

The demagogical limits of the political discourse

Gavril Cornutiu

University of Oradea, Clinic of Psychiatry
26 Louis Pasteur Street, 410154, Oradea, Romania

Abstract

Starting from the rising mass violence potential and increased terrorism in Europe, a short analysis from a scientific point of view of the consequences of increased emigration to Europe was made. The officials refuse any sincere dialogue on the topic due to political correctness obedience. The conclusion is that only free debate at all levels of society can lead to just conclusions which in turn can help avoid blood shed in the future of Europe.

Keywords: immigration, immigration consequences, violence, scientific data.

INTRODUCTION

The shock behind these thoughts was the horrible murder committed by Breivik. It was clear for me, as a psychiatrist that this was no ordinary murder. It was actually a butchery, and such cruelty and indifference for the life of others, of so many people who you do not even know, is not part of normal behaviour. The butchery was a psychopathological act, and psychopathology deals with the limits of human pathology in relation with itself and with the others or with the non-human reality. This psychopathology tells us that no matter how absurd the idea of a psychiatric patient is, it is rooted in his peristatics. The psychiatric patient feeds on the surrounding reality, which he alters to the point of delirious absurdity. Thus, Breivik's twist of mind originated in a reality. And he is not the only one trapped in the bitterness of homicide. Before him, somebody else in Scandinavia stabbed a minister for the same reasons. The bitter taste was not just for the possible criminality but for society's refusal to discuss fairly and dispassionately, but with all the strength of reason, the realities which determined two disturbed minds to get into the trap of crime. Society acted just as insanely as Breivik had done. Since then, the multiple murder in Paris occurred, but for now let's be limited to what concerns us, Europeans. And then I remembered what Unamuno [1] said: "...for me the most hideous thing is the tyranny of ideas. There is no creation which I resent more than ideocracy which brings about, as a compulsory consequence, idioephorbia, persecution in the name of an idea, of a different idea being as worthy or unworthy of respect as the original idea". From this perspective, I feel that the western society had the same attitude towards the Talibans, with a different manner of approach: „those whose opinions differ have no right to speak”. I am not and nor do I want to be the advocate of those who created Breivik, but reason tells me that unless one knows the phenomenon, one cannot control it. I also know what we all know, that the mad man tries to stop the furious torrent, thus creating more damage, while the wise man directs the torrent in a direction in which the harmful monster turns into a blessing angel. In order to know the phenomenon, it must be discussed publicly, by all minds. Justice lies at the foundation of western civilisation, which positively differentiates it from other civilisations. European justice is based on Roman law, whose basic principle is the inalienable right of the parties to present their arguments. Moreover, 2300 years ago, Aristotle [2] referred to Solon's contribution and highlighted his merits, insisting on the following: „as the laws have not always been written in the most clear and simple language (...) it is only natural that divergences should occur while interpreting them and if this is the

case, only the people's court has the right to give an (compulsory) interpretation". This is the verdict of reason that dates two millenia back. We seem to continually forget what we knew yesterday. This is what John Stuart Mill said in 1858 [3]: „we could suppose that today we need no argument to prove why we should not allow any legislative or executive power, which does not identify with the interests of the people, to impose its opinions on that very people, or to decide which doctrines the people is allowed to learn about". J.S. Mill's remark is extremely important because, no matter how briefly one analyzes this sentence, one will notice that it refers to the the future state of a nation, which is more dangerous than the humility of present dictatorship. In addition, public debate conditions and enables what Descartes [4] noticed a few centuries ago „the things we perceive extremely clearly and precisely are all true" because „the things that are not certain and not entirely undoubtful" are related to „the ones that are manifestly false". And doubtful things are defined as such starting from the first „sign of doubt". Therefore, as the western society refuses to publicly debate in a sensible and dispassionate way the realities generating pathological reactions of the Breivik type, it disavowed the wisdom that stands at the base of its culture and civilisation. „Political correctness" is, as an expression of the cultural communism dominating the world today, the capitalist version of ideological communism, of bolshevik ideological intolerance and of its thematic tabus.

