

WINTER IS COMING 2.0

The death of liberal
democracy and the
resurrection of the West

WINTER IS COMING 2.0

The death of liberal
democracy and the
resurrection of the West

Fred Hamburg

Google-translated from Dutch, finessed by the author.

Writer: F. Hamburg

Cover design: F. Hamburg

ISBN: 9789464650235

© 2022 F. Hamburg. All rights reserved. Nothing in this publication may be reproduced, stored in a computerised database, or made public, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or any other means, without prior permission of the author.

1 The inadequacy of democracy

'a true democracy has never existed and will never exist'

- Rousseau

The word 'Democracy' is One Major Problem. For instance: The US calls herself a 'democracy' as does China, and yet the two countries are run entirely differently. The most popular definition of democracy ('governance by the people'), therefore, is too broad and vague.

Today, in the postmodern Western sense, 'democracy' *really* only means 'a way of life' in which:

- the dogma of the principle of equality governs the minutiae of life,
- the concept of a self-evident morality is absent,
- the way to govern a country exists in the tension - reeling from crisis to crisis - between rulers and the ruled (in which the dislike of politics among the latter steadily increases),
- the operationalization of the democratic dream (the 'final control in the hands of the citizens') leads to a paralyzing pluralism.

SINCE THE 19TH CENTURY, WESTERN DEMOCRACIES
MANIFEST THEMSELVES AS LIBERAL DEMOCRACIES.

Given this reality, I assert the following:

Liberalism, especially postmodern liberalism, contradicts the core culture of Europe. It substitutes the opinion of 'the single, erring mortal', transcending in a mass, for the time-honoured wisdom of a Tradition. It rejects concepts as 'truth' and 'objective reality' (as shifting and unknowable).

Consequently, it causes damage to the rationality of the group (in favour of the arbitrary action of the individual).

In liberalism any value or norm is only an *imaginary* 'contract' between 'autonomous' citizens. Gone is the idea of a given, stable normative extra systemic moment. That point alone, i.e.: that liberalism does not accept any a priori principle (the 'autonomy' of Man aside), inevitably leads to pluralism, disorder, chaos and downfall. For a political philosophy that denies the 'Idea of Goodness' and that abolishes any form of structure (family, gender, social class etcetera), deprives society (and the individual) of an external, guiding norm. It is therefore not accidental that the Dutch police calls her own liberal democracy 'a narco-state', that the Netherlands (my country) sits in 2nd place of countries hosting porn, that trafficking of women and children has exploded, and that disunity and hate speak louder than ever before.

The current liberalism turns out to be available in several types, degrees, and designs. But the largest common cluster can be articulated as follows:

(a) *All people are born free and equal.*

In the name of this unqualified preamble, liberalism wants every individual to emphasize his autonomy and individuality ('individualism'), if necessary aided by courses 'self-assertiveness' and 'empowerment.' [The liberal society thus is an aggregation of autonomous citizens with conflicting interests in economic, moral, and social fields. In other words: in (neo)liberal societies, there is no unity among the people.

Apart from this, people are *not* born equal (some are intelligent, and some are not). Nor are they free to decide on

Good and Evil (there is intrinsic evil, e.g. genocide).]

(b) *Not God but 'the people' is sovereign.*

[Contra: This principle of popular sovereignty is (1) only the 'secular equivalent' of the sovereignty of God, and (2) finds itself always in conflict with the autonomy/sovereignty of the state.]

(c) *Liberal democracy is the best form of governance.*

[This rhetorical (!) assertion functions as a dogma that the West must spread worldwide, if necessary, by force.]

(d) *There is freedom of association and expression (including a rigorous free press).*

[Contra: These political freedoms ('ideas, not facts') have in practice been constricted for nationalistic and religious movements; both are reluctantly - and in any case less and less - tolerated (= liberal totalitarianism).]

(e) *Financial capitalism with its free market, privatization and deregulation is standard in liberal democracies.*

[Contra: This benchmark takes for granted that there is no point where people are satisfied with their material wealth: they will always be motivated to become richer and richer. This attribute of financial capitalism is honoured even if the government - on that account - is deprived of its means to be effective (for instance to sustain an effective trade competitiveness; or to implement serious environmental policies).]

(f) *Religious life must be practiced in private; hence only 'the political' - thus 'the conflictual' - governs public life.*

[Advanced liberalism is au fond anti-religion; that is why the materialistic West hates religious, patriarchal Russia.]

(g) *The relationship between inhabitants and public authorities is that of a 'consumer' and a 'producer of goods and services'.*

[Hence the widely proclaimed economism.]

(h) *Peoples, nations, and cultures are merely aggregates of individuals whose essential relationships are reduced to legal contracts and market exchanges.*

[Hence the attack on the 'nation-state' and the identarians.]

(i) *The dignity of Man exists in his utter freedom of arbitrary choice (= 'the right of unbridled license').*

[Gone is the idea of 'rational Man' who can objectively understand Goodness (as ultimate goal of his actions).]

(j) *The 'Law' hasn't any educational value but only serves to protect rights.* The law in liberal democracies especially protects the freedom of opinion and the right to take part in the political process. [The liberal laws are conspicuously silent on the rights to employment and subsistence!]

Of the sub (a) to (j) mentioned points, I would like to focus on three of them:

- Equalitarianism
- Individualism
- Autonomous Man.

Ad EQUALITARIANISM:

The equality-ideology denies the reality of the genetic and psychological differences between the sexes. Even in the world's most feminist country (Sweden), where no means has been left unexploited to equalize the differences between the sexes, men and women remain persistently afflicted with specific preferences. In fact, the more the sexes are being de-profiled, the more men and women manifest their typical

forms of being. The experience of the socialist-feminist Kibbutzim is the same: even in this doctrinal equality environment, a return to the distribution of work according to the ancient order of men's and women's work took place in the third generation.

In a democracy, equalitarianism also means that every individual opinion, whether informed or not, counts equally. Absurd. People are not equal, nor are their positions in society. The 'one man one vote' is a dangerous simplification of reality. Moreover, the equality-ideology is no longer about equality of opportunities (as with Locke and Rousseau). Instead, equalitarianism strives for a society in which the government distributes outcomes (i.e., portions of income, power, happiness and 'human rights') among 'equals' according to a scheme called 'righteous' *because* it is egalitarian. The final effect of this ultimate equalization is:

- lack of freedom (especially for the non-political correct),
- passivity (one gets his equal portion and only wants to 'enjoy life.'),
- the acceptance of man 'as he is' (which is diametrically opposed to practicing virtues),
- 'ordinarism': everything is culture; 'a pair of boots is equal to Shakespeare' (Finkelkraut),
- a brutal income equalization (or something close to it).

Ad INDIVIDUALISM:

This political and social philosophy emphasizes the intrinsic worth of the individual; it teaches that each citizen has the right to pursue his own good. This 'individualized' view of man is valuable and as such the outcome of Greco-Roman, Jewish and Christian thought (especially of the latter). But in its further elaboration, it has unfortunately been overshoot by thinkers such as Locke, Smith, Hayek and Nozick.