritik)*, (The Holy Family (Criticism of Critical Criticism)). In Chapter VI they deal with the death of metaphysics, one of the main conditions of true Marxism.

1. Metaphysics in the XVIIth century (one thinks of Descartes, Leibniz et al.) was still intertwined with positive, profane content. It made discoveries in mathematics, physics, and other sciences that had the appearance of belonging to its domain.

2. Already at the beginning of the XVIIIth century this appearance had been destroyed. The positive (propositional) sciences had separated from it and became independent sciences.

The whole metaphysical wealth existed only in imaginings and heavenly things, -- just when the "real" (*op.*: earthly) beings and earthly things involved all interest. Metaphysics had become scaled-down. In the same year that Malebranche and Arnauld, the last great French metaphysicians, died -- 1715 -- Helvetius and Condillac were born.

**Note.--** Others -- historians -- also note that 1660/1725 in France establishes a cultural revolution, which is here referred to in its Marxist sense.

***Pierre Bayle*** (1647/1706).

Known for his *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (1695/1697) which was a model for the encyclopedists, D. Diderot (1713/1784) and J. d'Alembert (1717/1783). The Encyclopedia is published 1751/1772. It was a radical materialist.

Engels/ Marx about it: "The man who deprived the metaphysics of the XVIIth century and at once all metaphysics in the theoretical field of any credit, was P. Bayle!".

His weapon: skepticism but in such a way that he used metaphysical magic formulas in the process. Bayle was a Cartesian to begin with. But he lost his faith. His doubt - skepticism - about religion drove him to doubt the metaphysics that founded that faith. He subjected the whole history of metaphysics to 'criticism'.

More so - and Engels/ Marx emphasize: he proclaimed the atheistic society that would soon begin to exist, proving that a purely atheistic society is possible, that an atheist can be an honorable man, that man loses his dignity through superstition and idolatry, and not through atheism.

E.O. CF 39.

***Understanding historical dialectics Marxist.***

Fr. Engels, in his *Ludwig Feuerbach und der Ausgang der klassischen deutschen Philosophie*, (Ludwig Feuerbach and the Exit of Classical German Philosophy), Stuttgart, 1888, speaks at the outset of the Hegelian concept of 'wirklich'.

1. No statement of Hegel's has brought "narrow-minded governments and narrow-minded liberals" to such approval (governments) or anger (liberals) as "Was vernünftig ist, das ist wirklich und was wirklich ist, das vernünftig" (What is reasonable is real, and what is real is reasonable), (*Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, Vorrede).

The liberals thought: such a statement is the canonization of all that actually exists, the blessing of despotism, of the police state, of cabinet justice, of censorship. In this interpretation the liberals were not alone.

2. With Hegel, however - says Engels - all that actually exists is by no means also 'real'. Is, with Hegel, 'real' all that which is at the same time 'necessary', i.e. justifiable by reason. Reality is a process, an unfolding movement of all that was, is now, will be.

In other words: reality is dialectical. And this is in the form of history. Hence the term "historical dialectics" by which is meant that type of philosophy which grasps the self-development of all that is.

***Tax system.***

A governmental measure - according to Hegel - is not without condition valid, 'real', 'necessary'. After all, what is necessary turns out to be 'rational' ('vernünftig') on analysis. Insofar as the measure is rationally justifiable, Hegel calls it 'wirklich'.

***History.***

Thus something is real now only to become unreal later.-- Thus the Roman republic was once real, but the Roman emperor who supplanted that republic was then or there also.-- The French monarchy was once real, appropriate to the circumstances and therefore rational (justified), but in 1798 it had become unreal. It had to be replaced by the great revolution.

***Generalization.***

Thus, in the course of development, everything that used to exist becomes unreal. It loses its necessity, its reason for existence, its rationality.

English concludes: nothing is so sacred that it does not become unreal with time. Dialectical philosophy therefore says: "Alles was besteht, ist wert dasz es zugrunde geht" (All that exists is worthy of perishing).

E.O. CF 40.

**Lenin.**

Move us for a moment to 1900, the golden age of Marxism in which a multitude of encyclopedically oriented thinkers elaborate on Marx's system in various professional sciences.

The social democracy that converts Marx's work into party praxis will gradually split into reformist socialists (Second International) and revolutionary Marxists who will follow Lenin into the Third International. "With Lenin (1871/1924), an existence focused on the goal of revolution displaces economics (*M.Baslé et al., Histoire des pensees économiques*, (History of economic thinking), Paris, 1988, 280).

Vladimir Ilyich Oulyanov is the son of a school superintendent in the Volga region. As a grammar school student he was already a revolutionary. At fifteen he believed that God does not exist. As an expression of this, he tore off the cross that believers in Russia at the time wear, spit on it and threw it on the ground.

His older brother, Alexander, a fierce revolutionary, with some friends attempted an attack on Tsar Alexander III, on 01.03.1887. Barely on the street they were arrested with bombs in hand and partly hanged partly sentenced to forced labor for life. Since then Vladimir hated the established tsarism and its society.

He studied Marx's works thoroughly. Became a radical Marxist. Founded a secret society,--among others with N. Kroupskaia whom he would marry. He was taken prisoner, exiled to Siberia for three years where he adopted the name "Lenin" because the Lenin - a river - flowed through the place of exile.

**1903.-- Second Congress of Russian Social Democrats:**

Lenin's program and status comes up for discussion. It comes to a rupture that becomes final in 1912. The mensheviki "minority" (but with the largest number) did not consider the time for revolution ripe. Lenin and with him the Bolshevik 'majority' (with fewer drawers) relied on the great mass of peasants to eliminate the bourgeoisie and the nobility in a violent revolution. That is called leninism.

In 1917 he becomes head of state of the Soviet Union of Republics. This goes through civil war (1917/1921) and New Economic Policy (1921/1928; NEP) to have an era of five-year plans from 1928.

E.O. CF 41.

***That too is Chinese communism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** W. Ellis, China (*Deng's dour successor enjoys the last laugh*), in: The European 30.03.1998, 33.

Like Deng Xiaoping (Teng Siao-Ong; (1904/1997), since 1977 reformer of the economy without abolishing strict communism) before him, Zhu Rongji, since March 1998 the big man in China, knows what pain and suffering are in communist China.

Already in the 1950s, he sees industrialization not as visualization of an ideology but as efficient economics.

Consequence: in 1957 Mao Tse-toeng (Mao Zedong(1893/1976; founder of Chinese communism)) launched a campaign against "rightists": Zhu was sentenced to four years of agricultural labor.

1962+--- Reinstated in honor, his rising star resumes but becomes the target of Mao's cultural revolution (1965, with its terror, road killings, patrimonial destruction): in 1970, he is banished to "the peasant countryside" to watch goats and pigs and clean the toilets of communist bosses.

Unlike Deng, Zhu responds to this - to such "expulsions" and "ritual humiliations" - by "continuing his work.

It is noteworthy that Zhu acted in a politically moderate manner and practiced honesty in the monetary sphere. While other communists around him got rich on corruption and kickbacks a.o.

China's modernization was his major concern.

1987.-- As mayor of Shanghai, he left heavy marks on that city's notorious bureaucracy.

1998.-- Deng Xiaoping introduces economic liberalism in radical preservation of communism and orders the Tiananmen Square massacre as the still very influential man behind the scenes. With great courage, Zhu ensures that Beijing government repression does not reach Shanghai: "The people's army should not act against the people."

Afterwards, Zhu gradually rises to the highest political sphere. Until he is overwhelmingly voted as Deng's successor in March 1998. The rather technocratic communist was thus able to convince all his opponents - except for a small number at the ballot box - that they should give him a chance as the highest authority.

E.O. CF 42.

***The Black Book of Communism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** St.Courtois et al, *Le livre noir du communisme* (The black book of communism), (*Crimes, terror, répression*), Paris, 1997.

The book went over like a bomb in France. It was written by eleven French historians who -- it matters -- are all somewhere “left. But who don’t put a cloth over it.

To begin with: what Solzhenitsin (on Russia), Jean Pasqualini (on China), Pin Yathay (on Cambodia) have been shouting from the rooftops for decades about the killing of human beings in the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat is more than confirmed in this book. For it is based on the archives of the ex-communist states so that even the figures could be substantiated; Solzhenitsin, Rasqualini, Yathay were at the time called everything ugly by the Western intelligentsia: hence the deep uneasiness in those circles.

Jean-Francois Revel, *Communism (85 millions de morts!)*, in: *Le Point* 15.11.1997, 64/68, summarizing:

“This makes the 20 million (all outside the war) of the USSR, the 65 million of China (MaoTse-toung, now Mao Zedong (1893/1976; known for his *The Little Red Book* that programmed the cultural revolution that began in 1966), the 2 million of Cambodia (out of 7.8 million inhabitants) or of North Korea all the outgrowth of programmed exterminations (A.c., 65).

***Grossly eighty-five million.***

“With 65 million dead in China, Mao deserves the medal of the greatest murderer of all time” (Ibid.).

***Also racist killings.***

Killings that ethnics intended as such: Poles, Balts, Moldovans, Ukrainians, Chechens, Tatars were either slaughtered on the spot or taken away to Siberia to die of hunger and cold.

In other words : Hitler with his Nazis is not alone in this regard.

***Negationism.***

As demonstrated on 07.11.1997 in “Bouillon de culture”, a number of leftists, communists first of all, try to explain away this ultra-brutal fact. In particular by claiming that this huge killing does not belong to the “essence” of Marxism, especially of communism, but is only an aberration. But according to Courtois, it is indeed “crime against humanity.”

Courtois who at the time ran high with Mao,--in the eventful days of May 1968.

E.O. CF 43.

***N. Gogol the evil antichrist. -.***

Fr. Kafka interprets our culture from its Old Testament, Jewish axiomatics.

Let us now consider Nikolai Gogol (1809/1852), who also interpreted our culture - in its Russian form - but from his Orthodox background. We reproduce in short the opinion of L. Kobilinski-Ellis, *Die Macht des Weinens und des Lachens (Zur Seelengeschichte Nikolaus Gogols)*, (The Power of Weeping and Laughter (On the History of the Soul of Nikolaus Gogol)), in: R. von Walter, *Uebertr., N.Gogol, Betrachtungen über die göttliche Liturgie*, (Reflections on the Divine Liturgy,), Freib.i.Br., 1938, 80/100.

After all, the booklet is the translation of a long commentary by Gogol on the “divine liturgy” (understand: the holy mass) of the Orthodox Church. Gogol knew and lived his theology.

To understand the following properly, one must know that in a liturgical text, the Eastern Church refers to hell as “utterly ridiculous.” This expression completely dominated Gogol’s tragicomedy: it is theological tragicomedy.

***The radically doomed black-magician.***

Already Gogol’s first work *The Evenings at the Estate Farm near Dikanyka* shows a depiction of our culture in the persons of the black-magician (in *The Terrible Revenge*) and of the beautiful witch (in the story titled *We (Vii)*, i.e. *Earth Spirit*).

Kobilinski portrays the doomed mage as follows.

Black magic, i.e., totally unscrupulous magic, is, as an abyss, the perfect counterpart to the heavenly perfection based on the mortification of the primal drives that the New Testament advocates. The Eastern liturgy is a long rendering of that primal Christian ideal.

The unscrupulous magician - Gogol certainly knew such figures in the flesh - he draws as the antichrist, about whom the New Testament writes and who, e.g., in the Old Testament, in Psalm 72 (71): 9, is drawn as “the animal” beforehand.

However, this great unscrupulous one, owing to the last judgment (we think of *Jude 10* and *14/15*), knows himself to be given up to the terrible laughter of all things in the world. In his utter despair he wants the holy mite of honor to pray for him. But the latter curses him. Thereupon he chalks it up: “Father, you are laughing at me. I see it in your open mouth: your white teeth are grinning.

Whereupon he throws himself upon the holy man and kills him.

E.O. CF 44.

But, while the abyss - remembering *Numbers 1-6:31/35* or *Jud. 11* - whose flaming glow is one of ever-increasing, never-silent vindictiveness, swallows him up, laughter continues as the extreme fear of his entire existence.

Even his own horse laughs at him. More than that, he has the impression that even the unmoving rider on the Kriwan-mountain opens his eyes, notices him and begins to laugh.

***The evil antichrist.***

Do we note, in the *New Testament*, viz. *2 Thess. 2:3b/12*, the bizarre figure of “godless man,” “the lost creature,” “God’s adversary” (these are the three terms by which *2 Thess. typifies*), who in tradition is called “the evil antichrist.”

This figure, a personal being, will assert itself “at the end of time.” Apparently Gogol states that this end of times is underway,-- given, among other things, its great omen, namely, the all-encompassing apostasy.-- Kobilinski-Ellis further describes.

The figure of the ancient, unscrupulous magician is, fundamentally, for Gogol a model of the greatest unscrupulous of all history, the evil antichrist. Precisely that magician is, in Gogol’s works, a central figure.

***By the way*** - according to Kobilinski-Ellis -: the evil antichrist is one who tempts all creatures eventually but is himself not to be tempted by anyone, because he chooses in full consciousness the unconditional hostility towards God, who created him and is his judge.

He is, as it were, unscrupulousness itself. Man allows himself to be deceived by him and is, as a passive deceiver, still susceptible to salvation, while the archetypal leader himself, by virtue of his lucid choice, is a “lost - I mean: irretrievably lost - being”.

***“My countrymen, my soul stiffens with fear”***

So says Gogol in his third and final period of writing, which deploys with Letters to my Friends. The texts of that time contained a series of predictions that were not understood by anyone at the time. If they were not already ridiculed.

Yet - says always Kobilinski-Ellis - they become understandable “after the period of the great planetary catastrophe we are experiencing” (meant our eventful twentieth century): “My countrymen, my soul stiffens with fear when I sense the supernatural majesty as imminent.”

E.O. CF 45.

Gogol writes past century as one who feels “spiritual death” approaching along with the great day of world judgment.

“Just wait - he writes - soon the seemingly orderly states will echo a shout that will send the most famous heads of state into confusion.

Remember the darkness in Egypt (*Exodus 10:21/29*): the blind night covered everything in full afternoon. From all sides ghastly shapes watched (*note: as Wis. 17:3, 17:15* clearly says), for primeval unsavory creatures with mournful faces suddenly became visible (*note: in faces*);!

Thus Gogol attempts to make contemporaries aware of the deeper causes at work in our culture : very realistic and yet also visionary.

***Actual humanity is a caricature.***

The matter-of-factly sober descriptions that Gogol displays in his numerous works are pure microscopy of souls in its “pettiness” of all days. These he describes with the utmost accuracy.

1. He sometimes caricatures a very small amount in such a way that the silent smirking and giggling of what is represented becomes perceptible.

2. Suddenly that infinitesimal becomes a clear caricature of God’s high ideas in this regard. Gogol is a theologian: from God’s ideas, which he “perceives” in everyday reality but as distorted through its caricatures, he perceives. Accurately observes.

***The weeping laughter.***

Gogol laughs for reason of the caricatures he notices in and around him. But in the depths of his deep Christian soul he weeps: the creation has failed! Instead of being a happy, ‘ideal’ (realizing God’s ideas) creation, it has become a weeping caricature. In the course of cultural history this becomes abundantly clear.