The essential problem

The reason for horrible murders and slaughters of the Breivik type was territorial invasion by „extra-domestic", „out-of-the-pack" or, simply, outsiders threatening the masters of the territory. The reaction is natural, present in all species on the zoological scale. It does not differ from guarding dogs which protect their territory. It might look like we are going too low on the evolution scale and offending human race, but, looking at things from the cultural and cultural philosophical perspective, Lucian Blaga [5] asserts that the first mode of human existence refers to „the human existence within the given environment and its preservation". The fact that a cultural philosophical reasoning reaches a conclusion converging with the conclusion of evolutionary Darwinism means that the conclusive synthesis is correct due to the fact that nature is unitary. Therefore, at the most profound level of the existence of life, the problem at hand is the undeniable and vitally important reality. We have established that at the root of the criminal reaction of the Breivik type lies a real social cause and that it expresses a fundamental law on life, beyond human consideration. What is the dimension of this problem swept under the carpet by political correctness? We might be tempted, at first, to think that an image of this dimension is given by the rising popularity of right wing political parties from France to Austria. But we shall leave these aside as they feed on the same social reality that nurtured Breivik. The real dimension of the problem is revealed by the following two discourses of the collective mind. None of them has anything to do with right or left wing politics. They express the extra-political collective mind. More than a year ago, the following speech attributed to the Prime Minister of Australia became viral on the internet and it was repeated over considerable periods of time. It does not even matter if it truly belongs to the Prime Minister, not for the collective mind; the fairy tale is more convincing than reality in most cases. If it reached Romania all the way from Australia, it must have travel vast geographical spaces. I did not keep it but I remember its main idea as it impressed me. It was the first time in history when something like this was expressed. The idea was something along the following lines (I will use my own words) „we have built this society and this civilisation. We demand that those who come to our country should integrate by adapting to our world and not the other way around, us adapting to their ways, as they are the ones who need us and feed on our work".

The second signal, a bit less direct, comes from Germany, at the end of 2014. Regular people, without any political engagements used to shout publicly "This is our country. Let them build their own country back home". And this type of discourse occurs for the first time in history. The three behaviours- the Breivik type reactions, the Australian speech and the German discourse- are in fact a development of the attitudinal state of the collective mind, spread on three continents.

If emigration had the same scale in Japan, or China, or anywhere else in the world, reaction and development would be the same. This is a natural reaction belonging to the very nature of life. Immigration has reached its highest and there are consequences that question the social, behavioural, cultural status quo, as well as who represents the power in this emigration geography. This generates anxiety about the future among the peoples receiving immigrants. Does this anxiety have any scientific base? Eduard O. Wilson, probably the most competent biologist on the matter, in his analysis of Social Conquering of the Earth [6], of species (not just humans) which conquered the entire planet, observes: „By its force and universality, the tendency of forming groups and then favouring the members of a certain group bears distinctive signs of instinct". The phenomenon stems from what psychologists call, referring to humans, „prefigurative learning", starting with the upbringing of children within a group. Therefore, this collective western anxiety has a biological foundation on the *vitae* scale, continued in humans. Actually, human history confirms the biological research. Take the history of the Americas for instance, in a totally different moment in time and with totally different motivational springs, it represents an extreme variant of the case stated above. At the base of the European and Australian anxiety lies the instinctive question: „will we ever die out or survive in reservations like the Amerindians?". History takes measurements in generations and centuries. And one must not forget what Arthur Schopenhauer [7] demonstrated about the „*principium rationis sufficientis frendi*" as the law of causality. He thus demonstrates the chain of events has a cascading causality. According to him, any becoming is the phenomenologic expression of a cascade emerging from strict reasonings of the „this is the way and not the other" type. Whatever tomorrow brings is justified by what we have today. It all seems abstract, at an ideatic level, but let us remember what Unamuno said [1]: „Ideas rule the world? I tend to imagine that there is not a more propelling idea as the idea of human". This means that we are driven towards the future by the human vector, about which Rudolf Steiner [8] used to say: „the concept by which the human being is considered a free entity, relying totally on itself, is apparently challenged by the fact that the human being appears as a member of a natural unit (race, clan, nation, family, gender etc.) and acts in a unit (state, church etc.)". In other words individuals cannot deny their origins and will always act in the direction imposed on the subconscious by their origin. The origin print is final. Therefore, the theme causing the collective debates in discussion poses real reason for anxiety when it is projected in the future. One of the thinkers who meditated at the fate of western type civilisations was Oswald Spengler [9], who asserted: „the fact that human thinking unleashed cannot understand its own consequences is part of the drama of this time". The fact that for almost 100 years Spengler's words were not taken into consideration means nothing due to two arguments. First of all, he analyzed the future of western civilisation from a completely different perspective at a time when the problem in discussion today had not occurred yet. Second of all, we do not measure history in momentary centuries.

