INVISIBLE KINGDOMS

The cultural loss called Political Correctness

INVISIBLE KINGDOMS: *the cultural loss of Political Correctness*

"The Real is impossible' said Lacan, leaving us dangling within the inhospitable zone of the uncanny, destined to experience incessantly two innate disturbing losses - the personal and the cultural. However, out of the strong comes sweetness: this decree should be seen as a gift, where the imaginative power is fueled by a painful lack. But then ... in the same breath Zizek tells us in the name of Lacan, that phantasies are no more than masked ideologies, repressive interventions that appear under the cloak of a reverie, which is constructed to avoid a waking-up into reality. We sustain partial blindness in order to evade the Real desire which is grounded within the unbearable loss. And so the human craving of turning the impossible into the possible, of setting up a ladder to bridge heaven and earth is ruined again by post-modernist trends of intoxicating sophistication.

Disenchanted and exhausted by this dead-end journey, we yearn for leeway, where unfulfilled desire will not go astray following another deceptive creed. Hence, fleeing a lion only to meet a bear, we fall into the hands of the liberal ideology, founded on a false image of the human subject as a free and autonomous agent.

Precisely at this point, some comfort might be found in turning our eyes from post-modernist routes, back to the old Romanticist thinkers. To be reminded of encountering the sublime, as a craving to cure that oppressive sense of loss: that in losing oneself in a spiritual ecstatic contemplation, there is hope for redemption. Taking the Romanticist road of listening to the inexpressible, where silence is coupled with an aesthetic thrill, or an ethical perplexity, means to listen to our own inner voice, to realize that there is no litmus paper handy for use. This notion of the sublime that Kant defines "*as beyond any qualification or comparison*", opposes the cognitive genre where decision-making is scientifically supervised, and words that cannot be attributed to a referential aspect of reality are considered as non-sense.

Since the cognitive genre prevails by ignoring discourses which launch 'anxiety of the unknown', and lacking rules for a clear-cut judgment, the fundamental idea shared by German Idealism and Romanticism, that there are things in Being that are not reducible to appearances, is laid off. Both Idealism and Romanticism are considered a threat to the main imperative of liberal democracy, regarding the vital role of experience. Kant's idea that both aesthetic and ethical judgment cannot be based on rules, is replaced by schools of thought asserting that only what is accountable counts - that only what is perceived by our senses can be allowed into the body of knowledge! In adopting Hobbes's view as it appears in the Leviathan "*reason is the step, scientific progress is the path, and benefit to humanity is the goal* ", the encounter with the sublime becomes even more unviable.

Since WW2 we were instructed that romanticism leads to National Socialism - and so a whole generation of German romanticists and their offshoots were shelved. Romanticism was replaced by Positivism on the one hand and phenomenology on the other. Writers and thinkers who strived to aspire beauty and the human role as the Guardian of Being, were washed away by the strictures of Political correctness

Is there any chance to escape this righteous, oppressive tool of Political Correctness? Democracy by its very nature distorts the link between symbolic fictions and reality, and the nature of this distortion is masked by Utopia intended to preserve day-dreaming for the deluded subject. And so ideology exhausts itself in producing the blind spots of Political Correctness, as its most powerful discursive self-protection. Under arbitrary definitions of good and evil universities turned from celebrating the imaginative powers of the mind into institutes for professional training.

If we accede that the Real is really impossible, few questions should be asked: how is it possible to free ourselves of those velvet gloves that censor the voice of desire? How do we trace back the spirit of Romanticism, to wrestle with the inexpressible? How to encounter courageously the anxiety of the uncanny? How to contrive our invisible kingdom by fearless dreaming?

If E.T.A. Hofmann's imaginary horror stories inspired Freud's idea of the uncanny, I wonder what revelation we can expect to gain from the readings of Harry Potter or from the trendy vampire genre.

In this collection of articles I attempt to expose how in the name of equal rights and

fraternity liberal democracy is entrapped with Political Correctness guidelines that shatter any aspiration to diagnose or analyze the maladies of our culture. As an ideological apparatus Political Correctness that spreads a smoke-screen before our eyes, should be blamed for blocking human existential chaotic magical wonder by installing fear and guilt instead.

Athens OR Jerusalem: *the story of Cain and Abel re-told*

abstract

In his famous essay '***Jerusalem and Athens***' Leo Strauss refers to western civilization as oscillating between two rival poles of wisdom: Athens, the polis, the birthplace of democracy, where under the reign of philosophy and reason, art and science were venerated; and Jerusalem the city of God where God communicates with his chosen people by revelation, where the LAW supplies truths beyond reason.

Contrary to the view which traces this clash between Athens and Jerusalem, back to the Maccabies, was where monotheist belief won the battle against Hellenic pagan reasoning, I argue that the disparity between Athens and Jerusalem is ingrained in the biblical rivalry between Cain and Abel: it is the eternal enmity between the tiller of the soil and the nomad shepherd. We are told by the Old Testament (the voice of Jerusalem) that God *prefers* Abel's sacrifice to Cain's offering of the fruit of the soil. Hence, in the archaic rivalry where 'Athens' represents rootedness (*Bodenstandigkeit*) and 'volkisch' aspirations, and 'Jerusalem' represents wandering rootlessness, cosmopolitanism and internationalism, the Bible takes the side of the wanderer. The myth of autochthony that constructed the Athenians as the children of the earth stands up against the master biblical narrative, where under God's command Abraham left his country, his kindred, his father's house unto the land of Canaan. Thus, the children's of Israel wandering legacy of settling (never dwelling), expelling rooted indigenous people, instigating wars (Joshua and Judges) and being exiled again and again is imprinted in the divine biblical voice of Jerusalem.