Thus, the text from the Eastern liturgy gets it right: “the utterly ridiculous hell.”

This worsened as the end times approached. Gogol, like a great many Russians of the time, lived with the impression that gradually the end times were setting in. With its top figure, the evil antichrist, as the “manager” of our period.

Our period with its all-around deconstructive mentality. With its supreme degree of sciences and techniques. But without God’s ideas as a norm. With its norm-forgetting of all kinds.

E.O. CF 46.

***The development of (German) social democracy.***

“Scientific socialism and the social democratic party rightly recognize as fathers K. Marx and Fr. Engels.” (*J. Aengenent, Textbook of Sociology, Leiden, 1919-4, 79*).

1848.--”Proletarians of all countries, unite!” Such was the cry in the Communist Manifesto issued by both.

In 1864 they founded the International (workers’ association), which ceased in 1872, due to quarrels, especially with Bakounin’s anarchists.

1869.-- Together with A. Bebel (1840/1913) and Wilh. Liebknecht (1826/1900) they founded the Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei, which in 1875 merged with the party of F. Lassalle (1825/1864; known for his “iron wage law”). It was not until 1891 that this party became purely Marxist.

***Internal divisions.***

After the reconciliation with the Lassalleans, the internal divisions continued. The right was for gradual evolution with parliamentarism. The left was for revolution, which the Young Socialists within the party advocated. These already separated in 1891 into a new party that was very anarchistic.

Thereupon, the strife started again within the parliamentary group. The ultra-Marxists (dogmatists, revolutionaries, principles) wanted revolution. The revisionists (opportunists, parliamentarians) wanted evolution.

Hence fierce divisions over tactics: “May one participate in social legislation? To militarism? May one collaborate with ‘bourgeois’ parties in a ministry? Is a general strike advisable? Do syndicates serve to agitate or to improve the lot of the workers? Is labor permissible for a married woman?”. Etc..

But the revisionists went further learned by the facts: they questioned the Theories of Marx and Engels. The accumulation and concentration theory, the theory of impoverishment and the industrial reserve army, of crises and the “Kladderadatsch” proved to be wrong.

E. Bernstein even questioned two of Marx’s main theories: the one-sided materialist view of history and the economic theory of value derived from Ricardo. The Neo-Marxist party rallied around him, demanding “a revision” of the party’s political program. They were accused of not being “socialists” anymore.

E.O. CF 47.

***M. Walzer 's assessment of Marxism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** *M. Walzer, The idea of a civil society*, in: *Strive* 60 (1993): June 483/497.

M. Walzer is a prof at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton University. He advocates a pluralistic social democracy.

***K. Marx: Humanity as a great industrial whole.***

Marx advocates a humanity that is a large industrial whole. Without the traditional state. Walzer calls this cooperative economy: In it, everyone can be a producer: artists produce, inventors produce, craftsmen produce. "Band-workers apparently do not fit in so well" (a.c., 487).

Walzer puts that on Marx's account as a romantic. The world industrial complex consists of creative men and women. They manufacture useful and beautiful objects in order to indulge in them as gifted people.

Democracy, in the bourgeois sense, is a provisional biotope in which Marxists prepare the ideal humanity. But that type of democracy does not have a value of its own. Doing politics in that framework is meaningless in time, namely when in the future state -- or rather future humanity, everyone will be an active producer(s). As a famous saying goes, "The state will disappear."

In other words: the system of cooperative economy consists - will consist - of a non-political state (if that word still makes sense) but with a conflict-free form of government, a kind of purely administrative government.

To this Walzer responds.-- In fact, it is any political interference that will disappear.-  
- Something like a governing organism will always be necessary for the organization of the economy. Not wanting to call this "the state" is "just a Marxist conceit" (ibid.).

Where Marxist politics was tried in reality, in fact "the state" very quickly became predominant.

Consequence: most Marxists - at least in the West - call themselves "democratize" socialists. That is: socialists who cultivate both economy and political state. "They thus provide a double biotope for the good life". As a pluralist social democrat, Walzer believes that two biotopes are better than just one. He has a certain sympathy for the "syndicalists" (anarchists) who situate the good life in a workshop run by the workers : one produces and co-decides.

E.O. CF 48.

**Religious Socialism.**

**Bibl. sample:** Fl. Van Oirschot, *Concise history of the social question*, Roermond / Maaseik, 1950, 278/292.

The author begins by noting that utopian socialism was far surpassed by Marxism, which “conquered” entire parts of the world. “But from the beginning divisions (...) can be observed.” (O.c., 279). At the same time, various groups saw salvation in more peaceful means and approached an ethical Socialism.

At the same time religious people evolved with regard to the social question and socialism which in very many cases was a- or even anti-religious: - Especially in “evangelical” (understand: Protestant) circles socialism and religion came across as reconcilable:

“Thanks to the principle of free inquiry and the non-existence of a church tradition or hierarchy, nor of a social movement of any size of its own, there was more room for manoeuvre there for those who thought they could reconcile socialism with their own religious convictions. There, then, we see the first attempts of religious socialism”.

There were religious socialists in Germany, Austria, Holland, Belgium, and France. But in Switzerland, in the Alemannic part at least, religious socialism - as one of the offshoots of Calvinism - gained a relatively large importance far beyond the borders thanks to especially clever leaders.

The preacher from Zurich, Hermann Kutter (+1931), was one such person. In 1904 he published his *Sie müssen*, (You have to), which was translated into many languages (in the Netherlands : Zij moeten). An excerpt.

“The social democrats are unconsciously the executors of God’s irresistible will. - Christianity, the church no longer possess that God. Since they have betrayed Him, He has abandoned them. For they do not protest against the immorality of the existing class conflicts and leave to socialism the task of founding a new order.

The socialists must therefore advance because the living God drives them. They are the men of revolution because God is the great revolutionary (vengeance-robbing sin).

That God, that absolute God of Calvinism, is now again preparing His great surprises. He is again going to pass his judgment in storm and thunder and shame our cowardly Christianity”. This is how Kutter wanted to re-establish the kingdom of God on earth. One hears the Biblical language.

E.O. CF 49.

***Castrism.***

The term “castrism” (“fidelism”) is derived from Fidel Castro (1921/2016) who, as a resistance fighter, took on Cuban dictator Batista in 1952, was imprisoned (1953/1955), gifted and exiled but landed from Mexico with a guerrilla force in 1966 to become prime minister in 1959 and head of state of Cuba in 1976.

***Socialism.***

He nationalizes large landholdings and foreign companies, provoking conflict with the West (the USA in particular). Leans towards the communist countries (Soviet Union, China, etc.) and in 1961 Cuba is declared a “socialist republic”. Provides troops in Africa, among other places.

***Castrism.***

Definition: to provide Latin American countries with a state system based on the Cuban-socialist model. Which provoked tensions with the “gringos” (Americans).

***Note.--*** Salon - castristen.-- “With the Soviet Union you could - by the end of the 60’s - hardly get by. Cuba became “the big alternative” for many left-wing intellectuals from Western countries: Cuba-goers included Harry Mulisch, Peter Schat, Hugo Claus. (*M. van Nierop, Nieuwe woorden, (New words), Hasselt, 1975, 37).*

This type of castrism has now faded away. but for a great many revolutionaries in Latin America, Castro remained “the great leader.”

More to the point, Latin liberation theology competed with castrism (not simply with the approval of the Vatican).

***Divisiveness.***

Castro called Latin American countries to revolution. Actively supported guerrilla movements in Guatemala, Columbia, Venezuela, Bolivia (to which he sent Che Guevara (1928/1967; guerrilla theorist)).

***Disagreement.***

The conflict was inevitable within castrism itself: the Soviet-Russian theory was against partisan method (it makes the ruling bourgeoisie more right-wing) but wanted popular front governments in which and right and left parties worked together.

***Conclusion.***

The output of Castrist-inspired guerrilla ‘s has now subsided. Meanwhile, intellectuals no longer travel to Havana to see the great alternative and Castro fashion has faded away.--which does not prevent Castro from holding his own at home (the Pope visited him in 1997) and castrism from smoldering on in Latin America.

E.O. CF 50.

***Liberation Theology.***

***Bibl. sample:*** K.Vandebos, *From Marxist to cultural model (Shift within liberation theology)*, in: *Campuskrant* (Leuven) 24.10.1996.

G. De Schrijver, professor of dogmatic theology KUL, is speaking following *The Paradigm Shift in Third World Theologies of Liberation* (an international symposium), organized by the Center for Liberation Theology (Faculty of Theology).

***The origin.-- 1965+.***

In Latin American universities, “one eagerly studies neo-Marxist authors.” The classical Marxist analysis of the social question is radically given priority. And in the wake of this, they are looking for “a socialism of their own, which puts an end to poverty and oppression.”

***Note.--*** Dependencia theory.-- The major financial centers - the USA in the lead - control Latin America. The ruling capitalism only sucks cheap raw materials from poorer countries.

***In passing,*** Gustavo Gutierrez the pioneer of liberation theology, puts that theory into perspective.

***Christian base groups.***

At the same time, groups of Christians are emerging who want to surpass the traditional social teachings of the church with “a real social commitment”: no more charity but far-reaching structural reforms. These groups invoke biblical motifs such as the book of Exodus, in which the Israelites, subjected to slavery in Egypt, make an exodus to “the promised land”.

***The Latin American Episcopate.***

The 1968 conference of bishops in Medellin, Colombia, supports “the new theology”: the poor must become aware that they are “the authors of their own history.” They also support the grassroots groups.

***Note.--*** Behold the first years of liberation theology. In the meantime, things have changed: the Vatican, fearful of atheism in response to a purely Marxist analysis, reacts negatively up to a point.

The collapse of communist systems - the Wall of Berlin in the late 1980s undermines the reality of Marxist analysis. The local populations show an attachment to their cultures (including pre-Columbian ones). Consequence: the theology of liberation evolves with it.

E.O. CF 51.

***Pragmatic mindset.***

***Bibl. sample:*** A.Reszler, Les nouveaux “hommes nouveaux” de l’Est, in: *Journal de Genève/ Gaz.d.Laus.* 14.02.1996.

The author ties in with Vilfred Pareto (1848/1923) in his Treatise on General Sociology (1916), which predicts the rise of a new elite in Europe, the elite of power technicians.

**a.** Higher values (traditional or recent) put these in parentheses unless to dress up with them.

**b.** Pragmatism they espouse: power - its conquest, preservation and, if necessary, recapture - is their value par excellence.

The countries of the Eastern Bloc passed through a brief period of post-communism in its democratic form before 1993/1994. With strongly liberal politicians in power, who disappointed the population for reasons of transitional measures that were not pleasant.

**1. *Red barons.***

From the ranks of the former communist parties, from 1993/1994 onward, former “apparatchiks” emerged and regained their former dominant position (except for the Czech Republic). These people perfectly respect the new rules of political-economic pluralism. At once they learn to deal with - what they had never known - public opinions. In Pareto’s language “lions”.

**2. *Pink technocrats.***

In Pareto’s parlance “foxes” (they are much more flexible than the previous ones).- These replace the lions. They were reformists in 1980+ and are pluralists. But the start of their careers shrouds them in obscurity so that they come across as “new figures.”

For example, Aleksander Kwasniewski who was elected in 1995 and became president of Poland says, “Never have I been a communist. Since 1971 I have seen very few communists. I did meet many technocrats, opportunists, reformists, liberals”.

Reszler.-- These are in favor of the market economy. From very different political-economic axioms that range from liberal in American over social-democratic or French socialist to Marxist-Leninist.

But their eclecticism - they choose from what is there - makes them flexible figures who manage the transition from rock-hard command economy to market economy well. What the populations did not forgive the first liberals (before 1993/1994), they would much rather forgive them.

E.O. CF 52.

***Karl Marx reconstructed.***

**Bibl. sample:** A. Reszler, *Marx, Penseur du XXIe siècle?*, (Marx, Thinker of the XXIst Century?), in: *Journ.d.Geneva, Gaz.d.Laus.* 30.10.1995. The author is prof at the University de Genève.

**A. *The grasp of learning systems.***

The effect of doctrines on people results rather little from their practical results. This is because

- a. a doctrine with even negative effects is perceived as hopeful or
- b. it responds to the sighs of a period.

Thus the poor results of “the ideal societies” tried out in the USA by disciples of Ch.Fourier (1772/1837: “phalanstères”) or of Et.Cabet (1788/1856; utopian-socialist) make little impression on utopianists. Thus, the failures of P.J. Proudhon (1809/1865) or M. Bakounin (1814/1876) come across to anarchists as all the more reasons to engage in precisely the same sense.

**B. *The grip of Marx.***

That Marxism is revived in the former people’s democracies (Eastern Bloc) as interlocking with all kinds of nationalisms and in Western Europe as a Marx renaissance is not surprising, notwithstanding “the Berlin Wall.”

Indeed, Marxists argue that K. Marx was fundamentally misunderstood both in the Eastern Bloc and in Western European universities!

The picture of Marx since +1990 sketched by e.g. J. Derrida (*Spectres de Marx* (1993)), M. Vadée (*Marx penseur du possible* (Marx, thinker of the possible), 1994)), D. Bensaïd (*Marx intempestif* (Untimely Marx), (1995)), H. Maier (*Convoiter l'impossible* (*L' utopie avec Marx*) (Coveting the impossible (Utopia with Marx)), (1995) et al, shows us Marx as “an open thinker”, who risked himself on a skeptical basis to the limits of the conceivable.

It is therefore a question of purging the intellectual heritage of the father of scientific socialism (who strongly rejected the utopian precursors) of one hundred and fifty years of misinterpretation. In this sense, a growing number of authors are looking for a hitherto “unknown Marx.”

Reszler.-- In fact, except for some aspects of his closed system, Marx remained strictly dogmatic. It is not because his view of Industrial society and its future evolved somewhat that his dialectical materialism is not the immutable core of his teaching. To make a relativist thinker of him misunderstands the necessity which, according to it, “governs history.”

E.O. CF 53.

**Marx, yes, but.**

**Bibl. sample:** M. Najman/ Ph. Petit, *Marx redevient-il capital?*, (Does Marx become capital again?), in: *L'Événement du jeudi* 28.09.1995, 72/75.-- We pause to consider the atmosphere.

**A curious congress.**

In Stockholm, in 1989, the united socialist parties - with the exception of a few - come to the conclusion that a purely socialist (managed) economy is inadequate in terms of goods and services. The collapse of the communist regimes ("The Berlin Wall") is there to make the failure clear.

Since then, a kind of liberalism, summed up in the term "the neoliberal world order," has prevailed everywhere. How can one come up with Marx now?

Books, treatises, magazines show that Marx is once again "in". Under the title "Marx international" a congress will open in Paris on Thursday 28.09.1995. Some five hundred researchers are expected. From the USA, Western and Eastern Europe, Latin America and Asia, journals and university institutes will participate under the guidance of the review "Actual Marx".

**Themes.--** The collapse of "Marxist realism" (critical balance sheet), current capitalism, the new social unrest, the alternative to capitalism are on the agenda.

