Studies in Changing Democracy 1

Democracy in the Age of the Post-religiousness

Foundations of Alternative Economics

Bearbeitet von Cezary Józef Olbromski

1. Auflage 2012. Buch. 250 S. Hardcover ISBN 978 3 631 63793 7 Format (B x L): 14,8 x 21 cm Gewicht: 430 g

<u>Weitere Fachgebiete > Religion > Indigene Religionen > Agnostizismus, Atheismus,</u> <u>Säkularer Humanismus</u>

schnell und portofrei erhältlich bei



Die Online-Fachbuchhandlung beck-shop.de ist spezialisiert auf Fachbücher, insbesondere Recht, Steuern und Wirtschaft. Im Sortiment finden Sie alle Medien (Bücher, Zeitschriften, CDs, eBooks, etc.) aller Verlage. Ergänzt wird das Programm durch Services wie Neuerscheinungsdienst oder Zusammenstellungen von Büchern zu Sonderpreisen. Der Shop führt mehr als 8 Millionen Produkte. Cezary Józef Olbromski

Democracy in the Age of the Post-religiousness

Foundations of Alternative Economics



Studies in Changing Democracy Volume 1

New Complexions of the Political

Edited by Cezary Józef Olbromski



Introduction and Acknowledgements

Many people consider his or her selves to be not replaceable. I am only referring to it.

I am grateful to my colleagues who have commented on an earlier draft and who stay away from my work (an anonymous author).

The influence of emerging technologies on sociality has been recognized among anthropologists, linguists, engineers, geographers, sociologists, psychologists, and others (Duranti 2006, Goodwin & Goodwin 1996, Jones 2004, Keating 2006, Keating & Mirus 2003, LeBaron & Streeck 2000, Mondada 2003, Sarangi 2004, Suchman 1992, Wasson 2006), and has been a basis for theorizing about interaction. Following work on contextualization cues (Gumperz 1982), participation frameworks (Goffman 1961, Goodwin & Goodwin 2004, Philips 1972), focused attention (Kendon 1973, 1990, McNeill 2006), embodied action (Bourdieu 1977), and activity types (Levinson 1992). (Keating, Sunakawa 2010: 332)

According to Bossuet (1688: iii [quoted after:] Voegelin 1975: 15) interpreting chaotic multiplicity of existential tension between authority of the state, institution–axles of senses, and the individual as the awarenesses of senses, "the intellectual power of the individual cannot substitute for the accumulated wisdom of the collectivity". Bossuet (ibidem) has expressed a fundamental problem of functions of ideas in modern history. This statement theoretically introduces much more fundamental problem of universalism of the individual sense. "Bossuet observed the phenomenon of religious disorientation and of the consequent instability of sentiment and dogma at the time when the rapid variation still took place." (Voegelin 1975: 14) These transitions have been mixed with dynamic process of secularisation. Considerations focused on post–secularized sphere of the totariental (hereafter: T) are based on, in fact, Bossuet's statement about the existential tension.¹

During my studies on *Democracy in Irons of Totarientality—Contempora*ry Limitations of Democracy (Olbromski 2011a) perhaps none of us were informed about the phenomenon of the social as the following: WikiLeaks; the next opening of aggressive and predatory politics of the Catholic Church in Poland (see chapter I, XI); extremely right–wing terrorism in Norway (DF: 1); the 11th of November 2011 occurrences in Warsaw (DF: 2); the Arabian Spring 2011; the Greek case; the Hungarian case; and many others. The theory anticipating nume-

¹ Notice the shadow of a doubt that there are no low and/or highflying transcendentals or centric and successive levels of beings, being postulatively intellectually forced, there are still individual consciousnesses ordering the social.

rous contemporary social/political deviations is focused on two terms² playing important role in description and generalization of the most basis social actions.

It sounds like a truism that society is constituted in social action and that the political is derivative of social action. Nevertheless, no one can falsify these statements in the context of neither social life nor political or state activity.