Characteristics of the Immigrant theme

Throughout history, the first population migrations that took place from one geographical area to another were made with the aid of warrior force and in compact groups. Then, the

colonization of the new world followed, forcefully, insidiously, but always with force at disposal when necessary. This initially happened in small groups, then individually. Now, population migrations are done individually and under the protection of law. But neither laws nor constitutions can foresee the number of people that can emigrate from one country to another. Until now, no such problem was taken into consideration. Mathematically speaking, the continuation of emigration together with the huge birth rate differences between the occidental population and the emigrants make the change of demographic ratios a sure reality in the foreseeable future. The present state of affairs will generate within 2-3 generations, at the most, a situation of minority of European peoples in their own countries. Does anybody have the right to dictate this? Do European peoples have the right to disinherit their grandchildren or great grandchildren in their own countries? Where does the right of a people over a territory come from? There are three sources of this right. The first is historic. The people that settled and grew in a territory are more legitimate owners of that particular territory than any other newcomer. The second is the political right, which is related to state organizations, obtained through sacrifices and which also gives the present state organization frame. The third one is the demographic right, the Wilsonian right, which allowed the reconstruction of the Central European states after the Habsburg period. For the time being, European peoples have in their state organization all three rights, but demographic evolution in the present direction, will lead to the disappearance of the demographic right of peoples now inhabiting a territory and the majority of the future will feel entitled to make claims to own the territory. One has to consider that between the European peoples and the American people, where the present demographic norms come from, there are essential differences. They cannot be compared. European peoples were formed where they are as a continuation of the ancestral populations on those territories (with two exceptions only). The American people is still developing from seeds coming from all over the world, through emigration from the very beginning. Americans have no bonds with their past. Their past was yesterday. European peoples have generations and generations that have shed their blood for their country. Can the sponge of demagogy erase the blood of predecessors? Another characteristic of the present diffused immigration is that integration is also made though granting the right to vote, a fundamental right of a citizen. But voting, under the circumstances of progressive immigrant growth, until becoming a majority, will mean the takeover of the power of decision, with all its subsequent consequences. The fact that immigrants remain linked to their origin, in terms of religion, culture, traditions, etc, is a proven reality and a consequence of some natural, biological data. The question that arises here is how can such an evolution be possible starting from the most generous democracy premises? But reality, including human reality, is the synthetic sum of contradictions; and culture (one expression of which is democracy) is formed from "contradicting values", which tend to suppress one another. According to Stéphane Lupasco [10] a "contradiction of pure logic" is possible as well. The logic of the socio-cultural field contains therefore an intrinsic contradiction as it administers extremely vast complexities. Moreover, the history of societies reveals the fact that what was logical and extremely necessary for progress at one time became an obstacle or a danger for evolution at the next level. And the presently diffused emigration happens on the background of a "mass culture" [11], which is the germination environment of the ideas of the collective mind. What is more, there is an occidental/oriental antinomy that manifested itself peacefully or violently during history, but continues and will continue, as oil cannot mingle with water. This also has something to do with the touch of eternal in humanity, which has independent variants and for which, until now, there is no social or historical proof in the sense of reducing one to the other. These variants of humanity evolve independently, no matter how convergent the image projected by globalization is. Even more, globalization with all its merits blocks perception only at the surface of the water, at the waves, drawing the attention away from the deep

currents that really dictate the future of the waters. It is time for us to turn from the waves to study the deep current, with a view to avoiding future violent or even bloody conflicts. To achieve this, we have to give up the demagogy of political correctness. The present political principles raise questions of maximum gravity in need of a rational response, which is not simple at all and cannot be given by politicians only. These questions are of the following pattern: Are English people the owners of England? Or their rights over England equal the rights of the immigrants who, through demographic evolution, will, at one time, represent the majority? Are the Germans the owners of Germany? What about the French? and so on and so forth for all European peoples. These peoples and their relationship with their land are not to be compared to the American people and their relationship with the land of America, which did not belong to them historically from the very beginning. These questions need stringent answers considering the present situation and the fact that political ideas and discourses are in contradiction with scientific data. Ignoring scientific data and conclusions is nothing but a road leading to failure.