J. Bidet, director of Actual Marx, professor at the Université de Nanterre (Paris), with J. Texier organizer of the congress, says: "Marxist is not the congress. Overwhelmingly for us, "the collective project" that came into being following Marx is buried forever."

But Marx's critical-societal thinking remains part of our heritage (...). To analyze with Marx the world of today as well as with others is the intention. "Back to Marx" is not what this congress wants. It wants to take up the problems - the themes - on the basis of a critical balance sheet which must go back to Marx".

**Note.--** Bidet.-- J. Habermas puts language and communication aimed at a collective design of living together at the center. What Marx wanted to achieve by organizing all people, all humanity, as a giant proletariat. But Habermas neglects that communication can only be real among equals.

J. Rawls (*Theory of Justice*) now, argues that real communication is possible only within the social contract,--which was rejected by the Marxists. With Rawls, a contractual economic world order can now be thought of.

E.O. CF 54.

***Social Criticism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** *M. van Nierop, New words*, Hasselt, 1975, 169/171.

The author first pauses to consider the subterm ‘criticism’. ‘Krinein’, in ancient Greek, means ‘to sift’. This typically modern term - P. Bayle (1647/1706) e.g. made it common - means “to seek out especially the weak spots in perception and reasoning” (which is what ancient Greek eristics did as well as today’s deconstructionists): “In practice, ‘criticism’ has acquired a predominantly negative application”(o.c., 169).

***Very popular term.***

Politicians and social workers, pop singers and poets, clerics, yes, even “wealthy publishers” (ibid.) “adopt a socially critical attitude.”

***Radicalism.***

The term is leftist. And it is the radical left. The criticism is not against the excesses of the “establishment” - the establishment, as one likes to say - but against the establishment as such.

That establishment does not include the whole planetary culture but only the non-socialist countries (Western Europe, the USA, Japan e.g.). The rich seven are radically and fundamentally rejected. Until the mid-seventies at least, this was the case. Because until then the Soviet Union, Mao, China, Cuba, etc. were considered fairly exemplary, ‘fairly’ because they also knew derangements and deviations while they were fundamentally sound.

***‘Critical’.***

The term became limited to “socially critical” in expressions such as “critical university”; “critical teachers” (we think of the Green Book for schoolchildren), even “critical priests.

***Note.--*** Prof. Martin Bronfenbrenner, in *Harvard Business Review* (1973: Sept./Oct.), distinguished in social criticism:

- a.** three anarchist tendencies (radical-anarchists (Hoffman and the Yippies (Zippies); moderate-anarchists (Hippies), syndicalists (“All power to the labor(st)-ers”),
- b.** neo-stalinists (in Japan, for example),
- c.** Humanist-socialists (the young Marx of before 1848).

In Belgium, social critics were called “gauchists” (extreme leftists) or “new leftists” (including anarchists, Maoists, Trotskyists).

Since the collapse of the communist states, people, even in left-wing circles, look differently at the so-called socialist countries that are proving to be not only deviant but fundamentally criticizable.

E.O. CF 55.

### ***Ecological Movement.***

According to *M. Breuil, Dictionnaire de sciences de la vie et de la terre*, (Dictionary of Life and Earth Sciences), Paris, 1997, 168 (Ecology), “ecology” means the scientific study of living things (biology) insofar as in interaction and communication with their habitat (environment). Plant ecology, animal ecology are aspects.

### ***Social ecology.***

1950+: the American Barry Commoner is the big man of it. Biology and sociology run into each other here. For man as a living - biological - being is interacting and communicating with his environment.

The environmental movement emerges: Commoner considered some results so alarming that in 1953 he went public to denounce strontium 90, an outgrowth of atomic tests in the atmosphere, as harmful ... where “people” considered it harmless. The environmental movement therefore called for an end to nuclear testing.

### ***Environmental Health***

All this led to “the European Year of Nature Conservation” in 1970. For environmental pollution had received the necessary attention. Destroying natural landscapes, increasingly grubbing up forests with increasing industrialization and with population growth, not to mention the extinction of plant and animal species or the unbridled use of sprays (insecticides e.g.) led to the suffocating experience of the polluted environment.

### ***Repercussions on the economy and economic policy.***

*As an aside*, the terms ‘economy’ and ‘ecology’ share the subterm ‘eco-’, derived from the ancient Greek ‘oikos’, meaning **a.** dwelling and **b.** yard, property.

The modern economy stands or falls by “economic growth,” i.e., the increase in the total product not so much quantitatively as qualitatively of economic activity. Translated into commonsense language: material prosperity.

The ecologists distinguished between prosperity (economic) and well-being (human). Holistic, i.e. involving the whole of life.

Consequence: all political parties - the ecologists in the lead - write welfare in their programs. With enormous repercussions on car traffic, industrial plants, road building, food etc.. Production, circulation, consumption - the whole economic circuit - is under threat. The counterculture weighs!

E.O. CF 56.

**'Underground'.**

The word is Anglo-Saxon, of course: "underground.

**1.1. The Underground Railroad.**

In the 1830s+, that metaphorical phrase meant "a system of **a.** secret and **b.** illegitimate organization of white Americans who helped fleeing slaves and slave women get to safety in Canada." Abbreviated: U.G.R.R..

Consequence: by generalization, the term denotes all that is secret and usually illegal to operate.

**1.2. Underground Movement.**

We are 1940/1945, World War II and in (by the Germans) occupied territories: the Allied propaganda directed groups and activities that meant resistance against the occupier. Armed or not.-- Hence the Dutch term "resistance" and "resistance struggle," resp. resistance fighter!

**2. The New Underground.**

Better: "culture-critical" or "social" underground.-- After World War II (1940/1945), countercultural tendencies, strongly socially feeling, get off the ground among the young people who therein express their aversion-and-resistance to the establishment.

Beatniks (think of *Allen Ginsberg* (1927/1997) with his *Howl and Other Poems*, of Jack Kerouac and William Burroughs), Yippies (Zippies) and Hippies (cfr. social criticism), Provo's and Kabouters, (Gnomes), etc.. take a cultural and socially critical stance. Themes such as sex, "mad minas," as free drug use, communes (smaller communities of "alternatives," anti-Americanism, liberation of Negroes, Hispanos, women,-- anti-nuclear bomb actions, ecological concerns are expressed in country music (American folk music style), blues, rock and pop music, folk music,-- in protest songs in rather extraterrestrial ways.

Given the enormous influence of such music, young people are being indoctrinated - without realizing it - into leftism.

It is immediately clear that "underground" is neither secret nor illegal except on one point, drug use. The Beatnik's of the fifties provoked a huge network of drug use and drug trafficking with all its nasty consequences.

Whether Underground is fading as *van Nierop, New Words*, Hasselt, 1975, 270, claims, may be true on the face of it but is fundamentally, underground, untrue: its conceptions are still making waves.

E.O. CF 57.

**Beat generation.**

**Bibl. sample:** *M. van Nierop, New words*, Hasselt, 1975, 22/24 (Beat)

In the 1930s, the term “beat”, in the sense of “rhythmic emphasis” and “accentuation of units of measurement” in jazz music, became popular among young people in the USA. At the end of the 19th century, jazz emerged in the south of the USA from the influx of popular music and the blues (New Orleans; 1920+: Chicago). Jazz went through a whole series of transformations and was so successful that “beat” 1950+ by extension meant “the musical and life rhythm of our time”.

**Beat Generation.**

In 1952, *the New York Times* first speaks of “Beat Generation”: with time, the term, under the influence of ‘spoutnik’ to ‘beatnik’, representative of the beat generation. The term comes from Jack Kerouac (1922/1969), who together with Allen Ginsberg (1926/1997) and William Burroughs (1914/1997) makes up the trio of leaders.

***On the Road by Kerouac* (1957)**

is a main work: an American, estranged from the America of the fifties with its economic prosperity, is out to escape the slept-in atmosphere of a slept-in city you, eager for “creativity,” understand: jazz, art, language.

In *Howl and Other Poems* (1956), the Beatnik’s Bible, *Ginsberg* says, “I have seen the best minds of my generation ravaged by madness, starving, hysterical and naked, wandering in the Negro states at dawn, seeking a frenzied prick, like hipsters (*op-ed*: jazz fans) with angelic heads, coveted by the primordial and celestial connection to the dynamo in the night mechanics” (*Howl, City Light Books*, 9).

In *Junkie* (1953), Burroughs dissects the terrifying perseverance of a drug user. The drugs “gobble up the user of them without any quid pro quo.”

In other words, beat equals criticism of society with its culture of profit, performance, consumption and waste.

Way out: individualism (which is typically modern), anarchism (individualistic socialism) but also oriental mysticism (think *Gary Snyder* (1930/...), ethnologist who thought highly of Amerindian cultures and orientals (*Myths and Texts* (1960, an ethnopoetic work) and drug mysticism. Beat is “beaten,” defeated, and “beatific,” beatific.

The beatnik’s put in the counterculture, counterculture, that will carry so many young people along.

E.O. CF 58.

***Containment openness of the hippies/ yippies.***

***Bibl. sample:*** G.J. Demaix, *Les esclaves du diable*, (Slaves of the devil), Paris, 1970, 29/30.

The author cites Kenneth Keniston, prof of psychology (Yale University).

**A.-- *Postmodern openness.***

‘Postmodern’ means “all that settles with modernity on the basis of its actual results”.

The gap of generations (M. Mead) expresses itself in a kind of inclusivism. As individuals or in groups, the postmodern generation wants both its own personality and its movements to be open to all ideas, all oppositions.

***Psychological:*** accepting those who are different, sometimes against their own reluctance. They want to “integrate. With as an aspect the abhorrence of any rejection of any aspect of the others as others.-- Behold the axiom.

**B. -- *Postmodern praxis.***

The will to identify with the Vietnamese farmer, the poor of the USA, the disinherited or disabled from everywhere continued from the Hippie/ Yippie movement.

Inside their own state, they honored radical democracy (which in the U.S. includes Negro Africans, Hispanics, women, Native Americans and so on) up to and including “political correctness.” Outside their own state, they inaugurated a new internationalism that gives place to all peoples with their cultures.

***Multiculturalism.***

The decisive factor was not your descent (class, country) but the type of relationship you cultivate towards your fellow man.

***American pragmatism***

(Ch. Peirce (1839/1914) et al.), French existentialism (J.-P.Sartre (1904/1980) et al.), South Slavic communism (Josip Broz (Tito) (1892/1980), who toned down communism and introduced self-governing production units in 1950 without state administration) were studied diligently.

But Indian mysticism (Katmandu), Japanese Zen Buddhism and the Precolumbian cultures were also appreciated, empathized with. A- and antiracist.

Curious: one’s own parents with their ideas that were “different” were not accepted; in the USA the established America was rejected. The exclusivism of modernity was the target! The ethnocentrism the moderns immediately.

Behold an outline of the Hippie/ Yippie interpretation of “politically correct,” the absolute equality of all people.

E.O. CF 59.

***Right : the silent majority.***

***Bibl. sample:*** M. van Nierop, *New words, Hasselt*, 1975, 312/313.

History proceeds dialectically: the proposition, especially through exaggeration, provokes the contradiction.

***1969.***

Nixon becomes president of the USA.-- The republicans he represented faced disturbances of all kinds. Negro neighborhoods and universities were coming into - leftist -- movement. With his party, Nixon stated that:

- a. only a small but highly influential group or layer was behind the disturbances
- b. while the silent majority, only wanted peace and order. So much for the population gap.

***The intelligentsia and the mass media.***

President Mitterand in France once said that today's democracies are governed by the legislative, executive and judicial powers but not without the media and those who control the media but are outside the political responsibilities.

According to Nixon and his Vice President Agnew, the people of the silent majority were not covered in the media, or were covered far too little. And the universities ignored them as well.

***Minorities.***

Historians know that public disturbances -- riots, revolts, revolutions -- are always led by militant minorities. But even its opponents who want to thwart, in an active way, make up only a minority.-- The masses prefer not to be involved in radical and dramatic events: they watch, wait.

***Elsewhere than in the USA.***

In Western European countries, it is the "right" that acts or tries to act as the interpreter of the silent majority that is presented as "averse to all that leftist mischief.

***Three axioms.***

1. The left, especially the new-left (gauchist, anarchist, libertarian) intelligentsia, already dominates the media too much in a kind of "media terror."

2. Consequence: a false image of the vast majority is created thanks to manipulation (the leftists speak of awareness.

3. Because the majority wants "peace and order," it remains silent and also has no real voice.

Behold the dual society in which we live.

E.O. CF 60.

***Critique of Marxist and Capitalist Reason.***

**Bibi. sample:** J. Wilke, *La grande dérive*, (The great drift), in: J. Wilke et al, *Les chemins de la raison*, (The paths of reason), Paris/ Montréal, 1997, 103ss..

The author dissects the most recent developments of rationalism.

**1. Marxist Reason.**

09.11.1989: the Berlin Wall falls. Prepared by the Polish June month and the Hungarian summer.

For there was once - for more than seventy years - one of the most radical rationalist systems. This system pretended to be able to manage from on high the essentials of the activities of more than four hundred million people and - this with the final touch - to determine the fate of the entire planet. It survived the criticism of A. Camus (1913/1960) but came to a dead end.

Notwithstanding its scientific and technical achievement, it did not survive the demands of the moment. It tried to de-fatigue itself, i.e. to rid itself of unnecessary burdens, but the Berlin Wall still marked the end.

Soviet rationalism had lost its reason, its sufficient and all-justifying reason. It had once begun as the emancipation of the poorest. All its reason consisted in that. But it neglected that emancipation and thus lost its sufficient reason.

**2. Liberal-Capitalist Reason.**

The Soviet shipwreck was not a single case.-- Another huge complex of rationales followed: neoliberalism.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the leaders of the neoliberal system swam in triumphalism. They came forward with their theories of transformation and their adjustment program all the way to the Kremlin.

F. Fukuyama, *The End of History*, in: *The National Interest* (Washington), in 1989, spoke of the end of all major problems since and for the reason of the fall of the Soviet system. The free world and its liberal democracy would create global harmony.

The *raison d'être* was now: the liberation of the individual - Yet the unfreedom that such a system of red creates for millions of people - those who fall outside the boat of prosperity for example - takes away its *raison d'être* from the neoliberal system of reason.

“Shoot over without rationalist defense both the poorest and the liberal few. From this void, ghosts rise”. (O.c., 105).

E.O. CF 61.

**Populisms.**

**Bibl. sample:** D. Rochebin, *Une interview avec Elie Wiesel*, in: *Journ.d.Genève / Gaz.d. Lausanne* 16.11.1991.

Wiesel (1928/2015), escaped the Shoah, received the 1986 Nobel Peace Prize. - “I distrust populism anywhere in the world, because, though the populist leader(s) address the crowds and manipulate them, yet he (they) depends on it and is manipulated by it.”

**Definition.**

J. Domas et al, *Maxidico, Ed.d.l.connaissance*, 1996, 867 distinctions.

**1.1. Social.--** 1860+ A socialist streak emerges in Russia that riles up large popular masses against the Tsar in the name of a socialism to be introduced.

**1.2. Politics.--** A political streak that foreshadows large popular masses -- especially “the little guy” -- meeting its demands. Thus, e.g., some nationalist liberation movements in Latin America.