To refute the common view that in this battle between celestial ordain and secular reasoning Athens is winning, I believe that the present day confronts us with just the opposite. By analyzing the Occidental state of affairs according to an alternative key where Athens signify rootedness, and Jerusalem wandering and *rootlessness*, we realize how Athens' thinkers from romanticism to Nietzsche, Fichte, Schiller, through to Jung's cult (anthroposophy, theosophy), Spengler and Heidegger's 'volkisch' aspects (as distinct from nationalism) of rootedness are violently dismissed. Their stress on an affinity with the Greeks as bound to a spiritual aversion to Jerusalem is eliminated from the cultural discourse. In fact cosmopolitanism and internationalism as promoted by Jerusalem philosophers (Marxist, Neo-Marxists, Frankfurt School and critical studies, to Husserelian constructivism and Phenomenology, to Leo Strauss' universal monism echoed by American Neo-Cons), are triumphant beyond any doubt. The more Heidegger's thought condemning rootlessness and cosmopolitanism are disregarded, Derrida and Levinas the advocators of wandering and rootlessness flourish.

What is the role of cultural studies, if not to take into account the critical writings of a whole generation of 'Athens' philosophers that had foreseen the degeneration of the West, tried to redeem the German University back to its essence, aiming to restore philosophy to its rightful place while dealing with politics poetically.

The questions that should be posed are: How did it happen that the intellectual world is totally dominated by the philosophers of Jerusalem whilst the voice of Athens is silenced? Is it the fear of Fascism that causes a forgetfulness of being? Are the blind spots of Political Correctness taking us into a treacherous trail of darkness?

"I know that everything essential and great originated from the fact that the human being had a homeland and was rooted in tradition"

Martin Heidegger

"For me Heidegger is the greatest philosopher of the century, perhaps one of the very great philosophers of the millennium: but I am very pained by that, because I can never forget what he was in 1933. He has a very great sense for everything that is part of a landscape; not the artistic landscape, but the place in which man is enrooted. It is absolutely not a philosophy of the émigré! I would even say that it is not the philosophy of the emigrant. To me, being a migrant is not being a nomad. Nothing is more enrooted than the nomad. But he or she that emigrates is fully human: the migration of man does not destroy, does not demolish the meaning of being"[12]

Emanuel Levinas

In his famous essay '***Jerusalem and Athen***s'*: some preliminary reflections*'[3] Leo Strauss refers to western civilization as oscillating between two poles of wisdom: **Athens**, the polis, the birthplace of democracy, where under the reign of reason philosophy art and science were venerated; and **Jerusalem** the city of God where God's LAW supplies truths above reason. For Leo Strauss the western man is constructed complementarily by both biblical faith and Greek thought. I would argue that all attempts to reconcile the Jewish imperative of "first act and then listen" with the Greek urge for understanding are doomed to fail. It is not Athens and Jerusalem but Athens *or* Jerusalem. To refute the common view that traces the clash between Athens and Jerusalem back to the Maccabean war where Jewish monotheism won the battle against Hellenic paganism, I argue that the disparity between Athens and Jerusalem is ingrained in the primordial split between the tiller of the soil and the wandering shepherd. It is the biblical rivalry between Cain the dweller, signified by the craving for rootedness, against Abel the wanderer.

The myth of autochthony associates Athens with rootedness (*Bodenstandigkeit*) as disparate from 'Jerusalem' marked by wandering and rootlessness. The Old Testament (the voice of Jerusalem) tells us that God prefers Abel's sacrifice to Cain's offering "*And in process of time…, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the*

---

[2] Levinas. E., (1998), Entre Nous: On thinking-of-the-other (N.Y. Columbia) p. 117

[3]Strauss, Leo,(1997) Jewish philosophy and the Crisis of Modernity, *Athens and Jerusalem; some preliminary reflections*', (Albany(State university of N.Y. Press) pp 377-405

LORD. And Abel, he also brought of the firstling of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel and his offering; But unto Cain and his offering he had not respect." It is evidently clear that the bible consistently leaned to the side of the wanderer. Therefore, the bible should be seen as a subtext for understanding Jewish history, where the narrative of wandering and exile is already there. Oddly this implicit concurrence between Jewish repetitive history of wandering and exile as anticipated by biblical narration is blurred and disregarded. When Biblical scholars are asked: why there is no one hint that might give a clue to God's arbitrary preference of Abel over Cain, they insist on giving this story as an example of God's inexplicable conduct. One does not need to be a Biblical scholar to discover that the Cain and Abel story is only a sinister prologue for other biblical stories to follow.

The myth of autochthony[4] (where *autos* refers to what is one's own) and *chthonos* (denotes the root of the earth), should be employed as a Rosetta stone for an alternative reading of western antagonistic history between Judaism and Hellenism. The myth which constructed the people of Athens as the children of the earth, opposes the biblical Jewish master narrative, where under God's command Abraham was compelled to leave '*his country, his kindred, his father's house unto the land of Canaan*.' Abraham's lament: "*I am a stranger and a sojourner*" stamps 3000 years of Jewish history. With the revival of the Greek legacy, volkisch' ideologies (later over-shadowed by nationalism), restored the concept of autochthony. Hence, the battle between Judaism and Hellenism goes beyond paganism versus monotheism, to the perception of the gods of earth and heaven, who are near you, in you, with you - as contrasted with the Jewish absent transcendental god.[5] To the question: "*what does he live for*?" Anaxagoras answers "*to contemplate the sun the moon and the sky*". In his lectures on Earth and Heaven Heidegger tells us how the old Holderlin dwelled on the authentic essence of the Greeks as the proper element of the occidental. For Holderlin Greece meant "tenderness", the glance of reflection of the "athletic eye". This conjunction of Earth and Heaven, and beauty as truth comes through the place in which the poet dwells. "*sweet it is then to dwell, under the high shade of*

---

[4] The term autochthony is mentioned by Homer. see: Homer, The Illiad (Chicago University Press, 1961) book 2, lines 546-7. It is the myth about the Greeks as autochthonous human being.

 [5] What Jung concluded as: 2000 years of Christian Judified civilization that masked the true natural Aryan God within.

trees and hills". In the Greek way, the wanderer comes to rest only by traveling poetically. Jerusalem means dwelling poetically and never ending traveling. It is the poetic craving for Zion from the rivers of Babylon, followed by the failure to grasp in Palestine the sweetness of dwelling.