Post-materialism and democracy seem seemingly separated terms. It is expressed by impreciseness of the first term. There are some publications using almost Orwellian language—or to be more precise, not enough clear terminology—trying to familiarize with the phenomenon of post-materiality. It seems as the breakneck to precede and complicate by obscurely depicting of contemporary political changes, notice that post-material phenomena of the political are analysed and democracy is put to the test of coherence in action. This goal is realized by showing how before–post–modern intellectual streams have smoothed the way for thinking within the sphere of depersonalized rules and orders, and by using the before–post–modern language. Note that the author steers clear new terms to explicate and to describe processes of contemporary democracy.

What is therefore the contemporary sphere of the political? Initially speaking, the political is not very large part of totarientality (hereafter: T–y) indicating on a new character of changes and obeying some kinds of behaviour. The political actor is not human being but the group of thematized information (hereafter: Δ). Δ s effectively falsify the political, all traditional sources, and reservoirs

² The terms are: (1) groups of thematized information (hereafter: Δ) and (2) totarientality (hereafter: T-y); totariental (hereafter: T) means total + pole-less + disorienting. The purpose of Δ is conquest and magazine of civilisation important pieces of information. Information is understood in the prism of scattered economical goods: (1) a group = given net topography; (b) the thematization = using of pieces of information accessible within various systems of senses and activities as a means of influence. Δ is an organization thematizing pieces of information by using up-to-date digital techniques. (1) The thematization consists in separation and preparation to use the pieces to expanding its own domain [of activity]-and to reach temporarily superiority within surrounding of domains being in interaction to each other. What is new in this configuration are arbitrary fixed manners of proceeding that can be also arbitrary-and temporarily-extended to the outer. (2) The sense of being of the organization resolves itself into searching and thematizing what can be used exclusively. The exclusiveness-based on multiple into T-y data—is desired to create senses, sets of data with virtue of hard obligation of facts, and obligating generally principles and orders. In other words, tactics of Δ consist in inscribing into T–y. T–y becomes the natural surroundings of Δ due to its informational exclusiveness in a field that is obtruded. Δ seems to be a contemporary cryptographer who does not involve the intersubjective sphere of consumptive symbolization and axiological simplifications but steers T-y in its possibilities of action to make impossible different propositions. It is impossible to reach persistent leading, due to the nature of T-y.

of identity philandering with Δ . The reservoirs become Δ s and the primal character of its senses is neutralized by instrumental efficiency. This is a new kind of social subject and effects of this new circumstance being under consideration.

 Δ changes principles of game and, in fact, it develops T–y. The totariental (hereafter: T) is trying to overcome by Δ s but finally the T will be complicated. The sense of T–y is changing; notice that every efforts to overcome or, at least, to familiarize T–y is fated to fail. Finally, Δ does not compete against something else but it extends a domain of obligation of its own rules and principles. Δ is self–sufficient system of manners of acting, norms, values or its equivalents, rules, principles; and first and foremost it is self–sufficient in absorption and creation of pieces of information that prejudge about primal importance of influence within T–y. Influence within T–y is defined as a momentary and transitory exclusiveness of possibility of imposing conditions (values or its equivalents, rules, principles etc.) within T–y. This kind of transitory Δ is able to falsification by the conditions that up to the fixed moment have been obligated within the internal domain of Δ and it able to neutralize the initial conditions of discourses.

In other words, Δ , as an organization enlarging its domain(s) of obligation and efficiency, possesses numerous features prejudged its existence. Therefore let us point out some features of the T: (1) creative formation of social sphere as technicized thinking; (2) creative reconstruction and impersonation of social sphere by crisis acting; (3) using of flexible systems of gaining of pieces of information; (4) possibility of economic—and moral, organizational etc.; (5) success despite of ideological domination of others; (6) exclusiveness of using given pieces of information; (7) exclusiveness of access to some pieces of information as a result of thematization; (8) ability of decisive initiative; (9) resistance from manipulation; (10) ability of effective multiplication of individual actions; (11) resistance from heterogeneity of surrounding acquired due to thematization/thematizing; (12) using of tool of sector crisis (cf. Dobry 1995) within the sphere of T–y; (13) implementation of its–own–sector–homogeneity as a method of consolidation by harnessing of T–y; (14) fixed and inflexible initial schema pointing out the direction and conditions of social communication.³