**2. Artistic.--** In literature, film and so on a streak that reflects the life of the great masses, the little man in particular.-- One sees: it is a type of communitarianism.

**Le Front national.**

Wiesel sees in strains like those of J.-M.Le Pen (born 1928), leader in France of le Front national,

- a. a pure populism (from the right, yes, the extreme right) and
- b. an a- and anti-democratic danger. “Its language, Wiesel says - situates itself outside of democratic ethics and politics”.

**Note -- The program.**

Basis is the cultural concept: is culture all that cultivates “own people first”. Education is correspondingly (e.g., banning the Islamic chador in school; limiting the number of “foreign” children in school). Family is a first-class value (discourage abortion; parental income for those who want to devote themselves to their children as parents).

Social: all kinds of concessions only or by priority for own people. Abolition of the anti-racism law (la loi Gayssot). Strengthening of the judiciary and police. Return of foreigners. Liberal and nationally limited economy.

Le Pen and his “lieutenant” Br. Mégret consider themselves the spokesmen of “les petites gens” (the little man). They identify themselves as the victims of a certain,-- mainly left-wing but also right-wing layer in the population. On neo-Nazism they leave the truth vague: the Shoah is “une petite phrase” in the history textbooks, for example.

E.O. CF 62.

**“The New Judges.**

**Bibl.sample:** Bernard-Henri Levy (b. 1948; *La barbarie à visage humain* (1977) , - has it in *Le Point* 19.09.1998 about Alain Minc contra les juges.

He connects to the Monicagate of Bill Clinton, president of the USA, elements of which are an “independent” judge, stirring up public opinion. With as object: the private life of the president up to and including his sexual fantasies. Active figure : “Kenneth Starr, le procureur pornocrate et fou” (the pornocrat and crazy prosecutor). - He argues that in France one has reached the point where something analogous is occurring. This is why he considers Minc’s book on “the judicial revolution” to have been current for two decades.

**1:** In principle, the new judges represent an advance in democracy. In Italy (“mani polite”) and in France, they have vigorously dealt with abuses of privileges. With good reason.-- Up to there the “ideal,” -- platonic: the idea (the principle). But what does this ideal actually become. That will now be revealed.

**2.1.** Every position of power - and the new judges are one - suffers from the temptation to become transgressive - ‘absolute’ - and to degenerate immediately. The judges thereby become new rulers without counterweight.

And not without populism: a certain mass is all too happy with the swipes at the greats of the earth.-

**Note.--** Add to this - BHL is curiously silent about it - the vicious role of the media and journalists (we think of the “leaks” that mobilize the general public “by mere chance”).

**2.2.** No one is safe anymore: corporate heads, officials, ministers et al are held accountable. Good.

But “that judges in their own name condemn an innocent, needlessly imprison a suspect,-- possess the absolute weapon which consists in publicizing with great miserable ease a judicial investigation against a citizen of the state and immediately so besmirching or even cracking him for life so that those judges escape any sanction (in view of their immunity)” is called by BHL “l’irresponsabilité des juges.” The lack of a sense of responsibility -- betraying norm blurring -- on the part of those who dabble with legal texts and other norms.-- Minc is axed again and again by BHL.

E.O. CF 63.

**2.3.** Since two decades, how independent are the new judges and how are they? Minc: the judges are people! So subject to influences (passions, whims, interests), to influences (intimidation because of mafias, potentates, “friends” and ... “girlfriends”)

**2.4.** The most mediocre of the new judges call upon “the people”--not so much to make known to the world the difficulties of their enterprise or the inadequate resources at their disposal! But to present to “the people” “their nostalgia for God knows what irreproachability” or “the desire that they feel to call, for example, the French President to account”.

*Note.--* That even a president becomes subject to court is in itself pure democracy. Here BHL in Minc’s wake is talking about what is exposed to all too human tendencies as a result. “All power corrupts”.

More so: in France, “the political class” looks on in bewilderment. Silence. And whoever dares to denounce the excess of power of the new judges will be intimidated by “le nouveau maître (juge et opinion mêlés)” (the new master (judge and opinion mixe), “the new ruler, viz. the judge together with public, mobilized opinion.” BHL

*Conclusion:* in France, the capitulation machine is already there secretly and so a Monicagate can emerge any day in France as well.

*Note.--* In the Bible at times there is fierce criticism of “the judges”. Take, e.g., *Ps. 58 (57)*. “Is it really so that ye, gods, have committed righteous judgments? That thou hast judged the descendants of Adam (men) according to right? Yet not: in hearty ways thou hast put together what is false. From the mother’s womb they have gone astray,- the godless ones, as they are in their unreal judgments, from the womb. (. .)”

One sees: the sacred text is not tender and seeks its cradle in the mother’s womb, in the womb! So early and so deep is evil in it.

*Note.--* That they are called “gods” is due to the fact that this was their title. Cf. *Exod. 21:6.--*

Nor is *Ps. 62 (81)* tender: “Ye gods? This is “sons of the Most High”? Thou all? Surely not! Also: as man thou shalt enter into death”. Not to mention *Luc. 18:1/8* where the cynical judge for whom God is dead and the neighbor airs, deviates not by excess but by negligence toward the powerless.

E.O. CF 64.

***Nationalisms.***

***Bibl. sample:*** M. Walzer, *The idea of a civil society*, in: *Streven* 60 (1993): June, 489/490 (The Fourth Answer).

Nationalism states, in the social field, that the best biotope or sphere of life is the nation. We are bound to it not by free choice or contract but by blood ties and descent as well as a common past. To be ‘fellow human beings’ and ‘fellow fates’ generation after generation is “the good life”.

***Left but especially right.***

Democrats, including socialists, can be nationalists.

***In passing,*** one thinks of the workers who today vote for the extreme right. -- but usually nationalism is clearly right-wing.

***Disappointments.***

Nationalists react against e.g. the decline of traditional popular morality,-- against the abuse of the freedoms inherent in the free market economy (in this sense they are even “social”).

“That citizens (political democracy), workers (Marxism a.o.), consumers (economic liberalism) so easily become nationalists is a sign that the three ideologies are inadequate.” (A.c., 480). In other words: nationalism risks coming across as rooted in frustrations.

***As an aside,*** criticisms of parliamentary democracies and its scandals are rife.

***Willingness to Sacrifice.***

When the nation lives under foreign domination, however, the positive root is exposed. And this is in the struggle for freedom.-- The nation gives sacrificially out of solidarity: “The individual members commit themselves to ‘the good life’ in an autonomous state,--not for themselves but for their people.” (Ibid.).-- Hence, in passing, the name “sovereignism” instead of nationalism. A sovereign state seems to be the natural milieu of a nation. “The welfare state has had its greatest successes in ethnically homogeneous countries.” (Ibid.).

***Conclusion.***

Nationalism goes hand in hand with a multiplicity of state forms and a multiplicity of economic systems.-- But “in the name of one’s own people” excesses are always possible : one comes to aggression against domestic others -- minorities, migrants -- and against foreign others -- other nations -- as recent history shows almost daily.

E.O. CF 65.

***Communitarian (community) identity.***

***Bibl. sample:*** R. Gubert, *Europe centrale (Le réveil de l' extrême droite)*, (Central Europe (The awakening of the extreme right)), in: *Le Point* 07.06.1997, 78/84.-

The ex-communist countries have seen “the values” of the far right gaining influence in recent years: ultra-nationalist parties - taking advantage of the new democratic structures, of which they are making vigorous use - are gaining votes from the workers, the unemployed, the farmers especially to the extent that they are becoming victims of the economic - liberal, yes, capitalist - reforms.

***Two types.***

On the one hand - since the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989) - there have been dozens of skinhead or neo-Nazi movements that have made their presence felt throughout central Europe. Seven years later, they are still challenging.

***Note.--*** More than seven hundred skinheads from all over Europe gathered in complete democratic silence, in le Val-de-Ruz (canton Neuchâtel). They possess a high degree of organization with a “potential for violence that is no imagination.” A type apart make up the Hammerskin's. Threats against Jews, asylum seekers,-- gauchists and foreigners. Molotov cocktails. Swastikas. Churchyard violations. Usually in “groups. In Sweden, gays have to suffer even with killings “mostly by neo-Nazis”.

The revue Mjölfnir (Neuchâtel) was convicted of incitement to racial hatred ((Mjölfnir is Hammerskin).

***On the other hand***

- parallel - there are the party leaders - they take care of their democratic appearance and play the “democratic game” - who participate in the elections. They get from 5 to 10% of the votes, depending on the country. Which is not that much. But still given the hesitant democratic rise, they play a role that exceeds that number.

These far-rightists refuse to see joining the European Union as joining “big business” (a term we have yet to hear. Nato: joining is “selling oneself to the Americans”. Privatizations: breeding unemployment. The state: must be strong and defend “the weakest”.

***Note.--*** With us the same slogans applied: workers, unemployed let themselves be captivated by the same “values”. Add to this, with us, the increasing crimes, including juvenile delinquency, and the increasing insecurity (thefts, robberies).

E.O. CF 66.

**Chinese triads, a type of maf(f)ia' s.**

**Bibl. sample:** G. Posner, *Triads (La mafia chinoise)*, (Triads (The Chinese Mafia)), Tock, 1990.

The author, o.c., 43ss., says that the Chinese triads 1674+ arose as secret societies (S. Hutin) that took on the Manchurian occupation. Nationalist, in other words. But they evolved, over time, into mobs.

**Definition.**

“La Mafia” (Sicily) is a secret society created in the early XIXth century. Leadership family clans. Authoritarian. They “take the law into their own hands” (*note*: an anarchist trait) against the established justice. This by “all means” (crime: extortion, corruption of authority figures).

By extension: any association of people with the same interests (to be pressed by all means,--which distinguishes them from an ordinary pressure group, lobby).

**Model.**

U.S. Newsday: “Finished off by a mob”. -- On 19.07.1992 : Vinh Than Luong (27) in New York an ordinary member of the Ghost Shadows (Ghost Shadows), a Chinese triad specializing in business,-- drug trafficking, prostitution, clandestine immigration), goes to spend the evening with three comrades in a bowling alley.

3.15 p.m. Outside, they are ambushed by about twenty Chinese. One of them grabs Luong by the neck, puts a bullet through his head, and fades into the crowd without ‘witnesses’.

**Who is behind this triad killing?**

The killing took place in the territory of the White Tigers. But these live in peace with the Spirit Shadows. So perhaps the perpetrator, the killers, are members of the Born to Kill, a Chinese-Vietnamese triad, or also of the all-powerful Flying Dragons.

**The difference.**

There are the e.g. Italian mafiosi or even the Russian ones. The latter approach the Chinese in cruelty. But every police officer notes the exceptionally merciless methods of the Chinese mafias.

**Importance.**

As Hong Kong and Macao fall into Chinese-communist hands, the triads move to America and Europe, including Brussels, “capital” of Europe.

It may be important for us to get to know a little better the type of communitarianism that makes up maf(f)ia’ and particular triads.

**As an aside,** “triad” (triplet) refers to the numbers the members wear that end in 3.

E.O. CF 67.

***National Socialism (Nazism).***

Given that the personality of Adolf Hitler (1889/1945) dominates Nazism to a very high degree, first a characterization of the “Führer. -- Son of a customs officer, wants to attend art school but fails.

Very early on, pangermanist (Germanism first) and anti-Semitic (anti-Jewish) positions attracted him. - In World War 1 (1914/1918) he is a soldier in the Bavarian army. Anton Drexler founds the German Workers’ Party in 1919: Hitler becomes a member of it. He transforms the party into the *Nationalsozialistische Arbeiterpartei* by becoming its leader in May 1921. He enriches them with the S.A. (Sturmabteilungen).

1923 he and others attempt a putsch (coup) that fails. February/December 1924: prison. There he drafts *Mein Kampf* (1923/1924), the theory of Nazism.

1925+: he refounded his party which he enriched with the SS.

In 1933, he takes power. Until, 1945, when Germany loses the war with the Axis powers.

According to L. Cheles/ R. Ferguson M. Vaughan, ed., *Neo-fascism in Europe*, London/ New York, 1991, the factors that explain the rise and success of Nazism are

- a. economic crisis with social ills (the 1929 crisis first and foremost),
- b. the military defeat of Germany in 1918,
- c. the political-social disorder in postwar Germany,
- d. German big business’s fear of the rise of communism such that it saw in the Nazis “a dam against the communist danger.”

***1933.***

Since 1930 in the German parliament (Reichtag) every majority was lost. This rudderlessness, in the midst of a severe economic crisis and social tensions of all kinds, fitted in with the intentions of the German (and international) communists. But much more so in the intent of the German right that included conservatives, even monarchists and especially nationalists and wanted to “clean up the parliamentary mess.” But Hitler’s populist-nationalist NSDAP eliminates all these rivals.

*As an aside*, behind the few notables, military and financiers who brought Hitler to power were powerful economic-political interests, - as H.A. Turner, Jr, *Hitler*, janvier 1933 (*Les trente jours qui ébranlèrent le monde*) (The thirty days that shook the world), (Gelman - Levy) et al. expound.

E.O. CF 68.

***National Socialist doctrine.***

Characterize briefly.

**A.-- *Criticism.***

Nazis take a stand against both liberalism and Marxism -- they criticize parliamentary democracy for, among other things, its impotence in very difficult situations (of which there were plenty in the 1920s and 1930s).

**B.-- *Program.***-- Accentuate the main.

**1.-- "*Völkisch*".**

'Volks' wants to be Nazism. I.e.: the German people must come to full power development amidst the other peoples who then have to choose: for or against.-- Hence the defeat in 1918 was felt and represented as "humiliation of the people" in the propaganda. Jews and Gypsies are "people's aliens. 'Folk' also means "populist". Hitler and his party rely on large masses influenced by convenient propaganda. Hence the great party and other 'days'.

The working class certainly belongs there: when he was only a simple citizen and even down to poverty, Hitler lived with the "little people" and knew their problems by virtue of his own experiences.

**2.-- *Police state.***

The rule of law of bourgeois democracies was only a springboard to power.

**a. *One-party state.***-- Like the Soviets so did the Nazis : a party quantity typical of the democracies is unmercifully eliminated.

**b. *Police system.***-- The SS and the Gestapo -- sufficiently notorious -- are forms of "police," i.e., state and party police.

**c. *Army.***-- Like the communist systems so does the Nazi state: a good ideology-led army is an integral part of the police state. With the accompanying bellicism -- bellicose -- imperialist ideology -- that will lead to World War II (1939/1945). Antipacifism.

**3.-- *Economic ambiguity.***

The capitalist economy is preserved, although its liberal interpretation is avoided as radically as possible : the state prevails. Both agrarian economies and highly industrial systems could be managed by National Socialists. The fear of communism on the part of the large capitalists certainly plays a role in this.

***In other words,*** "Realpolitik" in the sense of N. Machiavelli (1469/1527; humanist) is the summary of Nazism.

E.O. CF 69.

**'Fascism' is not 'Nazism'.**

Italian fascism must be distinguished from Hitler's system.