Through Holderlin's poetry Heidegger highlights the myth of autochthony. He binds landscape and rootedness with the primordial affinity to the Greeks. For the *Volkisch* ideologists the kinship with the Greeks functioned as an aesthetic religion, for an authentic German homecoming; a path that was meant to rescue the Germans from negative facets of enlightenment and modernity.

A homeland for Heidegger was not a region demarcated by the boundaries of political enclosure measured by the science of cartography. The ownership of a land is a pre-legal, pre-economic entity, possessed by dwelling; in contrast to the Jerusalem way which turned the Promised Land into a real estate marketplace, where prices are rising or falling according to seismographic vibrations of anti-Semitism.

For Holderlin the church steeple with its metal roof, "*is a source of happiness for those who walk on a secured path with its nearness*". For Holderlin the regional silhouette of the church steeple embraces earth and heaven within the realm of belongingness to the native landscape. The synagogue that was founded as a gathering place for dispersed people to preserve their observance from straying is marked by blind belief and non-belongingness. In Israel where rural life is dying out, there is no skyline silhouette that contours the landscape between earth and heaven. Jerusalem is where the sacred is buried under a cluster of asphalt urbanity, where Jews are estranged in a promised land without a promise, where the synagogue is replaced with a shallow cultural consumerism. It is the Jerusalem tradition of wandering and rootlessness that prevails.

Like Spengler[6], Heidegger saw metropolis' urbanity as marked by rootlessness. That by adhering to the cosmopolitan values of modernity, the westerners lost their roots, their vivid power of thought and became deracinated beings. It is 'The spread of asphalt intellectualism' that characterize those who abandoned the permanence of the soil for the fluidity of a capital and so they are doomed! Heidegger charged the German as a *volk* with a spiritual mission to move the west out of its technological-imperial sphere. Yorck

---

[6] Spengler Oswald, The decline of the West, 1918-22

pointed to the Jews as a tribe which lack a feeling for the soil[7]. What marks the Jews as a danger in Heidegger's eyes is their rootless urban identity. The Jews as urban people proved to be very successful in the mid19[th] century, filling the ranks of the professional classes. In the new liberal capitalist period of the industrial revolution the Jews more than other groups were great survivors in the marketplace, uniquely ready for urban life. They were literate and experienced middlemen, they were mobile, ready to pack up and move, chasing new opportunities and economic niches. Heidegger never asserted that the émigré was not fully human. In the language of the *Heimat*, he describes the Jews as marked by Diaspora and exodus. And so, they resist the principle of autochthony. Heidegger's lucid analysis identifying the division between the ultimate wanderer and the tiller of the soil, is not anti-Semitism, it is the story of Cain and Abel re-told. Heidegger's statement "*Bolshevism is in fact Jewish*"[8] is a revelation regarding the wanderers as the inventors of internationalism.

Heidegger was the philosopher that unveiled the latent threat enclosed within the attempt to reconcile Jerusalem with Athens.

An academic atmosphere dominated by those who define themselves as Jewish scholars ends in an intellectual paralysis caused by an ethical double bind. Just by adding the prefix Jewish to their title (a Jewish philosopher, a Jewish writer, a Jewish sociologist) these thinkers announce their belonging to a racial blood community while simultaneously propagating the ideas of cosmopolitanism and internationalism. Oddly, the weird proximity of Jewishness to Marxism is unnoticed or silenced.

I argue that the political correctness vicious apparatus spreads smoke in our eyes, blinding us from seeing the devastating impacts of these ethical oxymoron created by the endless preaching about ethics. We should remember the links of some Jews in Bush administration to those who started out as Trotskyites and ended up as devoted Neo-cons. Chaim Weitzman's statement that there are no English Jews but rather Jews who live in England confirms Heidegger's assertion. Heidegger is neither an anti-Semite nor a racist. On the contrary, he rejects any kind of biological racism. It is rather the Jews that

---

[7] Paul Yorck von Warteburg "Katharsis" in Die Philosphiedes Grafen (Gottingen:Vandenhoeckh & Ruprecht, 19700 P. 174-5

[8] see in: Karl Jaspers, (1984) *Philosophische Autobiographie,* (Munich: Piper), p. 101

perpetuated themselves as a racial 'blood community'. The Jewish lobby activity in the Bush administration verifies it as such.

Therefore all attempts to pacify Athens and Jerusalem emerge from these sinister blind spots of political correctness. The gap between Jerusalem and Athens should be portrayed also by differentiating between national identity defined as a *volk* and marked by autochthony vs. a blood community which never grew roots in a homeland, thus becoming the symbol for Diaspora, migration and exodus. For Heidegger a *volk* identity is constituted through history. He interprets the Athens and Jerusalem hostility not in religious terms but as an ontological split where attachment to the soil cannot accept the uncommitted wanderer.

Since the beginning of time human beings were destined (as individuals, groups or tribes) to wander from one vicinity to the other. But we should not confuse the urge for survival with the desire for dwelling. Wandering and emigration should be seen as an inevitable means for striking roots in a new dwelling, it is never an aim in itself. Heidegger and other thinkers of his time strived to portray a geo-political mind-set of German rootedness and *Bodenstandigkeit* (the eternity of the soil). What sounds like autochthonous supremacy can be interpreted as the link of the volk to its homeland. For Volkisch ideologists a homeland is a mythical space that has its roots in the soil of the native earth, as a place for the historical unfolding of the volk[9]. For these neo-Hellenist thinkers Greek autochthony was inseparable from the origins of philosophy.[10] Setting the foundations of the Graeco-German affinity left its powerful mark upon German academic life and on intellectual elite in the early 20th century till the outbreak of WW2. After the war this intellectual enterprise was banned as it was deemed to legitimize the Nazis' brutal acts in the name of political exclusion.

---

[9] Bambach charles p. Heidegger roots p. 157

[10] Fichte for instance deployed the myth of autochthony to exclude the non-Germans from the originary people. By referring to the non-Germans as Barbarians he differentiated between the native, the *Urvolk* and the foreigner the autochthonous and the allochthonous.

