

# The Waning of the West



# The Waning of the West

Fred Hamburg

Google-/DeepL translated from Dutch, finessed by the author.

Writer: F. Hamburg

Cover design: F. Hamburg

ISBN: 9789465017655

© 2024 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.

# The Myth 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. China is ruled by a class of bureaucrats while in the US all issues are decided by the corporate elite. And when Jorge Luis Borges talked about "democracy", he was referring to 'the lottery of the ballot box' and 'the despair of not having heroes to lead us'. The most popular definition of democracy ('governance by the people'), therefore, is too broad and vague.

Today, in the postmodern-liberal 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,
- material and personal success (and not love and family) is seen as the dominant goal of life.
- the operationalization of the democratic dream (the 'final control in the hands of the citizens') leads to a paralyzing pluralism,
- 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),

HALFWAY THROUGH THE 19TH CENTURY, WESTERN DEMOCRACIES BEGAN TO MANIFEST THEMSELVES AS LIBERAL DEMOCRACIES.

Given this reality, I assert the following:

*Liberalism, especially postmodern liberalism, contradicts the core culture of Europe. It replaces the time-honoured wisdom of a Tradition by the opinion of 'the single, erring mortal', percolating into a mass. It rejects concepts as 'truth' and 'objective reality' (as shifting and unknowable). Consequently, it causes damage to the rationality of a government (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, 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. Because if a political philosophy denies the 'Idea of Goodness' and abolishes any form of structure (family, sex, social class etcetera), then this thinking deprives society (and the individual) of an external, steady guiding norm. As a result, it is not accidental that the Dutch police calls her own liberal democracy 'a narco-state', that my country (the Netherlands) sits in 2nd place of countries hosting porn, that trafficking of women 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 of traits can be articulated as follows:

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

In the name of this 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). But in every case, each human being is a child of God.]

(b) *Not God but 'the people' are 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.]

[Note. In the French Revolution, it was not so much the people who were a substitute for God, but *the Queen of Reason*. It would be Reason that would usher in 'a happy and innocent humanity living in harmony and absolute agreement'. In his *L'Homme révolté*, Albert Camus explains how this metaphysical revolt against God necessarily ends in terror. Indeed, the guillotine became a road to perfection].

(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. The best argument against this claim is 'a five-minute conversation with the average voter', Churchill (?)]

(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. To struggle against any 'collective identity' is a moral imperative of liberalism.*

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

(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 goal of his choices and 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. [Liberal laws are conspicuously inadequate on the rights to employment and subsistence!] Of the sub (a) up 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 effect of this homogenisation and Gleichschaltung is:

- a 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)
- the final destruction of society.

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).

Unfortunately, in its further elaboration by nominalism and Protestantism it has been overshot by thinkers such as Locke, Smith, Hayek and Nozick. As a result, postmodern man has arrived at a false understanding of human nature. We now live in a society in which the arbitrary, selfish choice of the individual (i.e., his 'freedom') is raised to the actual goal of the community. Our society no longer has a value in itself, no collective identity. She merely exists to allow the individual 'to be himself' in 'extravaganzas' and 'international festivals', free from religion, tradition and any other constricting ties (including one's biological identity). Neoliberal propagandists even proclaim that the sum of our intense and selfish desires will result in the best human society possible. Even spirituality today is commodified into 'esoteric retreats, mentoring videos, and self-help guidebooks' (Nora Hoppe). This *hyper-individualism* eventually results in narcissism and

the breakdown of social connectedness. The latter leads to an inorganic order in which each person is a rocky island, free of communal ethics but lonely and afflicted with a 'unshakable sense of superior morality.' There is no longer a vital community life, no Church, no labour union, no neighbourhood association etcetera. There is only this multitude of radical ideas, dominated by a concept of freedom without 'objective content' (especially without a well-crafted version of the notion 'Good'). This hyper-individualism - part of the neoliberal ideology - thus leads to a 'community of unhappy, self-absorbed consumers' low on solidarity and social assistance but 'high' on vanity, money and possessions. Thatcher ('there are no such things as societies, only individuals and families') came awfully close to this extreme individualism.

Such a fragmented society of uprooted people, in which everyone feverishly seeks its own interest, leads to the worst possible outcomes for *all* (!) parties, including the networking CEOs of multinationals, big investors, top bureaucrats and others. [This explains why 'ideological differences now are [also] used as a weapon in *intra-elite* (!) conflicts, both to pull down members of the established elites and to draw ahead of rival aspirants' (Turchin 2023).] This extreme individualism explains for example why in the extremely prosperous and neoliberal Netherlands (a) the number of homeless has doubled in seven years, (b) more than a million people take antidepressants, (c) circa 160,500 inhabitants are dependent on food banks, and (d) about 330,000 Dutchmen are not able to pay their (compulsory) health insurance. Indeed, the ultimate effect of this kind of individualism is 'the isolation and destruction of human beings'. Uncontrolled individualism apparently mutates into nihilism, 'the deification of Nothing'.