**Bibl. sample:** P.Aygoberry, *La question nazie (Essai sur les interprétations du nationalsocialisme)* (The Nazi question (Essay on the interpretations of National Socialism), (1922/1975), Paris, 1979.

The fact is that many use the term "fascism" for both Nazism and Italian fascism. Historically, that language is incorrect. It was advocated primarily by the communists.

1.-- The Nazis themselves do not want to know of an equivalence. Cfr o.c., 57/59 (Nazisme et fascisme italien).

2.-- When in their late twenties - some Germans label themselves as 'Faschists', they do not belong to the Nazi party. In fact, they are a wing of the Stahlhelmen.

3.-- After the seizure of power.-- We go after.

a. **1934.--** After the seizure of power, Dr. Goebbels (1897/1945), propaganda minister, devotes an article to "The Practical Results of Fascism": he praises "the Italian brothers," notes a "common enthusiasm," and endorses "the common struggle" against Marxism and liberalism, against pacifism, against democracy, etc. The article mainly mentions that against which both tendencies are opposed.

b. **1935.--** Adolf Hitler himself espouses the same "polite style"--says Aygoberry-- as his minister in the preface to an Italian book. He merely notes that "both systems hold views related to each other concerning **1.** the state and **2.** concerning socialism."

***Concealed racism.***

And Goebbels and Hitler totally conceal the racism that is with great certainty one of the basic propositions of Nazism.

**Note.--** S. Altink, *The myth of the minority*, Utr./Antw., 1985, 17vv speaks more or less in the same sense. "The left itself has in the past contributed much to the chaos surrounding, the concept of fascism:

For many leftists, fascism was a part of capitalism. To which the author: "The communist interpretation of 'fascism' as an outgrowth of capitalism was not entirely incorrect: big business was an important mainstay of a 'fascist' policy. But (...) never has a dedicated Marxist been able to pinpoint that capitalist influence exactly. (...) The 'fascist' parties worked against even the large entrepreneurs at times (...)" (O.c., 176).

E.O. CF 70.

### ***Nazi education.***

**Bibl. sample:** M. Danthe, *Comment fabriquer de bons petits nazis*, (How to make good little Nazis,) in: *Journal de Genève* 04.02.1889, draws attention to Erika Mann, *Dix millions d'enfants nazis* (French translation).

**E. Mann**, the daughter of Thomas Mann (1875/1955) - Buddenbrooks (1901) -, publishes an austere informative book in New York: *School for Barbarians (The Education Under the Nazis)*. Goal: The child becomes one with the will of the Führer. The book, dated 1938 outlines as follows.

### **A. Collectivization of the family**

Atmospheres of generalized snitching are methodically created. As a result, the parents in particular fall into perpetual fear and even mutual distrust, because the family no longer has intimacy: the authorities see, as it were, crystal clear what is happening.

### **B. Racialization and militarization of the school.**

All school programs are addressed: catechesis, history, literature. Even mathematics. The school inculcates "the values of Aryan culture."

#### **1. Racialization.**

Little Erna: "In class, we made an essay about the Jews titled "The Jews are a Mischief."

#### **2. Militarization.**

Handbook of Mathematics: "Given.-- An aircraft is flying at a speed of 240 km/h. Objective: to release the bombs at a distance of 210 KM.. Lowering the bomb load takes 7 min 30 sec.-- Asked.-- When will the plane land?"

Values Scale.-- Schooling exhibits a sequence: **1** genetic inheritance (on a racial basis); character**2**. formation; body**3**. formation; traditional**4**. schooling, **Note.--** One has called that irrationalism (biological vitalism).

### **C. Nazi youth movement.**

E. Mann reflects on this third circle of life.-. The family is still "too private." The school still continues too many pre-Nazi traditions. The National Socialist youth movement makes possible the general Nazification of the rising generation. With the priority goal of **a**. the future soldier and **b**. if favorable the future leader figure.

### **Guided information.**

The child, the adolescent, is fed only Nazi information as much as possible. A free market in information, so typical for democracy, practically no longer exists. Thus, as a young person one "knows nothing better".

E.O. CF 71.

***Nazi philosophy of history.***

***Bibl. sample:*** R. Benze, *Die Deutsche Erziehung und ihre Träger*, (German Education and its Sponsors), in: R. Benze/ G. Gräfer, *Erziehungsmächte und Erziehungshoheit im Groszdeutschen Reich*, (Educational Powers and Educational Sovereignty in the Groszdeutsches Reich,), Leipzig, 1940, Iff.

The text emphasizes parenting. In the process, a very clear history picture is instilled. We outline that somewhat abbreviated.

***A.-- Education.***

To guide the young man in his biological core in such a way that he can handle “the life task imposed on him by the environment.” In other words, what Americans call “problem solving,” the grasping of the given and the demanded as a task or task and the coping with the solution, is also fundamental to the Nazi.

The very profound difference lies in its racist circumscription. “For National Socialism, the German people, understood as the largest natural blood community, are central concerning the totality of life and that of education” (o.c., 5).

In other words: we stand for a pure communitarianism. But then “aimed at the racial unfoldment of body, soul and spirit” (ibid.).

***B. - Phaseology of cultural history.***

The stages of culture are the following. There are only three - four in the soil.

***1.-- Germanism.***

Working out body, soul and spirit in such a way that the personality of boy and girl “were healthy and strong and could cope with their earthly task (“Diesseitsaufgaben”), carried by deep godliness” (o.c., 2), was primal Germanic education. But - and this is decisive - thoroughly situated within the Germanic family and sibbe (*op.*: the family outside the family). Family and sibbe, as blood relations, were “natural communities”. One sees it: communitarianism, yet biological. “Racial values were felt to be the highest values”. Race, yes, in unison with natural selection (“natürliche Auslese”).

*As an aside*, over time the community broadened to include tribe and nation.

***2. -- Southern-Eastern Christianity.***

Some 1500 years ago, a “culture estranged from nature” penetrated Germanicity as a power alien to the people. After all, Christianity grew out of racial chaos and as such represents a faith that is above and against people (“ein über und gegenvolkischer Glaube”). With state help, that kind of belief was introduced into Germanic life. It was immediately the first time that folk alien culture imposed itself.

E.O. CF 72.

Christianity shattered the unity of the personality by denoting the body as a “vessel of sin” and educating the mind as unworldly, placing the soul in the service of a “lebensfeindliche Ideologie”. In addition, the ideal of the fundamental equality of all people, sealable by a baptism which did not involve race and blood ties, was held out.

“Even the Reformation, which began so hopefully (*note*: Martin Luther (1483/1546), the founder of German Protestantism), was unable in the long run to free itself from its (folk) alien bonds” (o.c., 4).

### **3. -- *Modern rationalism.***

This cultural movement, hostile to the Church-dogmatic bond, did liberate the spirit and the soul from the grip of the previous narrow-minded culture but did not penetrate to the liberation of the body. It continued the development started by the Church of Rome - with a different omen - and overemphasized the theoretically thinking mind along with the emphasis on the concept of “humanity”, understood as the unity of equal beings.

The Church of Rome had influenced only a thin layer thoroughly (the rest of the people were allowed to remain at lip service) - but rationalism as “Aufklärung” (enlightenment) had with its educational system a grip on the whole people to an increasing degree.-- Until the XVIII century the Church and rationalism remained more or less in balance as far as influence was concerned.

But in the course of the XVIIIth century, rationalism with its “enlightenment” gave the decisive answer regarding the estrangement from the church and the orientation towards this earth in terms of life and education: “objective science”, “popular education” and “popular school” were the catchwords.

### **4.-- *Nazism.***

Nazism returns to the unconsciously lived out preconceptions of Germanic life. Thus o.c., 4f.. Repristinaton thus in order to keep out both Rome and enlightened rationalism.

“Two commandments apply to the life and education of every German: ‘Deutschland Uber alles’ and ‘Ich bin nichts, mein Volk ist alles’” (Germany above all, and 'I am nothing, my people are everything' ), (o.c., 5). Well peaceful cooperation with other peoples, but no racial mixing and keeping inferiors alive.

E.O. CF 73.

***Social Darwinism and occultism.***

It is certain: Hitler stands in a German academic tradition that was decidedly racist even decades before Hitler's rise to power. What *Mein Kampf* says about racial hygiene, racial and blood purity, inferior human races, was "already commonplace in German universities and scientific publications for years" (H. Jens, *Mein Kampf was not original (Social Darwinism and Nazism)*, (in: *Streven* 1983: June, 797/809). It was as if the intelligentsia was waiting for a politician to turn "theory" into law.

Thus, as early as 1923, the first chair of racial hygiene was established at the University of Munich.

One also remembers that Fr. Engels, immediately after the publication of Ch. Darwin, *On the Origin of Species*, in 1859, signaled the work to K. Marx as the work that had now finally - scientifically - destroyed teleology (*opine*: to interpret nature as purposive and primarily subject to the intent of a higher power). A few months later, K. Marx confirmed in a letter to Engels that Darwin's work does indeed contain "the natural-historical foundation for our vision,"

***Occult racism.***

To Hermann Rauschning, Hitler said in 1936 that the proper name of the NSDAP should have been "Magischer Sozialismus" but that this could not be done for reasons of mentality.

L. Pauwels/ G. Bergier, *Le matin des magiciens*, (The morning of the magicians,), Paris, 1960, has many pages detailing the occultism of the Nazi movement. And not just superficially.

But the final blow to all those who claim that occultism and racism do not go together in Nazism is N. Goodrick-Clarke, *The Occult Roots of Nazism (The Ariosophists of Austria and Germany 1890/1935)*, The Aquarian Press, 1985.

The author thoroughly and rigorously studied scientifically the occult movements, which prepared and guided Nazism and were of decisive influence. Movements with mystical, racist, pangermanistic teachings are exposed in the work.

***In passing:*** L. Rasson, *Robert Brasillach (Literature and 'fascism' - Hitler the last of the magicians)*, in: *Streven* 1985: April, 533/541, mentions the occult practices and "fantastic realism" that also Brasillach, French Nazi writer, Nazism is and social-darwinist and occultist.

E.O. CF 74.

***Neo-Nazi occultism.***

Neo-Nazism is just about diffuse everywhere. That is known. The triggers are different than at the time : migrant issues first and foremost. To let us dwell for a moment on the occult aspect.

***Bibl. sample:*** *J.L.D., Les néo-nazis et la réincarnation*, (Neo-Nazis and reincarnation,), in: *Nostra* 18/24.09.1980, 37.

The author relies on Guy Playfair, American journalist specializing in the magic of Latin America. For more than twenty years he has been at home in Brazil, Argentina and elsewhere in South America. He is particularly at home in the well-known Brazilian spiritist circles, which rely on the conjuring of all kinds of spirits for both occult praxis and cultural activities (including universities and clinics).

In August 1978, Playfair received an information through from his friend, Dr. Andrade, president of the Brazilian Institute of Parapsychology. Some very reclusive groups had contacted him to obtain all reports on “artificial reincarnation.”

Brazilian paranormologists are very familiar with this phenomenon: a particularly receptive medium (*note:* mediator between this earth and the other world) is manipulated so that an entity (spirit) or several entities take possession of it, so that the medium is in a sense possessed by it. The dead are summoned (necromancy).

This praxis gives excellent results, for example, on paranormal phenomena. -- One mixes **a.** spiritualism, **b.** voodoo (voodoo) and macumba death calls and **c.** “reincarnation” (understand: possession by a spirit).

What to the Brazilian paranormologists is a paranormal phenomenon-however explicable-is to the neo-Nazis there a very serious matter: they thus summon entities that inspired the great leaders of Nazism at the time. Hitler and other occultly gifted people who are now dead are thus summoned and put into the service of neo-Nazism.

A medially very gifted child, trained according to SS methods in special centers, where one stimulates psychic abilities, is worked so that some Nazi spirit draws into it and inspires it.... Just as Hitler was inspired by such a being or beings. As other Nazis were inspired.-- People at the time -- 1930+ -- laughed at the Thule group and the Black order until when it was determined that there was actually nothing to laugh about.

E.O. CF 75.

***Communitarisms, (communitarisms, communalisms).***

***Bibl. sample:*** D. Chaerle/ A. Van de Putte, *Liberalism and culture (Will Kymlicka on multicultural citizenship)* in: *Tijdschr.v. Filos.* 59 (1997): 2 (June), 215/252.

***In passing:*** St.Cuypers/ W. Lemmens, ed., *Charles Taylor (A Mosaic of His Thought)*, Kapellen/ Kampen, 1997, draw attention to a main figure of communitarianism, namely the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor (*The Malaise of Modernity* (1994), *Multiculturalism* (1995), *The Political Culture of Modernity* (1996)).

Taylor, whose axiom is the human need for some kind of community in order to be oneself, criticizes purely procedural liberalism (limiting itself to merely formal agreements) and seeks a way out of the contradictions inherent in our multicultural and postmodern society. Truly a main problem of our culture.

M. Hunyadi, *Individu ou communauté?*, (Individual or community?), in: *Journal de Genève/ Gazette de Lausanne* 17.05.1997, says that in the USA communalism 1980+ arose as a reaction to excessive American liberal individualism (articulated among others in *J. Rawls, Theory of Justice* (1971)). He refers to A. Berten/ P.da Silveira / H. Pourtois, *Libéraux et communitariens* (Liberals and Communitarians), (PUF).

D. Cornu, *Le livre rose des 'communitariens'*, (The pink book of the 'communitarians'), in: *Journ. d.Gen./ Gaz.d.L.* 20.06.1996, talks about the Communitarian Network, (founded by the American sociologist Amitai Etzioni) and its international colloquium in Geneva. Are central - according to Cornu - the small-scale communities that survive in the midst of the "big social systems".

Ch. Taylor (the individuals have an identity (understand: personal axiomatics) because of being and staying fused with a community, an ethnion, a religion or so), M. Sandal (the common good of that group is the big rule), Alasdair MacIntyre (with a community goes tradition) are both briefly explained and criticized by Cornu who apparently takes a liberal point of view.

Especially the virtue activism which, in the name of the common good, wants to impose ethical rules "which belong to the domain of the individual conscience" (according to Cornu), is criticized. Dissidents are thus excluded and "the rights of man" (meaning the rights of the individual) are in danger.

Behold some approaches.

E.O. CF 76.

***The given and the requested.***

“Modern societies are increasingly confronted with the demand for recognition of the private identity (*op.*: axiomatics) of its members. In one way or another, social and political institutions would have to adapt to the cultural distinctiveness of certain groups.”--Provided by publisher.

This kind of intervention poses the challenge to political practice and thought that is gradually becoming known as multiculturalism.” (Chaerle/ Van de Putte, a. c., 215). In other words: the problem of multicultural citizenship.

***Communitarian terms.***

The authors distinguish between strong and weak communitarianism.

**1. Strong.**

Every human being is born and grows up within a community with its own axiomatics, its own culture. That cast in a community is even “constitutive” (*op.*: cause of) personal identity (understand: axiomatics, mentality, value system). “I myself, therefore, do not have autonomy to determine who I am or how I need to be” (a.c., 220). The group to which I belong does that for me. I am carried by that group to the worldly and philosophical level.

Until the moment that I start to think and act individually and become “critical,” set myself up as a human being who tests the reality of the group and its culture for its value.