 "the German remained in their original dwelling places of the ancestral stock while the others emigrated elsewhere; the German preserves the original language of the ancestral stock while the other adopted foreign language"

After 1933 Heidegger became preoccupied with the idea that 'the true revolution' had to come from the university. He described the university as a bureaucratic vortex that turned into an institutional center for research professionalization and teaching. He sought to restore the essence of the German university back to its original spirit that had been lost. Only by returning to its origin in archaic Greek thinking could the crisis of the West be resolved. He was close to saving academic thought from its paralyzed condition if only the Nazis had not diverted it away for many years afterward.

The more we engage with Heidegger's thought the more the discrepancies between him and Jewish philosophers come into view. Ernest Bloch the German Marxist philosopher (1885-1977) conceived Heidegger's philosophy to be a dismissal of the 1789 ideas of rationality, individual liberty and the "universal role of the law'. Bloch, who himself came from a wealthy Jewish family, mocked Heidegger's and Holderlin's poetic thinking regarding the secret Germany of the soil and the chthonic subterranean forces of rootedness as irrationalist provincial love. While Heidegger celebrated the volkisch dream of the 'vaterland', Bloch insisted on a European international ideal for Germany. While the German elite was pre-occupied with the question "*who are we*?" the Jerusalem Chameleon moralized the Germans 'to cover up their identity and to shadow their German essential *Dasein'*. Like Heidegger Bloch found in antiquity the sources for the German future. But while Heidegger followed Hegel, Holderlin and Fichte in privileging the Greek *arche*, Bloch nominated his Hebrew ancestral origins as a more proper model for fostering the democratic values of a new Germany. Bloch's utopian ideal for Germany, was a cosmopolitan international "community of the spirit". While Bloch repudiated the German *Sonderweg* in the name of Marxism, Franz Rosenzweig (1886-1929) who described himself as Heidegger's intellectual brother, in his famous book The Star of Redemption[11], denounced the preliminary assumptions of Hellenic autochthony regarding land, territory, earth, soil, roots and 'indigenous home' as treacherous and deceitful. Like Bloch he pointed to the Jewish origins as the real *arche*. Rosenzweig, who asserted that the uniqueness of the Jewish people is founded upon their blood bonds: "only blood gives present warrant to the hope for the future" calls into question the

---

[11] on the subject of 'blood and spirit' see: Rosenzweig, F., (2005), The star of redemption (Madison; university of Wisconsin press) p. 299

Heideggerian geo-philosophical discourse regarding the soil as the basis of a political community. By referring to old Jewish history of estrangement, wandering and Diaspora, Rosenzweig denounced Hellenism which ruled the whole of western philosophy as evil. Levinas as a recent prominent voice of Jerusalem claims that the commitment to rootedness is dangerous. Like Rosenzweig who asserted that "being a people means something besides being rooted in a land" Levinas argued that "the chosen home is the very opposite of a root. It indicates disengagement, and wandering"[12] .

Hence in the battle between Athens and Jerusalem, the present day presents us with a definite victory of Jerusalem. We can realize how in the realm of philosophy and cultural studies 'volkisch' aspects as distinct from nationalism are violently dismissed. Their stress on the affinity with the Greeks as bound to the spiritual aversion to Jerusalem is eliminated from the academic discourse. In fact cosmopolitanism and internationalism as promoted by Jerusalem philosophers (Marxist, Neo-Marxists, Frankfurt School and critical studies, to Husserelian Phenomenology and constructivism, up to Leo Strauss universal monism echoed by American Neo-Cons), are triumphant beyond any doubt. Secular Jewish intellectuals are outsiders looking in not only as Jews among non-Jews, but also as people alienated from their own Jewish culture. This explains their success in portraying modern alienation and initiating radical paradigms of post-modernity, constructivism, and critical studies. After inventing internationalism they are the advocates of globalization cosmopolitanism and a boundless free economy.

In their panic to assimilate into the German society by converting to Christianity, the Jews did not notice that German intellectuals were ecstatically abandoning their Christian faith in favor of Hellenist neo-paganism. So the more the Jews tried to fit in the more they generated hatred and antagonism. What started as volkisch ideology ended with excessive nationalism, aggression and militarism. It may be suggested that the Nazis bent toward radical militarism blocked the most constructive chance for saving the west from its decay. After 1938 the disillusioned Heidegger could see how national-socialism was trapped in nihilism and imperial domination as those who he repudiated so long before. From 1946 (Letter to humanism) Heidegger stressed the affinity of Greek and German in order to revive European culture. "It is our choice, today…to preserve European culture

---

[12] Levinas. E., (1969) Totality and infinity, (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press) p. 172

by cultivating its spiritual elements - or let it be destroyed by the greediness of globalization and by being blurred by empty cosmopolitanism." By 1955 Heidegger shifted his terminology by pointing to the dangers of 'calculative thinking", and the way the legal took over ethics and morality. While Heidegger does not discuss the subject of ethics overtly, Levinas adds some more pages to Heidegger's treatise in a way that devastates the whole Heideggerian enterprise. While all that Heidegger can say about ethics keeps within the aura of 'aboutness', Levinas take us around in circles, filling up the gap of what is missing in Heidegger's text. He makes us sweat in the effort to understand 'otherness'. But if lecturing ethics is an ethical act then God save us from this sort of ethics! Levinas is not alone in this obsession about otherness. It was Buber before and Derrida afterwards that tried each in his way to moralize us with the same theme. Rhetorically, I would ask why people who conceive their distinctness in terms of blood bonds, so obsessed with ethics and otherness? Heidegger was not a modest philosopher but when he got close to the notion of ethics his silence signals a vigilant response-ability.

We can see how the Greeks' myth of autochthony paved the way to an exclusionary xenophobic politics. But it is the task of cultural studies to take the courageous path and diagnose and analyze the maladies of our culture: to bring back to light the whole generation of 'Athens' philosophers that had foreseen the degeneration of the West 100 years ago. How did it happen that academic curriculums substitute the profundity of Heiddeger's philosophy with the compulsive study of his subversive disciples? This victory of Jerusalem confirms Heidegger's fears of the judification of western culture.