Additionally, the book contains analyses of implementation of crises of the politics and crises in politics. In other words, there are conditioned two proces-

³ Congruence of presented features of ∆ acting and activity of WikiLeaks being (cf. http://www.wikileaks.org/) "a not–for–profit media organisation" focused from 2007 "to publish original source material alongside (…) news stories so readers and historians alike can see evidence of the truth", is chance. The basis of the feature was created a couple years ago. On the other hand, also, my proposal—intrinsically connected with the modern Western thought and possibilities of contemporary techniques of communication—is non–accidental.

ses being simultaneously used in the contemporary democracy by political actors.⁴ These tools are moderators of naturally spontaneous democracy. Economic, cultural, and political changes are pressed by technically, sociologically and military equipped actors for whom democracy is an efficient tool.

In other words, the most important principle of contemporary democracy is neither common, creative, theoretical basis of the state, nor the principle of rule of positive law in democracy (cf. Weber, Merton, Höffe, Maravall, Przeworski, Troper), nor civic self–organization or mechanisms connecting individuals in quasi self–awareness social organism but the first fiddle should play, deliberative communication of multi– and transcultural surrounding. There is not deliberation considered as a political tool, in the book, but as existential—due to reference to the civic awareness—and systematically planed social experiment proceeded at real time. We are aware that human individuals give validation of democratic order. According to Phillips (1993 [quoted after:] Smyth 2005: 16–17),

the questions of democracy and difference are ones that are at the heart of contemporary dilemmas in democracy– and, on an international scale, have their counterpart in the fragmentation of older empires into smaller nationalities and the rising threat to national minorities.

Unfortunately, many circumstances prejudged about inefficiency of the awareness of individual as the main condition of democracy. Our selected analyses of the social thought since the turn of the nineteenth century point at the process of consequent domination of democracy by the sphere of domains of Δs .

Starting statements and initial results of this analysis are as follows. (1) Democracy is an impressionable kind of common existence of social group, and manifestations of extremeness and fundamentalism are imminence for its stability. One of the huge imminence is extremely right–wing parties and movements and one of the crucial enemies of democracy are denominational unions having enlarged base of supplies. In the first case, the real imminence consists not only in extremeness of political program but also in the lack of any economic program.⁵ In the second one, denominational unions having enlarged base of

⁴ It does not mean that there are only sophisticated manners of fear management (about fear management by the Catholic Church cf. Bauman 2010).

⁵ Some adequate illustration of the statement would be conditions of extremely rightwing parties during election 2012 in Poland. These political units—L–J and its political satellites—have had completely no economic program (DF: 3 and DF: 4). Notice that it took the place during economic and crises in EU, Japan, and USA. When journalist have tried to discuss with leaders of the party about economic program, was evinced that the only L–J economist of duty was on the holidays and that no one can professionally comment the current economic situation in EU in the context of current rates of exchan-

supplies, become similar to political parties and commerce institutions. There is also much of the muchness within principles of the unions: the denominational unions are to the backbone and structurally anti-democratic. In other words, the denominational unions become (very) limited liability companies with (the) revelation as (almost inexhaustible) initial capital. (2) Giving through traditional model of local community limiting possibilities of democratic government by small groups is not irrevocable process. Contemporary small groups being active on the local level seem as independence for traditional civil democracy and deliberative democracy. It should be pointed out that some intellectual streams on the turn of the nineteenth century prepared adequate basis for atomized and instrumental awareness of Δ members. Technical aspects of civilisation have only shown—as additional catalyst of changes—destructive possibilities of the awareness. (3) Some features of instrumental and formal rationalization of limitations of the social sphere are present as democratic tendencies into contemporary societies. (4) Deliberation is contra-proposition for orders of huge scale thematization an instrumental and formal rationalization. Deliberation is the most adequate method of consensus achieving in the age of the post-emptymeaning dedicated metaphysics and discourses age of democratization.⁶(5) The-