This is the modern, Cartesian awakening of individual consciousness.

***As an aside:*** theorists call that awakening ‘hermeneutics’, understood as individual interpretation

Right away, it must be said: in our culture saturated with anarchisms, this is more than obvious. It is the problem of the uprooted.

The strong form of community connectedness or solidarity lies in the fact that “the individual can remain within the handed down roles and practices as rules of conduct given to each individual.”

Individual thinking amounts to founding, justifying the self-evidence of the shared axiomatics by individual thinking. One remains loyal to the group,--even though one thinks individually. Tradition remains the predetermined axiom. One does not uproot oneself. Thus the group is ‘constitutive’ of the I or subject in its identity (understand: its mentality).

One speaks here, critically, of “social determinism” (a c., 246).

E.O. CF 77.

## 2. *Weak.*

One would better say “moderate” or even “liberal” For, although this type knows that man - take a child raised within a section or in a primitive tribe or even within an atheistic family - is inevitably “constituted” (determined, co-caused) by the group and its axioms (prejudices, mentality), it considers individual judgment, certainly in the modern critical and uprooting sense, equally inevitable : especially within our current culture where “I think; therefore I am” (Descartes) reigns supreme.

“It must be said, however, that the fulcrum and background of the communitarian conception is usually situated in the identity-forming bond with small and nearby groups,--that this view--even for communitarianism itself--cannot be maintained at the national level what all individuals of the same nationality still share is not a conception of the meaning of life but only a language and a history” (a.c., 229).

This means that each member of a small-scale community is also situated within a large community with its multitude of axioms.

In other words: a limited-community culture is, in our present planetary and globalizing stage, contained in a planetary-community culture. Which inevitably puts into perspective the small group within which one has one’s ‘roots’, one’s ‘roots’;.

Finally, only the rousseuistic political democrat situates himself within the national state in the strong degree, in that such a person feels himself to be a citizen of the state before anything else.

### ***“Political conclusions have cultural effects.***

The strong point of the communitarians is the emphasis on the midfield between the (liberal) individual and the state,-- midfield which is occupied by smaller communities, among others. When Castro, the Cuban dictator, abolished Christmas as a holiday because of the state ideology, i.e. the communist-atheist ideology, he was not so much touching the Santeria community in Cuba as the Vatican-Catholic community for whom Christmas is an important cultural fact. He has turned it into “an ordinary - understand: atheistically founded - working day”.

The communitarian here will take a stand against such a conclusion as a defense of religion as a “nest” where the individual can “find nest warmth.

E.O. CF 78.

***Cult Culture.***

***Bibl. sample:*** J. Hall, *Sangoma*, Utrecht, 1995-1, 1996-2, 121v..

The author is an American who, in Swaziland, gets himself initiated as a “sangoma; healer. The occasion: the well-known African singer Miriam Makeba, sees that he, who lives a predictable life as a writer in Los Angeles, possesses “rare gifts.” He then visits a healer who sees that he is “in possession of some ancestral spirits” and begins a risky life of initiation.

One day he stumbles upon “a Christian sect.”

They walked about singing, led by a tall man with a gray beard and brass cross in his powerful hands. They seemed to Hall “as much imbued with pagan rituals as with the Holy Spirit.” The group of about ten people was happy to see him and his companions. One arrived at a rectangular main building where its occupants greeted and invited him in.

The “elder” was talking about some converted Swazis, his appearance with the smooth manner and boisterous joviality reminiscent of an American television evangelist.

“And you are the American to become a sangoma? Hall sighs, “You can’t keep anything secret here either.” Sits down.

1. Very few people had already tried to convert him to one of the many “churches” that were springing up like mushrooms in Swaziland.

2. Joseph, “servant of the Lord,” the leader, then says, “If all mankind were not saved, they would go to hell.” By which, of course, he meant “member of the sect.”

“These people were obstinate and refused to look beyond their own religion.” (O.c., 122). They told him that if he performed the healing of people in the indumba (*op.*: shrine) - “the work of Satan” they said - he would go to hell. To which Hall replied, “The lidloti’ s (*op.*: healing spirits) are not holy and the healer does not worship them.” This upset them. Yet one said: “But you pray to your spirits anyway”. When they charged that he was additionally a Catholic, he was, in their eyes, “doubly sinful.” (p. 158)

Hall: “Their heads were full of propaganda, bigotry and fanaticism.” It did not go into the real Hall. That’s how confident they were in their community culture.

E.O. CF 79.

***The concept of pluralism.***

‘Pluralis’ (Lat.) means ‘plural(ies)’. Ontologically, ‘pluralism’ is the antithesis of the univocity theory (Spinoza e.g.), within which “fundamentally” there is only one single being that absorbs, as it were, the multiplicity that cannot be denied.

Sociologically, ‘pluralism’ means a society in which the diversity of views of all kinds (including the political) is provided for in principle (axiomatically)....

***A pluralistic democracy***

is a form of state in which everyone can freely express his or her views - may come out - can and may organize themselves with like-minded people, can and may strive for power by lawful and legal means. What is not possible and not allowed in the ‘people’s democracies’, in communism (except for a multitude of variants concerning the one party doctrine).-- Thus J. Van Breda, *Pluralism in: Alternative 1975: Nov., 21.*

However, The author also points out the danger of anarchism: if the plurality idea is carried through radically, then indeed a situation of fragmentation that anarchists advocate arises. This implies that non-anarchic pluralism “must not be allowed to undermine the unifying factors necessary for any social structure.”

***An intellectual model.***

***Bibl. sample:*** J. Macé-Scaron, *Intellos (Les nouvelles tribus)*, (*Intellos (The new tribes)*), in: *Le Point* 25.10.1997, 62/66.

The author very briefly lists the multitude of - especially political - currents in very recent France. He states that people are starting to think again instead of acting alone. A kind of basic ideology appears to be republicanism (normal in France since the French Revolution). It is present on both the left and the right.

He distinguishes four leftist ideologies: decembrists (= egalitarians) in the wake of Gr. Babeuf (1760/1791), i.e. radical leftists; postlibertarians, in the wake of May ‘68 (gauchist); Marxists, who advocate communism in Italian; socialists (Mitterand, Rocard, Delors, Fabius).

Then there are the liberals who mainly highlight a typical French liberalism. The souverainists are French nationalists (“France first”).

Catholics do not limit the faith to pious forms of life but actively extend it to all spheres.

Behold pluralism in its French way.

E.O. CF 80.

***Separation of church and state (“laicity”).***

***Bibl. sample:*** *Laot, La laïcité (Un défi mondial)*, (Secularism (A global challenge)), Paris, 1998.

The translation “separation of church and state” can be found in dictionaries. It is metonymic in that it refers to a part of the process of secularization, namely, the fact that a state, i.e., a political reality, does so without religious, including ecclesiastical, background or axioms. There where in fact laicity bans every conception of life and the world - even the atheistic one, for example - from political coexistence.

O.c., 36.-- To interpret laicity as political secularization (secularization which reckons only with visible and tangible realities) is to interpret it as open laicity. Open’, i.e. referring to several types of state system as complete opponents of themselves. To wit: not only the theocratic (*note:* putting forward a religion as axiomatics of political life) systems such as e.g. the Christian system (*note:* which was prevalent in the Christian west for centuries) or the Islamic system (such as e.g. Iran since the Khomeinist revolution in 1979 or Saudi Arabia etc.) but also all totalitarian systems whether they have atheism as an official basis (axiomatics) or not (we think of the Soviet system as an atheistic model).

In short: all systems of state policy which, in terms of worldview and philosophy of life, have as their axiom the prohibition of pluralism.”

***Note.--*** It will be immediately noted that the term “secularization” is not entirely accurate in that “secularity” historically - means putting religion in parentheses as a state axiom. Atheism is radically secular but insofar as imposed as a state axiomatics, atheism is antithetical to laissez-faire. One therefore avoids taking secularization as a springboard for laicity but rather “neutral axiomatics regarding the world and worldview of a state system.

***Note.--*** This seems to insinuate that a state that is laissez-faire does not hold any axioms regarding the lives of its citizens. Which, of course, is a logical impossibility.

And with this the discussions begin: what is the task of the state? Which in turn means: “What axiomatics must a state hold to be world- and philosophically neutral? For the umpteenth time an opinion.

E.O. CF 81.

***Multicultural liberalism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** D. Chaerle/ A. Van de Putte, *Liberalism and culture* (Will Kymlicka on multicultural citizenship), in: *Tijdschr.v.Filos.* 59(1997): 2 (June), 215/252.

Reference should be made to W. Kymlicka, *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, Oxford, 1989, as well as id., *Multicultural Citizenship (A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights)*, Oxford, 1995.

**1.-- Basic axiom.**

**a.** Every man is oriented towards the good life,--whatever that may in fact be. As a liberal, i.e. Cartesian-modern, he says that “my life will be a good life only if I myself, as a free deciding individual, lead my life according to my axiomatics.” (A.c. 216).

**b.** likewise Cartesian-modern, he says that critical inquiry, the testing by individual means of character, is “constitutive” (co-causing) of individual free choice concerning truth and good living.-- That’s the liberal Kymlicka.

**2.-- Corrective axiom.**

Kymlicka always and substantially situates that freedom, not as an afterthought, within a community culture - “culture” for short - in which individual freedom has always been cast. That is the communitarian Kymlicka. (Cfr a. c., 217).

*As an aside*, he himself raises the question of whether his axiomatics would not be better called “social-democratic theory.” We refer to M. Walzer in this regard.

***Political inference.***

Cultural membership as a “primary good” (an essential attribute) implies that liberalism and the liberal state should recognize and promote it and distribute it fairly.

In reality, liberalism forgot the communitarian aspect.-- The whole Western tradition on the subject puts the state first as a community -- including state citizens but sharing only the official language and culture. That is the nation-state. He is neutral towards the smaller communities. He refers to Rawls and Dworkin.

Yet there were always liberals who, in addition to citizenship, neutrality of the state in relation to communities, universal human and civil rights, also had an eye for the communitarian aspect: J. Stuart Mill, Green, Hobhouse, Dewey have attention, is liberals, for community cultures as a condition for individual freedom. They are at once Kymlicka’s thinking forerunners.

E.O. CF 82.

***The facts contradict the acommunitarian hypothesis of liberalism.***

For today the “nation-state” framework of thought is bypassed for the worse: only in very few states do all inhabitants, citizens, speak the same language or belong to the same group, group culture.

**a.** There are a multitude of nations within the same state which thereby becomes a multinational state. The nations in question may be roughly equal in size (in territory, membership e.g.) or they may be minorities facing a majority.

**b.** There are a multitude of community cultures within the same state but in such a way that - we think of integrating migrants - the state becomes poly-ethnic. The ethnic homogeneity is no longer there.

Note: in Kymlicka’s language, ethnic groups are not “national minorities”. They retain a number of characteristics (customs, ideas) from the original community culture, which is expressed, for example, in family and club life. But they integrate: speaking the language of the host country, participating in public institutions just like other citizens.

One thinks of the Flemings who went to live in France after World War II (1914/1918) - and before - and whose second and third generations have forgotten any contact with Flanders except in stories about the past.

**Note.--** Kymlicka also sees the fusion of both previous distinctions : a state can be poly-ethnic and multinational at the same time.

***A variant of liberalism.***

One sees it: Kymlicka represents an updated liberalism. Updated in that it reckons with multinationality and polyethnicity.

Most people don’t just want to belong to “a” culture: they want to belong to their culture above all else. Such are the ties with it. To detach them from it in any way (manipulatively, by force of oppression) is unfeasible. In this Kymlicka is a communitarian just like Ch. Taylor et al.

But with one major difference : the establishment of cultural identity does not rely so much on its content - its axioms - but relies on “societal culture” through Kymlicka remaining fundamentally liberal.

**As an aside,** “multiculturalism” is ambiguous. Gays and lesbians use it to denounce heterosexuality (as dominant). Feminists use it to denounce sexism, understand: masculinity.

E.O. CF 83.

***Aristotle communitarianist?***

***Bibl. sample:*** Otr. Höffe, *Der Meister aller Wissenden (Warum heute (noch) Aristoteles lesen?)*, (The master of all knowing (Why (still) read Aristotle today?)), in: *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* 08.11.1997, 6.

The author addresses the thesis of some communitarians who claim that Aristotle of Stageira (-384/-322), the great ontologist of antiquity,

- a. took generally accepted axioms of justice and conscience skeptically and
- b. thus fell back on the private rules of law and conscience of “small communities.”

***Höffe.***

Even when one learns universal rules of conduct - virtues - within a “small community,” one learns them as private applications of universal rules. More than that, according to Aristotle, one learns first of all something universal: to a danger one reacts neither cowardly nor overconfidently but bravely (“the golden mean”); with money one deals neither wastefully nor stingily but generously; to pain or lust one deals with it in a prudent way.-- And such rules more proper to common sense.

***State Free Communitarians.***

Other communitarians argue for a society that is as state-free as possible. Again, they appeal to Aristotle in this regard.

Indeed - says Höffe - the ‘polis’, the state, conceived in ancient Greek of course, relies on kinships, sexual ties, sacrificial associations and other forms of community. Well, all these ties are forms of ‘friendship’ because they come down to the conclusion to enter into life with each other.

In other words: on the one hand, Aristotle certainly values these “small connections” within the polis, but on the other hand, they do not replace, in his view, state offices, universal legal order, or the like.

Against a governmentless coexistence, Aristotle is thoroughly skeptical. In his typical manner, he assigns conscience and *rechsaxiomata* to it. He does not give a list of human rights. Yes, in typical antique fashion, he tries to justify slavery, unequal rights for women and “barbarians” (understand: strangers). But things like theft, assault, manslaughter, even insults he considers to be justified by prohibiting them through what he calls “basic rights.”

In other words : Life, a good name, some form of property, an inviolable body are of high value to him and enforceable by a government with its laws.

E.O. CF 84.

***Political theory on communities.***

***Bibl. sample:*** M. Hunyadi, *Michael Walzer (Tolérerer, dit-il au pluriel)*, (Michael Walzer (Tolerate, he says in the plural),), in: *Le Temps* (Geneva) 13.06.1998, 14.

Following the French translation “*Traité sur la tolérance*” (Gallimard), Hunyadi says what follows.

John Rawls or Jürgen Habermas try to express the axiomatics of today’s democracies in generally valid terms. M. Walzer, however, is a historically oriented thinker: he knows the general concept of “tolerance” (in the work limited to tolerance between communities) but emphasizes the quasi-infinite diversity of its interpretations in political systems: as in other texts, Walzer puts social justice first and expresses it in terms of goods to be shared such as health, education, wealth, nationality (“identity”) and so on. The one communitarian tolerance in its many achievements.

Walzer sees five distinguished conceptions of communitarian tolerance and five distinguished political achievements of it.

**1.-- Clues.**

A differential emerges.

**a. *Permissive acceptance.***-- “I resign myself to the otherness of the ‘others’ (understand : communities); otherwise there is no minimal basis of peaceful coexistence.” -- A pragmatic argument.