Much has been written and discussed about Heidegger's affiliation with the Nazis but despite the fact that he is considered one of the most profound philosophers of western culture (even Levin's admits he is the greatest), his volkisch geo-political ideas are ignored and his treatise is taught as a unique philosophical poesies. Is it for reasons of political correctness that we cannot admit openly that Heidegger was not affiliated to the party; it is the other way round: it is the party that went too far![13] The disillusioned Heidegger in 1938 identifies Hitler's political ambition of targeting the whole of Europe

---

[13] On this subject and Heidegger's geo-political philosophy see; Bambach Charles, ( )Heidegger's Roots: Nietzsche, national socialism, and the Greeks. (Ithaca: N.y, and Cornell University press).

by force as an expression of a Cartesian will for domination. With his attunement to the poetic arche of the Greek he asserted in 1942 that: "the essence of power is foreign to the polis"

To conclude, Levinas' idealization of the curse of wandering, turning migration into a virtue, is already foretold in the Expulsion from Eden story. It is the Jewish God who says to Adam : "Cursed is the ground for thy sake…. In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of your life" This is how the odyssey of wandering, cosmopolitanism, internationalism, the free market and the globalized economy starts. The questions that should be posed are: How did it happen that the intellectual world is totally dominated by the philosophers of Jerusalem whilst the voice of Athens is silenced? Is it the fear of Fascism that causes a forgetfulness of being? Are the blind spots of Political Correctness taking us onto a treacherous trail of darkness? I shall argue that since Marx was never blamed for Stalin's genocides, why should Heidegger be the scapegoat for Hitler's crimes?

Ariella Atzmon© 7

Calculative Thought Versus Authentic Imagination: *leadership response-ability*

This article identifies the underlying factors at work in the process of negotiation between western and non-western modes of thought. A philosophical examination, taking the middle-eastern conflict as a case study, may clarify the notion of leadership responsibility practiced under pressure of antagonism activated by the mechanisms of political Correctness as it is epitomized by diverse types of reasoning.

Following Heidegger's distinction between 1) calculative thought dominated by the techno-scientific tradition, and 2) contemplative thought associated with authenticity and projected on contextual temporality, revelations and beliefs, we can categorize democratic regimes into two groups. The first refers to states (such as the USA), where each of the leading groups is perceived as conforming to the ethos of calculative thought. The second group includes states (such as Israel) where the political game reflects a struggle between the two above-mentioned patterns of thought.

In calculative thinking, the human self-image is typified as an autonomous individual, while contemplative thought is characterized by those considering themselves 'spoken subjects.' Calculative thought becomes possible assuming that the human being is capable of reacting to reality in a reasonable manner, according to data or other kinds of information bytes issuing from the mass media. Representational thinking, which is privileged by most of us, treats reality as if it were a picture "placed before" the subject. Scientific thought is linked to representational thinking, in keeping with the view describing language as a - 'vocabulary of things,' - matching a name to a thing.

The idea of re-presentation regarding rational thought as a manipulation of abstract symbols, which get their meaning via correspondence with reality, characterizes the European, western culture ever since the scientific revolution. Judaism on the contrary decisively rejects any form of iconic images. The concurrence with the idea of re-presentation distinguishes Judaism and Islam from the western Christian tradition. The

notion of re-presentation might be seen as the core for the permanent hostility that Jews reveal towards the entire world since the birth of Jewish monotheism[14].

Since representational thinking is an essential element in the Christian world, it is at least not rejected by this tradition; Christianity is able to agree with the Cartesian idea regarding human beings as rational autonomous individuals. After the scientific revolution the philosophical view concerning representational thinking inspired the main schools of modern thought. This view is shared and assumed by most of us to be indisputably true. This is why for Christianity, secular law precedes religious law. In Islam and Judaism, however secular and religious law is united under the command of a divine authority.

Hence, we may infer that there is a gap between the secular, liberal notion of the state which relates to the self as an individual, and the Judaic way of thinking of the self as subjected to the elusiveness of words, lacking any definite final meaning. This view negates the western idea of democracy. At this point I would like to question the predominant assertion regarding the Judeo-Christian tradition which links Judaism to Christianity instead of exhibiting the kinship between Judaism and Islam[15].

The contrasted views concerning human beings' self-image, as an individual on the one hand or as a 'spoken subject' on the other, generate many aspects of profound antagonism entailed with hostility, leading to the exclusion of the Jews (as individuals and as a community) from the Christian world. On these grounds I would claim that Judaism might be seen as closer to Islam than to Christianity.

Techno-calculative thinking which is entangled within the scientific culture is inseparable from the liberal humanism that characterizes human beings as individuals. The term 'individual' presupposes human beings as intellectual agents, free thinkers who are not coerced by their actual historical, cultural or socio-political circumstances.

---

[14] Plato rejects re-presentation as associated with the notion of *mimesis*.

[15] The Jewish invention of the term Judeo-Christian heritage can be seen as an attempt that was meant from the start to associate Judaism and Christianity, and to exclude Islam. This deceitful maneuver is recently warded off by a Muslim – Christian campaign pointing to the fact that among the three monotheist religions it is rather Judaism that should be seen as an exception.

Under the façade of the false notion of Judeo-Christian tradition there is an intricate link between the 'eye for an eye' approach to retaliation and the liberal democratic distinctive styles of propaganda. This link is viciously hidden by the mechanisms of Political Correctness.

The 'Individual' attempts to reveal the transcendental order that lies beyond him. According to this view 'Individuals' are fully conscious, and can experience self-knowledge.