6

deliberative democracy has entered a kind of adolescence. Many of the broad questions emerging from its infancy have been explored extensively, and thus we know much more about both the potential and the limits of deliberation than we did a decade ago. That said, the future is still open, especially in matters of practice. Purely theoretical questions still remain, to be sure, but many of the big ad-

ge variations of Swiss Franc (ibidem). Also, it is obvious that extremely right-wing parties have not political programs except ideological manifests that should be called contemporaneous "new total indoctrination" and empty in respect of subject matter and blind to real economic problems.

Unfortunately (this comment is dated on the 2^{nd} of January 2012), European crisis is an occasion to reduction of budget and reduction of necessary and constitutive expenditures within the *civic* society. There are two groups which makes financial/political profits on European crisis, firstly, all kinds of the state terrorists (the professional scope of the state terrorism in Poland is very wide: even firemen have got many authorisations to surveillance) and secondly, extremely (probably right) movements. The last one has been based on frustration within the social. Unfortunately, as 20^{th} history of the Western totalitarianism teaches us that economic crises and frustration within the social are the best manners of reactivation of empty-meaning dedicated metaphysics and discourses and—let us say—capturing of voters and loyal by every kind of political extremists and roisters who base on empty-meaning dedicated metaphysics and discourses. I am expanding bellow this web of argumentation, let us say now that it is actually one of the most important catalysts of T–y within the social.

According to Neblo and Thompson (Neblo 2005: 170; Thompson 2008: 16 [quoted after: Neblo et al. 2010),

re are increasing after-11-September trends of controlling of the social. This process catalysis the T by militarisation of the social, it doubles and creates numerous secret services within the states and it treats democracy much more than external terrorist enemy. Therefore, it has been a reason not only of a reduction of civic rights in mature Western democracies but also, mostly non-intentionally, has resulted by fortunately strongly reduced comeback of empty-meaning dedicated metaphysics and discourses, as follow: (a) rigid discourses and expensive in exploitation religious façades and/or (b) rigid interests of groups connected with the former, not only communistic and not only between-two-World-Wars era, regimes creating, friendly to non-transparent relations the former secret-services officers economic, environment. Systematic decreasing of political global role of USA results that initiated originally process of internal, against external terrorism, controlling gets rid of original function. There are various trends present within middle and lower-middle scale countries, for example in Poland, being not only dominating trends and creating public opinion and giving general pattern of action. In other words, methods of struggle against terrorism have become manners of in-social surveillance and treatment of the social as a subject of exploration. (6) New type of a subject using during struggle against outer domains and against (with) T-y its own domain being identified into digital T-y is proposed in book. Political crises and crises of the political are very gentle terms to describe the phenomena. (7) The book contains polemic against traditional treatment of political changes depicted by historical analysis given by Max Weber (cf. 1973a: 266–290). The point of argumentation is historical but, in fact, Weber discusses against psychologists, theoreticians of law, and against specialist of criminology. Especially, he leads polemic against Möglichkeit und einige Anwendungen desselben by von Kries (cf. 1888) and works of Merkel, Rümelin, Liepmann, also against the most actual at that time work of Radbruch (cf. 1902). Weber's polemic is steered historically. Accordingly, social sciences used von Kries' methodological tools only within statistics (cf. Bortkiewitsch 1904); also, contemporary using of "fuzzy logic" seems as continuation of Weber's methodological stream. In addition, mentioned considerations on post-materialism are partly rooted in political sciences, partly in sociology and philosophy.

The book uses primarily in present and future tense, the past is recalled only as retentionaly transformed present. Post-materiality is directed into the

vances in our understanding of deliberation are likely to come by carefully aligning normative and empirical inquiry in a way that allows the two to speak to each other in mutually interpretable terms.

Cf. also the author's considerations about deliberation (see chapter IX).