**b. *Benevolent indifference.***-- “To have a whole world, there must be all sorts of things.” -- A kind of fatalism.

**c. *Stoic acceptance.*** -- “I resign myself to the rights of ‘others,’ even if the way they interpret them disappoints me.”

**d. *Open curiosity.***-- “From the ‘others’ I want to learn”.

**e. *Spiritual acclaim.***-- “Diversity is the richness of the world in which we all belong”.

Thus Hunyadi summarizes.

**2.-- Accomplishments.**

A kind of overview,--a typology.

**a. *Multinational empires*** (“empires”), such as ancient Rome, Austria-Hungary, Russia exhibit a government that encourages the peaceful coexistence of communities with a large dose of autonomy.

**b. *The UNO as an international community*** is weak as a political entity but is compelled to diplomatic forbearance. The UNO itself must be very “diplomatic” given its political impotence.

E.O. CF 85.

**c. Federal states** such as e.g. Switzerland with two or three communities adhere to mutual tolerance.

**d. National states** realize the least degree of tolerance toward communities, but tend most to grant citizenship rights to individuals insofar as citizenship.

**e. The USA, as an “immigrant state,”** achieves the greatest openness to individual and group diversity but is perhaps the least able to solidify the “identities” (communities) given the mobility - unsteady foundation - on which these communities rest.

***Walzer ‘s historical combinatorics.***

It consists of multiplying the five interpretations and its five achievements among themselves, as it were. This leads to an amazing number of very complex factual situations.

***Criticism.***

Sense of variety. Good. But by minimizing the universality of axiomatics, Walzer deprives himself of a reason or ground for solving practical problems.

***Hunyadi.***

Questioned.-- “Should modern politics favor individual or group disobedience?” “A decisive argument in favor of one of the two alternatives does not exist. Conflict situations must be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, i.e. in different ways according to the different groups and the different political systems.

***Hunyadi.***

Walzer is very precise regarding the indeed very diverse interpretations and systems in which these interpretations are realized.

**Note.--** The nominalism that thoroughly dominates American philosophy in the sense that the singular and at most the private are given the great emphasis (individualism, particularism), also comes through in the American that Walzer is. American thinkers fear nothing so much as “philosophical idealizations” which, although general (universalism), are too little established in a positive way.

If there is any classification at all, it is purely on the basis of positive studies. With the impossibility of arriving at standards that can serve as practical guides to solving singular or private problems.

E.O. CF 86.

***The Secret Services.***

***Bibl. sample:*** J. Bergier, *Je ne suis pas une légende*, (I am not a legend), Paris, 1977, 233/ 240 (*Le plus tard possible*), ((As late as possible)).

Bergier is known to have played a part in the bombing (on the night of 17/18 July 1943) of the Peenemünde base (a German missile research and production base). He was bound to silence because he knew military and diplomatic secrets.

Yet he spoke and also wrote about le Grand Jeu (literally: the Great Game (of Powers)), i.e., the struggle for control of the entire planet. For example, his *Agents secrets contre armes secrètes* (Secret agents against secret weapons), was about espionage.

***Cryptocracy.***

In *Le matin des magiciens* (1961), written with L.Pauwels, he says that the era of “the secret exercise of power” is coming. The “Russia/USA” relationship, the fragmentation of China, the formation of a new empire in Africa are already being prepared in those years within the secret services “et non plus par les gouvernements” because - as he says (and this interests us here very particularly) - “these governments have from along to less interest.

Yes, the puppets who - they claim - run them are no longer taken seriously by anyone” (o.c., 235). The “invisible governments”: these are the secret services (o.c., 236).

On this subject Bergier wrote, *Secret archives*, New York, 1976,. -- as well as *L'espionnage politique* and *La troisième guerre mondiale est commencée* (Political espionage and the third world war has begun), (Paris, Albin Michel). - Others -- W. Stevenson (*A Man Called Intrepid*, Sphere Books, 1977) and the Russian Bogomolov - - also wrote about it.

Literally.-- O.c., 239.-- “The secret struggle covers the whole world (...). The classic war that has raged between Croats and Serbs for several centuries continues at this time (1977) between an old generation of Serbs who participated in World War II (1939/1945) a new generation of Croats who live mainly in Australia.” (O.c., 239).

***The Secret Reason.***

Modern reason finds here one of its most remarkable - as good as never treated in philosophical books - expression. The most scientific discoveries of reason play a leading role within the secret services. Whether this form of modern reason thus serves “progress” (its grand narrative) is highly questionable.

E.O. CF 87.

***International law as the boundary of communitarianism.***

***Bibl. sample:*** B. Ferencz, *Nürnberg soll kein Einzelfall bleiben*, (Nuremberg should not remain an isolated case), in: *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* 11.07.1998, 81F..

Everyone remembers the International War Crimes Court in Nuremberg that dealt with Nazi war crimes after WWII (1940/1945).

Today an international conference under UN auspices is underway in Rome to make what was a passing fad at Nuremberg a permanent tribunal. Notice how countries like China, India but especially the USA, resist!

***The resisters.***

According to Prof P.Guggenheim (Geneva), “the dogma of national sovereignty” (main axiom of nationalism and imperialism) is the major stumbling block.

Second resistance: the “Cold War” (USA/Soviet Union), which fortunately ended in 1987 (M.Gorbachev introduced glasnost and perestroika).

***Legal Standards.***

1. Human rights contain rules of conduct that govern the “some/state” relationship in peacetime.

2. Humanitarian law since especially 1949 (Geneva: the treatment of victims of war crimes) and later in 1977 prescribe rules of conduct in wartime as part of international law.

Since the Nazi crimes -- genocide first and foremost -- such things, along with massive violations of human rights, have been tacitly labeled “never again” to be tolerated. However, the idea of an “international court” being permanent, although mooted, never materialized into an institution. The political will to prioritize international intervention in national states was lacking. In other words: the nation-state, dominant since the Renaissance, was and is “taboo”.

***Two temporary accomplishments.***

International shocked opinion forced the nation states into a temporary court of law in the wake of two massive events.

1. 1991.-- Yugoslavia disintegrates with mass violence, murder, torture, prison settings reminiscent of Nazi concentration camps. The Hague: a war crimes tribunal is established.

2. 1992, Rwanda sees half a million people massacred and maimed in tribal wars. A war crimes tribunal is established in Arusha, Tanzania.

In Rome now, they want to bring the “communities” (states, tribes) to the forefront of universal rules of conduct.

E.O. CF 88.

***Charles Gide's solidarism.***

**Bibl. sample:** M. Basle et al, *Histoire des pensées économiques*, (History of economic thought), Paris, 1988, 91/93.

Ch. Gide (1847/1932) practiced unifying economic science. In this sense he founded in 1887, with Jourdan, Villey, Faure la Revue d' économie politique.

The XIXth century exhibited a diversity of economic theory: liberals, ultra-liberals, socialists, marginalists, mathematicians, social reformers, protectionists, engineers,--all defended their point of view. Gide wanted to unify and transcend this multiplicity.

**Method.**

Economics as a science exhibits the following phases:

1. Observation of data (phenomenological starting point) and this unbiased;
2. Hypothesis building (inventing an explanation that discovers connections,-- especially causal connections);
3. Review o.k. new data (Principes d' économie politique (1917)).

**Definition.**

Economy proceeds through phases : from production, circulation, distribution to consumption. Its purpose is need satisfaction, for the needs of mankind are the activating force in economy.-- Utility value.

What is meant in economics is the usefulness of a product or service,-- usefulness that has to do with rarity. Which does not lead Gide to underestimate labor: "L' utilité et le travail" he says (id.).

***Solidarism (cooperatism).***

Gide distinguished five schools in his time.--

1. **Liberalism** (individualism,-- optimistic, conservative).
2. **Scientific socialism** (Marxism: deterministic).
3. **State socialism** (struggle t.v. legislation favoring the working class)
4. **Christian democracy** (to some extent anti-liberal; threefold foundation : church doctrine, family, patron).
5. **Solidarism**: will to make human society a great society characterized by mutual assistance such that natural solidarity -- if updated by the willingness of all or, failing that, by legal compulsion -- grows into justice.--

Gide's preference is for the latter (also called l' Ecole de Nîmes).

**Conclusion.--** Gide apparently does not belong to those who stick to pure economics : the social dimension runs in tandem with economics.

E.O. CF 89.

**Personalism.**

**Bibl. sample:** Fl. Van Oirschot, *Beknopte geschiedenis der sociale kwestie*, (Concise history of the social question), Roermond/ Maaseik, 1950, 292/318.

Personalism” should - to begin with - by no means be confused with “individualism”. On the contrary.

Denis de Rougemont (1906/1985).

This Calvinist thinker is with Emmanuel Mounier (1905/1950; Catholic personalist; founder of the magazine *Esprit*) one of the top figures of personalism.

**Existentialism.**

In *Politique de la personne*, (Politics of the person,), Paris, 1934-1, 1946-2, de Rougemont writes: “The success of existentialist doctrine seems to indicate that minds are awakening (...). Personalism arose in the philosophical atmosphere determined by names such as S. Kierkegaard (1813/1855; father of existential thought), Nic. Berdiaev (1874/1948), Gabriel Marcel (1898/1973; *Etre et Avoir* (To be and to have), (1935); Karl Jaspers (1883/1969), M. Heidegger (1889/1976).”

Indeed: to exist is to be thrown into this world as an individual and to create one’s own design for life. Not nature as in materialism for example; not a community as in socialism. But the individual human being in the midst of society and cosmos,--with his ethical mission.

**Personalism.**

The personalist(s) puts the human person at the center, in his individuality and with a personality. But situated in society. By this last feature, personalism integrates all that is community.

Hence, personalist socialism also emerged.

Says de Rougemont: “The concepts of person, individual, personality must be disentangled and purified in order to then base a renewed social order on them.” Philosophers like J. Maritain (1882/1973; Catholic), N. Berdiaev (Orthodox), a number of young Protestants, also many agnostics (*note*: who put religion in parentheses) have tried to demonstrate the immediate importance of a definition of ‘person’ for all social action.”

“If man were not a person, even if in a stifled and oppressed way, in a sickly way, in a possible way or in disposition, he/she would resemble all other things in the world.” Thus Nikolai Berdiaev who, as an Orthodox, adds that man as a person resembles God.

From the “person/world” couple, personalists have continued to think in all directions.

E.O. CF 90.

***Political democracy according to m. Walzer.***

***Bibl. sample:*** M. Walzer, *The idea of a civil society*, in: *Streven* 60 (1993): June, 483/497.

Walzer, prof at Princeton University, is known for his *Spheres of Justice*, New York, 1983, in which he situates man not in a single “sphere” (“biotope”) but in a multiplicity of spheres in which he can “live well” (pluralistic social democracy).

***Classical and neoclassical political democracy.***

Being a citizen was the ideal for one layer of the ancient Greeks. To participate in all freedom, to help decide. To help bring about the ‘polis’ or state -- such was the classical thesis.

***Neoclassical.***

J.-J. Rousseau (1712/1778), at least in a common leftist interpretation,-- John Stuart Mill (1806/1873; social liberal),-- the democratic radicals in XIXth and XXth centuries, - up to and including the New Left (gauchism of the sixties),-- they all reestablished citizenship as a “sphere” of good living.

When women, workers, people of color, migrants ask for their “rights,” they, consciously or not, put ability to participate in conclusions in the state first.

Communitarists in the U.S.A. also urge a renewed sense of citizenship as an antidote to the fragmentation of contemporary society. After all, like Rousseau, they lack an eye for the smaller subgroups that are situated between the individual citizen and the state,--in the “civil society. The state dominates and does so in a one-sided way.

***Walzer has two comments.***

1. The interventions of the current state have “increased enormously” (a.c., 486). Among other things, under the pressure of politically active citizens. Yet it cannot be said that “the citizens are the city governments”. The stronger the state becomes, the more it swallows up small-scale communities (hamlets, families, churches, nations, etc.). There is no room for co-conclusion.

2. The ordinary citizen is primarily concerned with how he will earn his living. “He/ she is more strongly involved in the economic community (*note:* in which he/ she earns a living) than in the political one” (ibid.).

That encompasses a danger to real involvement that is true civic sense.

***More to the point:*** a number of citizens make economic activity the ideal,-- e.g., in the form of a career in business. Which puts civility in the shade (to say the least).

E.O. CF 91.

***Pluralistic Social Democracy.***

***Bibl. sample:*** Michael Walzer, *The idea of a civil society* in: *Streven* 60 (1993): June, 490/497.

Walzer is an American Jew and defender of democratic socialism. Main axiom: man, at least in a true democracy, lives simultaneously in different spheres of life"! From there, his *Spheres of Justice*, New York, 1983.

***Single-mindedness.***

The sometimes called "republican" political democracy based on classical (Greek) or neoclassical (Rousseau) models focuses on the citizen as a co-deciding being in state affairs. On the contrary, state affairs are one sphere of life.

Marxism puts the worker - homo faber - at the center of a large industrial enterprise that over time becomes humanity. That is precisely one sphere of life.

Liberalism puts the abundant supply of goods and services, worked by entrepreneurs, valued by consumers - both situated in a free market economy - at its core. That, on the contrary, exposes a sphere of life.

The nationalist or sovereignist puts the nation as a system based on blood-relationships and destinies at the center. This too is precisely a sphere of life.

***Pluralism.***

These four solutions of the social question Walzer considers one-sided. And thus insufficiently though not to be underestimated,-- Walzer situates man -- at least in a true democracy -- simultaneously in the four previous spheres of life supplemented by many others. He calls this civil society with its multiplicity ('fragmentation') and with its solidarity.

Think of people spontaneously seeking each other out, forming and reforming all kinds of groups -- associations (biotopes, spheres of life),-- not for the benefit of a particular institution (family, tribe, nation, religion, commune, interest group, ideology, brotherhood and so on) but purely for the sake of being connected. After all, we are social beings before anything else. Cfr. a.c., 490v..

Among the associations he lists : trade unions, parties, movements of all kinds, interest groups,-- families, churches, family businesses, state or municipal institutions, workers' communes (collectives), purchasing cooperatives, non-profit associations.

In all these years of life, Walzer situates the one citizen in civil society. It is defined precisely because of this.

E.O. CF 92.

***State and society.***

Being a citizen - and thus, as - Rousseau preached - participating in politics (political democracy) is only one of the many roles that the citizen plays. And yet the state plays a role that differs from the other spheres of life. The state frames civil society, although it appears to be only one element of it. "It defines the space for action, it lays down the rules for all the activities of associations. Also the political activity". A.c., 494).

"In practice, then, citizenship takes some precedence over all our other commitments. Therefore we need not yet be citizens (*op.* political co-decision makers) 'all the time' and, according to Rousseau's wish, seek our happiness first and foremost in politics." (A.c., 495).

Just as we should not be continuously active in associations (a.c., *ibid.*). Civil society is already sufficiently democratic if we only participate responsibly in some of its subgroups.

***Examples.***

Even the failed totalitarianism of e.g. the Polish communist state could still "lay down the law" for the Solidarnosc trade union: it became a Polish trade union, which had to determine the economy and labor policy "within Polish borders."