The term 'Individual' refers to something quite different from the term '(spoken) subject,' it conceives human beings to be products of metaphoric devices and signifying chains, *"The World is created by The Word."* The category of 'Subject' however questions the notion of self as synonymous with consciousness, and disregards emancipatory philosophic-ideologies. It is quite obvious that conceptualizing human beings as (spoken) subjects coincides with orthodox Jewish assumptions

Israeli democracy, which claims to be inspired by the common values of the free western world, advocates freedom and equality and finds itself in a crucial dilemma of conciliating between Judaism and the notion of a democratic state. I would say that Israel's attempts to declare itself as a Jewish-Democratic state presents a paradox. Israel which considers itself the only democracy in the middle east is actually governed by a coalition of two rival cultural-political groups (mentioned above), a fact which negates the possibility of its defining itself as a liberal democracy. Actually, Israeli democracy is maneuvering between the imperative of rationality in keeping with secular calculative thought on one hand, and with contemplative reasoning inspired by a superior godly command on the other.

The two metaphysical perspectives are susceptible to deterioration. Calculative representational thinking which finds its most powerful expression in modern, scientific rhetoric is motivated by the prospect of improving measurements and assessments in order to manipulate and control. The fact is that people living in liberal, democratic states are accustomed to assessing their state of affairs, according to observable, quantified indicators, grounded in the correspondence theory of truth. The project of calculative, political reasoning assumes that as more facts or mass media information are shared, there is more knowledge to be stored for governing better choices and reliable judgments. Hence, the illusion concerning predictability and freedom of choice, serves to alleviate demagogic trends directed by propaganda and advertisement.

Calculative thinking according to Heidegger, manifests a human betrayal which exemplifies the forgetfulness of Being. This forgetfulness reveals a basic need for certainty and an urge for prescriptive, scientific guidance, defined under the slogan that "Only what is counted counts." According to Heidegger there is an unbridgeable "gap" between the two forms of thought. This does not mean that contemplative thought is better. But the main problem is that calculative thought thrusts aside other forms of thinking as inferior.

Contemplative thought should not be confused with magic thought. We have to take into account that genuine authenticity which often is associated with contemplative modes of thought, might end with imaginary, magic thought, where people tend to believe in a human oracle as a medium of divine communication. In the Judaic tradition, it is associated with that part of the temple where the divine presence was manifested by the 'holy of holies.' The designation applied to the breastplate of the high priest - *the Urim and Thumim* - where some hidden message was believed to be communicated by a divine messenger. These kind of messages are regarded as authoritative and infallible, undeniable truth. The belief in a message which is inspired by a human vehicle, operating as the medium of a divine communication, is likely to bring about the worship of idols and amulets which has become more prevalent among the people living in the modern democratic State-of-Israel.

Consequently, Jewish contemplative anti-representational thinking is surreptitiously defeated by fetish objects and human oracles. I contend that, unfortunately Israeli democracy suffers simultaneously from the disastrous diseases of the two opposing perspectives. However, Israeli, secular Jews are taught to ignore non-western styles of thought as inferior, but at the same time they are not familiar with other existing types of thought, even not with their own tradition of Jewish orthodoxy. Obviously most Israeli Jews are also not acquainted with Islamic and other oriental styles of reasoning.

We should not identify calculative reasoning with scientific thought, since the occupation of science may be seen as the learning of our surroundings by amazement and curiosity; while calculative thought projects upon making predictions, controlling the present order and dominating most possible, subsequent change.

Contemplative thought, on the contrary, does not seek to measure but to uncover the meaning of things. It is linked to what Heidegger calls authentic philosophy. Contemplative thought is close to the hermeneutic tradition, reminiscent of Jewish Talmudic learning which presumes seventy faces to the *Tora*.

The contemplative form of thought which refers to modes of language like free conversation, poetics, literature, music or everyday language includes a portrayal of occurrences without there being any determinate rules for description. In Kant's philosophy these genres refer to the principle of productive imagination. Contrary to calculative styles of thought where questions are aimed at a definite response, what counts in non-western traditions of thought, like for instance the Judaic tradition, is to remain questioned by the text and stay responsive to it through meditation. 'Studying' and 'learning' requires that reality be treated as an obscure message addressed by an unnamable agency. One must listen to the verse of the *Tora*, decipher and interpret it, and keep in mind that this interpretation will itself be interpreted as a message, no less enigmatic. So, in the end, the prominent scholar's reading is what determines the law.

Since Israeli society is immersed in bitter political battles between the two ideological discourses, it never revealed any attempt to exhaust the positive values of the two existing cultural trends.

In western regimes, where political deliberation and national defense are based upon a rigorous elaboration of selected data, the political leader becomes the guarantor of the event. In this state of affairs, decision making might be authoritarian, just as in the case of theocratic regimes. The Israeli regime, which relies on a coalition that sustains the *aporia* between democracy and Judaism, manifests an authoritarian process of decision making which is motivated by both sides.

This repressive procedure for civic deliberation imposed by the Jewish state *aporia* calls into play the censoring apparatus of Political correctness. It is where the access to the past is blurred, certain routes for textual interpretation are blocked and in the name of victimhood a wide range of political criticism is prohibited.

Since Christianity is capable of recognizing human beings as individuals, this *aporia* concerning the nature of reason, knowledge, choice and judgment, is not recognized.

Hence, Israeli democracy is unique for two reasons:

a) It is distinguished from that of western countries, where the controversy between the secular and the sacred does not represent a case of *aporia*. Within and alongside the Christian culture, when man is perceived as an individual, secular law precede the religious law.

b) Israeli democracy is also distinct from most religious, Islamic regimes because of the linkage between observance of the law and the self-persuasion of being chosen.

Oddly enough, calculative thinking which is associated with liberal democracy, that in the name of rational reasoning attempts to shove aside other forms of thinking, became contaminated under the rule of Political correctness. Like a Trojan horse in the heart of liberal regimes, it blocks rational reasoning and betrays the western values of justice, freedom of speech, and responsibility.

However reflection on the notion of' responsibility' might provoke contemplative thought, thus elucidating the differences between the two types of thought.

The breach between calculative and contemplative types of thought is recognized in view of recent world events. It sharply illustrates the dispute between Materialism (as an odd cooperation between vulgar positivism and Husserlian phenomenology), and Idealism, as a late improvisation of 'Lebensphilosophie' embraced by groups which apparently never got access to Nietzsche's writings.