What can be done?

Four premises lie at the base of our conclusion.

The first premise is represented by the right to speak the truth, which is a fundamental right, it is the right of not being a liar by complaisance. In its absence, humans lose their right to be themselves. Every person has the basic right to think on their own and to discuss their conclusions with others. If somebody denies one's right to say what one sees and believes, is one not forcefully silenced? And is one not then the slave of the most hideous dictatorship hidden under the blanket of democracy? Does one or does one not have the right to be ourselves?

The second premise comes from another fundamental level. An unattended garden eventually ceases to be a garden and turns into a wild field or a meadow. Do we or do we not have the right of „gardening” our society? Do we need to have this right granted by anybody? By who? Or do we have the duty to garden our society? Does anybody have the right to stand in our way?

The third premise targets the essence of democracy in its unspoiled sense. It is not the governments that have the right to impose norms, beliefs or regulations on the people but the people have the right to demand support and assistance to the needs of the population. Otherwise democracy becomes a mere demagogical slogan which endorses dubious interests and manipulates and violates peoples. Has anybody ever become the sole owner of basic human rights or of the basis of democracy?

The fourth premise is the one stating that nobody is the sole possessor of truth, and that includes me. I merely exhibited scientific and philosophical research in order to describe a present reality that can lead to tragedies if overlooked. We were fed beautiful fairy tales about the disappearance of nations, ethnicities by international communist ideologies. The Soviet Union or Yugoslavia had bloody ends, rekindling hatred and intolerance for centuries onward (crowds hardly forget, though appearances may be misleading). Therefore we have the duty to seriously approach the theme of the future of emigration. But the social human truth is not always reasonable and logical as expressed by science. It has affective resorts (beliefs included) at least as deeply rooted as the scientific ones. That is the reason why political demagogy about the future of emigration must be abolished and replaced by an honest and argumented dialogue of all points of view from all layers of society and all geographical areas

on the topic în discussion here. The dialogue must not be only for the elites or – at the very least – politicians. It must involve the masses, and the current technological and globalisation tools enable such dialogue. In a fairly short amount of time, if the dialogue is firm, honest, unedited and not censored, we will have a clear idea of the peoples' future intention; this will have to be imposed to governments. This approach will save our future of dark and dangerous moments.

References

1. Miguel De Unamuno, *Ideocrația in Eseiștiști Spanioli*; roumanian ed.; Ed. By Ovidiu Drimba; Ed. Univers; 1982; 155-156.
2. Aristotel; *Statul Atenian*; roumanian ed; Antet; 2000; IX; 27.
3. John Stuart Mill; *On Liberty*; roumanian ed. *Despre Libertate*; Humanitas; 1994; 24.
4. Descartes; *Méditation Métaphysiques*; roumanian ed. *Meditații Metafizice*; *Meditația întâi*; Crater; 1993; 15; 19.
5. Lucian Blaga; *Ființa istorică*; Ed. Dacia; 1977; 32.
6. Edward O. Wilson; *The Social Conquest of Earth*; roumanian ed. *Cucerirea Socială a Pământului*; Humanitas; 2013; 78.
7. Arthur Schopenhauer; *Über Die Vierfache Wurzele Des Satzes Vom Zureichenden Grunde*; roumanian ed. *Despre împătrita rădăcină a principiului rațiunii suficiente*; Humanitas; 2008; S20; 58.
8. Rudolf Steiner; *Die Philosophie Der Freiheit*; roumanian ed. *Filozofia Libertății*; Polirom; 1993; 176.
9. Oswald Spengler; *Der Mensch und die Technic. Beitrag Zu einer Philosophie des Lebens*; roumanian ed. *Omul și Filozofia Vieții*; Alon; 1996; 81.
10. Stéphane Lupasco; *Logica dinamică a contradictoriului*; Ed. Politică; 1982; 161.
11. Richard Bassel; *Der Mensch des 20. Jahrhunderts*; ed by Frevert Ute and Haupt H.G.; roumanian ed. *Omul secolului XX*; Polirom; 2002; 11; 30.