**Note.--** "Solidarnosc" is "solidarity. Formed in Gdansk in 1980 as an independent union with its own leadership,-- Solidarnosc is outlawed by the communist state and becomes clandestine in 1982. In 1989, the union becomes legal again to play an important role in the new institutions and even the state government.

Walzer cites a second example.

In the USA viz. Families with two parents working outside the home need help from the state (subsidized child care). National minorities to maintain their own education rely on state aid. Capitalist entrepreneurs and corporations rely on the state.

Trade unions cannot exist without legal recognition and protection from "unfair labor practices." The individual human being must be protected from the power of e.g. officials, patrons, experts, patrons. Lobbies must be curbed.

Reason: a stateless civil society runs into power relations that create inequality - injustice. only the state can remedy this.

E.O. CF 93.

***Bringing it together, yes. but there is nothing grand about it.***

One would say that unilateralism “impresses.” To give up one-sided systems-democratic citizenship (Rousseau’s political democracy), Marxist cooperation, liberal thought individual autonomy national identity-is to give up something great : “a clenched energy, a clear choice, a sharp distinction between pro and con” (a.c., 496).

Civil society with its multiplicity of spheres of life “does not give this impression” (ibid.). Its great merit lies in bringing together - we call it generalization - but that has nothing great about it. Thus literally Walzer.

In other words: militantly minded people do not attract such a thing.

***Increasing degradation.***

Is society ripe for Walzer’s project? Walzer doesn’t think so. Violence, homelessness, divorce, neglect, addiction indicate increasing degradation. The actual citizen and his society is not a cozy reality. Except for the privileged it never has been.

Usually, people are in some subordinate role such that they learn submissiveness. Not or not so much autonomy. This is precisely why the movements advocating political empowerment (Rousseau), Marxist salvation state, liberal-free market, nationalism grew. All liberation movements” (a.c., 497).

But none of them actually brought overall, real and lasting liberation : “Their fiercest advocates - who extolled the state, the cooperative, the market or the nation - are probably partly responsible for the disorder of today” (a.c., ibid.).

Likewise, communitarianism (communitarism, communalism) - Alasdair McIntyre, Charles Taylor, Michael Sandel - which rejects liberalism and sees real justice only in situating oneself in a community, a tradition, with which one feels solidarity, is rejected by Walzer as one-sided: not in a single but in a multiplicity of communities is man - the citizen of the state - in solidarity with others.

The model on social question, as in the Frankfurter Schule, is Biblical prophecy, as Walzer specifies in *Interpretation and Social Criticism*, Harvard University Press, 1987.

E.O. CF 94.

***Christian state economics.***

***Bibl. sample:*** Fl. Van Oirschot, *Beknopte geschiedenis der sociale kwestie*, Roermond/ Maaseik, 1950, 322/324.

Whatever it will be called “Christian economy”, “solidarism”, “social Catholicism”, it will get off the ground in the XIXth century. Slowly because surprised by the de-Christianization (especially since the French Revolution). But sure.

***1834.-- Economie politique chrétienne appears,***

He begins with a critique: the clergy is confined to the church building and the sacristy; Catholics do well to give alms, but they must learn to put social theory, derived from Christian axioms, first as the basis of culture.

***The task of the state.***

The state - said Villeneuve-Bargemont - must ensure that workplaces meet hygiene requirements. Child labor - still a world problem in 1998 - should be prohibited below the age of fourteen. Savings and provident funds should be set up for the workers.

Typical of his time: that men and women work separately.

***The rights of the working people.***

Labors have -- in some circumstances -- the right to deliberate about their common interests,-- to form trade unions. The latter may be given legal capacity. The establishment of them must be guaranteed on new bases and thus promoted. These syndicates would then be concerned with the foundation of support and provident funds, of temperance unions, schools, public courses.

***Note.--*** The overwhelming influence of the liberal system of the time is still felt where he -- distrustful of the mid-century guilds -- does not want to see the guilds restored, so much so that the new trade unions are not allowed to get involved in setting wages.

This did not prevent the Count, relying on his faith, from having the courage to brandish the abuses of the liberal system without hesitation. He could not do this without offending the ruling bourgeoisie - including the Catholics - or without being suspected of “socialism”. In any case, he was a trailblazer.

E.O. CF 95.

**Von Ketteler, “our great predecessor” (Pope Leo XIII).**

**Bibl. sample:** Fl. Van Oirschot, *Concise history of the social question*, Roermond / Maaseik, 1950, 332/337.

Don't we forget: in 1848, Marx/ Engels publish their *Communist manifesto*. In that year, Die erste Versammlung des katholischen Vereins Deutschlands (The first meeting of the Catholic Association of Germany), is held. About twenty members of the Frankfurt parliament attended, including... a pastor from the village of Hopsten, von Ketteler.

Already on the first evening people from all sides urged him to speak and already on the first evening he delivered the well-known speech on *Die Freiheit der Kirche*. (The freedom of the Church.), In it he placed the social question in the foreground,--”the weightiest question which (...) has not yet been solved. That was in Mainz.

A little later, von Ketteler held the people of Mainz in breathless suspense with his six sermons in Mainz Cathedral on “*die groszen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart* (the major social issues of the present), (*a.o.* right of ownership, freedom, family, destiny of man, authority of the church).

### ***The bishop of workers.***

Von Ketteler becomes bishop. Undeterred, he inquired of socially feeling foremen, of experienced labor leaders,---by reading German and foreign writings. As a result of this long study, *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum* (The Workers' Question and Christianity ), appeared in 1864. With enthusiasm the book was greeted,-- even in non-Catholic circles. The book became a starting point long after.

Sharp was his assessment of the then all-powerful ruling Liberal Party in Germany. It consisted (according to him) mainly of freemasonry, the great representatives of big business, the rationalistic “*Professorenthum*” and the banal “*Literatenthum*” that eats at the table of the aforementioned high lords and in their service must speak and write daily.

Von Ketteler reproaches them for pretending that the working class will get out of its sad condition - “most workers are physically exhausted” - by some self-help, some concessions and appreciation of the worker merely in fine speeches. Even education, lectures, popular libraries, excursions, magazines, etc., will not give the worker real joy in life and security of existence, if all this does not put Christianity as axiom first.

The deepest cause of the social question lies in the great apostasy of the last centuries which were more a pretence than a real Christianity.

E.O. CF 96.

***Christian solidarism (Christian democracy).***

***Bibl. sample:*** J. Aengenent, *Textbook of Sociology*, Leiden, 1919-4, 102, 456 (The Solidarism).

The work is a very comprehensive and well-founded exposition of Christian social teaching.

***Organicism.***

The model is the biological organism, which consists of many heterogeneous elements and parts but forms a very coherent unit. Above all, the problem of the professional classes - an updating of the medieval guilds (which to a certain extent served as models again) - became one of the busiest topics discussed. They largely occupy the middle ground between individuals and the state.

***Center Thinking.***

Christian solidarism is midway between liberalism and socialism, for it does not want extreme individualism and emphasizes the solidarity of interests but not extreme. It does not want an absorption of the individual into a community (state, industrial society, municipality, economic profession) because it demands autonomy. Thus Aengenent, o.c., 105

“The Catholic school teaches that three factors must work together for the improvement of the social situation : individual, community and church.” The latter with its Biblical axiomatics, -- Thus o.c., 115.

***Christian democracy.***

In the second part of the XIXth century, the term “Christian democracy” came into circulation.

The definition read, “Beneficial action for the benefit of the people, grounded in natural law and the gospel.”

With this last modality the metaphysical foundation is pronounced. The social question, namely, is the outward sign of the fact that the being or nature of humanity, not only of laboring humanity, is an objective fact which can be grasped by reason, modern or otherwise, but is in any case not created by it. Humanity insofar as justly organized is in other words an objective idea.

More to the point, this objective idea takes root in God’s mind and is therefore a divine idea.

This makes traditional metaphysics the basis of beneficent action for the people.

E.O. CF 97.

***Mondragon (Arrasate), a social Catholic experiment.***

D. Villey/ C. Nâme, *Petite histoire des grandes doctrines économiques*, (A short history of the great economic doctrines), Paris, 1992-2, 395, says that “most of the great economists were atheists, except Malthus.

Rarely are theologians aware of economic theory. Some episcopal mandates even demonstrate equally puzzling ignorance of basic economic laws when they claim that overtime creates unemployment or that the patron should not seek his profit.” That may be true, of course.

Yet this is no reason to minimize the social teaching of the church, for it is conceivable that economists do not know everything either. Therefore, we dwell on L. Bouckaert, *Mondragon (An experiment in entrepreneurial participation)*, in: *Streven* 65 (1998): 3 (March), 221/229, which we summarize.

***Worker self-management.***

In ex-Yugoslavia the experiments have failed. But a rare experiment in the Spanish Basque Country seems to prove that self-management of workpeople succeeds: in Mondragon (the Basque town of Arrasate), a business complex is operating that currently - 1998 - has 160 cooperatives with 23,000 member co-owners.

***The danger of succeeding.***

In case of success either the workers keep their share in the company and hire new staff with a wage contract (so that they do not co-manage) or they convert the share by selling it to wealthy capital owners. This is how it threatens to go within our capitalist, competition-based system.

***Mondragon.***

Mondragon, however, avoids both closures: the growth curves for turnover, profit and employment continue to rise. The model is so attractive that in the USA and Great Britain adapted cooperatives are created.

***Origins.***

In 1941, a young priest, José Maria Arizmendiarrietta (+1979) - Arizmendi for short - was appointed by the diocese in what was then an 8,000-strong village (southeast of Bilbao) with a very high level of unemployment and poverty. Only a steel mill provided industrialization and employment. But militant workers caused bitter conflicts.

Arizmendi first wanted to study sociology at Leuven but the bishop refused: his social pragmatism had to venture out in the field and learn.

E.O. CF 98.

***No militancy. Rather, pragmatism.***

Not an axiomatic. Rather, the practical feasible. But from a Christian social attitude, where, as the church says, labor as a creative force takes precedence over capital.-- Immediately Arizmendi sticks to the role of counselor

**1.-- Formation.**

Arizmendi gathers the youth in discussion, sports and formation groups. More than that, in 1943 he founded a technical school for boys 14/16 that became the starting point par excellence of the rest

He made an agreement with the University of Saragossa to allow creative students who were not able to pay to acquire an engineering degree through self-study.

A business school was established in neighboring Onati in 1960.

In 1968, he founded a Research Center for Applied Industries (electronics, robotics, information technology).

**2.-- Cooperatives.**

‘Cooperative’ is an association for the purpose of meeting needs more economically (e.g., food).

**1955:** five engineering students, with Don José Maria, with their own savings, with some residents start a cooperative (ULGOR). Careful not to defy the Franco regime that did not favor worker self-government. Even after Spain’s absorption into Europe, the cooperative continues to flourish, yes, exports (stoves, ago’s, washing machines and dishwashers).

**1960+.--** One cooperative after another is established. So that now there are a 160.- - caja laboral popular (people’s savings bank).

The financing and technical and social assistance for those cooperatives came from a bank that Don José himself, without the fellow workers, set up with two members of the founding group. The bank was successful because it paid higher interest rates and invested in the area itself. The people knew that.

***Hybrid cooperatives.***

The stakeholders (managers) share the decision-making power. Workers and consumers, producers and suppliers, workers and farmers act together as cooperators in this process.

***Social Security.***

A social security cooperative of its own was established because it could not do so otherwise. As part of the Caja. In 1967 it became independent.

**Conclusion.--**Although very independent, these cooperatives and thus form one cohesive whole. Thanks to a common association contract that establishes rules, and mutual purchases and sales between the cooperatives.

E.O. CF 99.

***The axiomatics.***

The basic propositions are twofold. The democratic principle, which governs the decisions, and the ownership principle, which governs the claims to the company's assets and results.

**1.-- *Democratic.***

This term here means: those who are governed have power over the decisions. The governed - directly or through delegation - govern themselves.

***The difference.***

In a classic company it is the shareholders who -although absent- govern (e.g. appoint directors), -- not the employees, i.e. the directors, who therefore do not govern themselves.-- That is typically capitalist (the capital holders dominate)

The 'management' (board) in Mondragon manages the company on behalf of, in the interest of all co-owners, members of the cooperative,-- without shareholders. Not the shares (money investments) but managing the membership in the cooperative.

**2.-- *Private property.***

In workers' self-government, the administrative law of the enterprise is in principle decoupled from the law of property.-- But that does not imply that private property is thereby abolished,-- nor that there is no connection between democratic control and efficient (effective, results-oriented) management of property.

Unlike the experiment in ex-Yugoslavia (communist), Mondragon integrates private property rights into self-management. Each member of a cooperative is entitled to a portion of the net book value of the enterprise through an "individualized internal capital account." Bouckaert considers this the most original finding of Don Jose's church-inspired system.

***Yet it is not working-class capitalism.***

The amount of shares one owns does not come into play. What does matter is the personal membership. The shares are a personal loan to the company, which is repaid when someone leaves the company (retires, for example).

So one should not say too lightly that Church doctrine does not "know" economic laws, or does not know them enough, in the case of Don Jose's experiment. We think it more than worthwhile to draw attention to it now that even believers minimize Church social teaching.

E.O. CF 100.

***Resistance to the neoliberal world system.***

***Bibl. sample:*** R.Petrella et al, *Guerre économique (L'heure de la résistance)*, (Economic warfare (The hour of resistance)), Geneva, Cotomec, 1997.

Cotomec, Boulevard du Pont'Arve, Geneva, stands for "Commission Tiers Monde de l' Eglise Catholique". Eight specialists treat with rare vehemence (J.-J.Arnaud) the neoliberal world system, mainly understood as globalization.

**1. *System as task.***

The authors define as follows: "deletion of thousands of jobs, deepening inequalities, wild speculation. Such multifaceted menace creates across the globe "a real apartheid (*op-ed*: social divide) on social issues both in the north and south of the planet." With a Matthew effect: the poor of each hemisphere become impoverished while the rich become richer.

**2. *Resistance as a solution.***

"The hour of resistance is dawning" (according to the proposers). "That resistance can get results" they say. - How to resist?

**1. *Theoretically.***-- They reject any form of assent to the system such that "the idol of the almighty market" is knocked down from its pedestal.

**2. *Practically.***-- They exert as much pressure as possible toward an economy that respects man as man. So e.g. by subordinating any money placement -- take: in a pension fund or so -- to the fact that the financial institution puts into practice strict rules of conscience.

***Note.***-- In such a resistance these Catholics are clearly not alone : non-believers -- for their own reasons or grounds -- also do this. The difference is in the axiomatics of the Catholic Church and its social teaching.

***A judgement.***

J.-J. Arnaud, *Guerre économique: la résistance*, (Economic warfare: the resistance), in: *Journal de Genève, Gazette de Laus.* 10.04.1997, speaking of the book says "A book that addresses the issues of our time as globalization (*note*: of the neoliberal system) - almost,- frightens everyone."

***Note*** -- It should not be forgotten that John-Paul II, already in *Reconciliatio et paenitentia*, brought up the notion of "social sins": social groups of a certain size e.g. whole nations or blocs of nations, create - alone or with other actors - situations which are to be interpreted as biblically understood "sin" (unconscionability). Our planet, according to *Guerre économique*, is in need of this.