The calculative, imperialistic character evident in democratic countries steers many conflicts towards a dead-end. This marks the limits of the two kinds of leadership: one is defined as rational and 'enlightened' the 'other' is considered reactionary, fundamentalist, and even evil.

Should a responsible leader trust the exclusivity of calculative thought, or should he simultaneously be attuned to the voice of authentic contemplative thought? Is it not the virtue of responsibility to pay attention to what can be neither quantified and evaluated, nor applied to 'a closure principle'? Ruled by input/output data-base reports, calculative thought is doomed to forget ethical and moral values. So if responsibility means

recognition of what cannot be controlled, then an aggressive hunt for human control may be turned into inhuman irresponsibility. Calculative thought implies an advanced culture of efficiency and control, which may "get out of control" because it disregards 'empathy,' and the sense of 'otherness.'

Despite the traditional position of viewing responsibility as linked to increasing the power of predictability for the sake of the citizens' welfare, I shall associate predictability explicitly with the "unforeseen." Ironically, we may conclude that enchantment with the certainty bestowed by" scientific" (calculative) predictability can actually be taken as a refusal to confront responsibility. Citizens living in liberal democracies have to be cautious about contemporary, official rhetorics, and to keep in mind that "Black Boxes" do not reveal the truth (concerning airplane crashes). "Black Boxes" just like blind spots, aim to obscure the inaccessible 'real' happening for the sake of populist propaganda, causing people to trust leadership response-ability.

Lyotard's concept of 'The Differend'[16] marks the rift between the two modes of thought. The concept of 'The Differend' (Lyotard,1-22) relates to a case of conflict which cannot be resolved due to the 'lack of a rule of judgment applicable to two discourses.' 'The Differend' proclaims a condemnation of calculative thinking as a representational discourse that refers exclusively to the correspondence between the observable and the non-observable. Thus any coherent non-observable presentation is ignored. 'The Differend' should be seen as an awareness of rhetorical regulators of propaganda, imposing silence through unmarked communication fueled by the inseparable couple, namely: victimhood and gilt. The differend that stresses the idea of language as a limitation of reality, signals silence, but it is also the moment of silence which signifies otherness.

To proceed with Heidegger's philosophy we shall note that language acts primarily as a candid means of relating to the understanding of Being, and is that which gives man's being its meaning of humanity. It is human self-definition that should define empathy towards the other as a virtue, which cannot be encompassed in terms of

---

[16] Lyotard J-F. (1988), *The Differend:Phrases in Dispute*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

knowledge or any other means of representational thinking.[17] The act of saying means taking responsibility for the conduct of communication. Responsibility on the part of the knower precedes any relation to knowing. The human subject ceases to be understood as the subject of his own mind and turns to become the subject of language and ethical demands.

Heidegger precedes Levinas on the notion of otherness. While Levinas[18] associates the Hebrew words for 'responsibility' אחריות with אחרות, which means 'otherness', Heidegger links the word responsibility to 'response', as connected with 'ability'. These two aspects of the concept of responsibility fit the human active–passive interplay.

For Levinas, responsibility means an empathic ability to respond to otherness, marking a shift from the active towards the passive side. Evidently, Israeli politics reveals a sharp inclination toward the active pole in the response-ability interplay. The Israeli response to Palestinian provocation delineates acts which oscillate between deliberate military attacks and controlled aggression. These two articulations illustrate the distinction between an attentive response to otherness and treating the other as an object.

The concept of 'otherness' as 'alterity' in Levinas' ethics does not view the 'other' as an extension of my-self, but stresses the absolute other that is above me. In Heidegger's philosophy, in a diversion from traditional humanism, the human 'other' stops being an object of inquiry. Levinas describes the other as somebody who is totally unknown to my-self, and it is my responsibility to secure the 'other's urge to define his identity on his own terms. But since articulation of a common will necessitates stratification of the population according to predefined criteria of identity, cancellation of the other's 'self definition' challenges the traditional definitions for what we mean by 'Humanism,' 'Freedom of Action' or 'Freedom of Choice'.

---

[17] In Levinas' terminology the word is a 'saying' which means an ethical event (contrary to the *said* which refers to the propositional content). It means that making face-to-face contact precedes all determinate communication.

[18] Levinas, E., (1981) , **Otherwise *than Being or Beyond Ethics***, (Nijhoff),

I argue that most minorities' rebellions originate in that aggressive compulsion to define the identity of 'others.' In Israel it is exemplified by the Israeli Arabs' riots and Jewish orthodoxy's resistance to this arrogant authoritarian policy. We can trace the attempt to delineate other groups' essential needs for self-definition. In Israel for instance, we encounter indefatigable, perverse efforts to cause the Palestinians to replace their leadership.

In the case of Israel, despite the fact that the population is divided between the two antagonistic, discursive genres, the authorities are accustomed to outlining the profile of the population's common will by utilizing calculative methodologies such as polls' technology. Hence, according to the view that language forms the socialized human being as a 'subject,' we should admit the conclusion - that it is the manifestation of an absolute case of a Differend.

Ruled by database reports, calculative thought is doomed to forgo ethical and moral values. So if responsibility points to what cannot be controlled, then the polls' culture attempts to control prediction can be seen as irresponsible. An advanced culture of efficiency and control may "get out of control" because it disregards 'otherness.'

The traditional prevailing position views responsibility as linked to increasing the power of predictability. But since predictability is clearly associated with the unforeseen, we may ironically conclude that enchantment with the certainty bestowed by" scientific" predictability can actually be taken as a refusal to confront responsibility. The fragile state of latter-day democracies is conditioned upon keeping in mind that predictions are merely forecasts, nothing more than false prophecies.

The Public opinion poll's indisputable invasion into the public sphere exhibits immorality simply because it blurs the individual face, and as such it betrays the notion of liberalism. Ironically, the great believer in human individuality is led astray by the promise of a scientific method which will safeguard objectivity and neutrality in the democratic decision making process. Disrespect for the voter is precisely what is displayed by using the poll apparatus that erases his unique face. The citizen of the liberal-democratic state is thus cynically manipulated by the corresponding machinery

of matching polls' data with leader's profile, and thus falls victim to his naive belief in free choice.

By deconstructing the word person, we shall reveal that the notion of person originates in the Latin word *persona*, which means a mask, a concealment of the human face. Public opinion surveys which are grounded within contemporary democracy, replace face to face contact with an indifferent anonymous entity. The crowd-will substitutes paying attention to people's personal desires. It leads to a forgetfulness of response-ability towards 'otherness.' Imposing anonymity on the citizen's face, and compelling digital modes of thinking on communities whose typical life style is characterized by contemplative modes of learning, constitute an inhuman act. To enforce techno-scientific reasoning on people committed to be constantly inspired by intuitive[19], heuristic and hermeneutic insights reveals a growing bluntness. It affects insensibility concerning human rights and equality. In the case of Israel it eliminates empathy for the misery of non-Jewish minorities in favor of keeping Israel as a national home for the holocaust survivors. Israeli democracy is an odd phenomenon that keeps going on due to the prevalent aggressive 'unwritten' postulates of Political correctness. While pretending to be a civic society guided by western law, Israel, under the guise of techno-calculative, (as if) rational thought violates human rights and equality.

Since leadership should represent all sections of the population, the more leadership declares support for rational-calculative politics of progress, the more it reflects opacity towards what are considered non-western forms of thought. Leadership reacts in an irresponsible way, which ends with dehumanization and even demonization of the non-western opponent. It legitimizes the use of the most ultra-modern technological implements of war from nuclear bombs (in the past) to F16 missiles (in the present), as if there is more humanism in killing with modern weapons then using primitive means like stones or home-made Molotov cocktails.

Since the Israeli political arena exemplifies the case of a 'Differend', it becomes an impossible mission for an Israeli prime minister to navigate within such antagonistic streams. The fact is that most Israeli political leaders adopt calculative reasoning

_____

[19] The notion of 'intuition follows the meaning given to this concept by Bergson as distinguisher from reason. Bergson, H., (1992), *The Creative Mind: an introduction to metaphysics*, (A Citadel Press Book).

which thrusts aside all other thought as inferior. Most of them are products of the military high command, lacking any civic, cultural experience, so they exemplify a disastrous combination. I shall assume that only an educated leader, one blessed with a productive imagination and able to internalize the complementary relationship between the two modes of thought, would be the one able to prove response-ability.

Following Bergson I shall associate calculative thought with the concept of reason, which is recognized as an organ for orientation in the control of action in the real actual world. And intuition should be linked with an ontologic contemplation. If reason serves life in an ontic way in the sense of survival, then intuition is our internal experience as part of Being. A contemplative act bringing us closer to the infinite secret of the 'real.'

In view of Lacan's statement that 'the real is impossible,' democracy, by its nature, delineates an irreducible gap between symbolic fictions and reality. This gap and its irreconcilable nature are masked by the correspondence theory of truth, making the impossible society viable.

Let us wish that western politicians in general and the Israeli leadership in particular would stop communicating exclusively in what Heidegger calls 'idle talk' and start attending to the voice of authentic language. It should be remembered that 'Idle talk' is a by-product of calculative culture, conventionalism and representationalism. In Heidegger the words 'Idle-talk or '*gerede*': fosters illusion of understanding without genuine grasp. It obscures or holds back critical inquiry….it transpires in an echo chamber of incessant, vacant loquacity, of pseudo-communication that knows nothing of its cognates which are, or ought to be, "communion" and "community"[20]

In order to survive the madness of the present, it could be beneficial for the Israeli regime to internalize the old Jewish 'truism,' namely: that the human being is created by the 'word', that Being and life are grounded in language. This view should remind some contemporary leaders that response-ability is associated with the ability to listen to the speech of authentic languages. In keeping with Lyotard's assertion that "there is

---

[20] Steiner, G., (1989) *Martin Heidegger*, (University of Chicago Press), p -95.

no non-phrase, silence is (also) a phrase" (Lyotard: xii), we may infer that responsible leaders should keep in mind that violently silencing the authentic voice of the self, is likely to turn into the most horrible acts of terror.

Ariella Atzmon©

This article was presented at the I.M.I.S.E. (29) conference in Naples. Summer 2002

'**BLACK BOXES**' – *the overt manifestation of the covert*

abstract

This article examines the link between rhetorical styles of mass media, and false images of science (which became common due to contemporary science education).

In order to direct attention to the rhetorical device for distracting people's minds from one subject to another, I attempt to examine the intricate link existing between: 1) The use and the abuse of language 2) (false) images of science, and 3) rhetorical styles adopted by latter-day propaganda and advertisement.

I shall describe contemporary rhetorical styles oriented by the ideal of using concepts and meanings "univocally," as an inclination towards the signalization of the linguistic sign.

If according to Kant, an aesthetic idea is an intuition by the creative imagination for which an adequate concept can never be found, then the invisible subtle role of (science) education, is to reduce to a minimum the capacity for personal aesthetic acts. Every effort is made to keep the learning subjects (along all stages of schooling-from nursery to higher education) in secure conceptualized systematic paradigms of knowledge, of which science is the most reliable.

Consequently, the rhetoric of signalized, techno-scientific language becomes part of an emancipatory ideological illusion such as freedom of choice. A shift from visualizing reality as representation, towards the interpretation of reality as an act of simulation, is related to the view which conceives human beings as spoken subjects rather than sovereign autonomous individuals.

This article attempts to challenge contemporary trends of humanist education, which are grounded within the phenomenological and constructivist schools of thought. I would say that the populist current view referring to reality as a 'vocabulary of things', i.e.: representation, prevents people from an encounter with the sublime. It blocks the ability to contemplate vague positions which entail doubts and uncertainties. And so, the citizens of liberal democratic countries are left defenseless in the hands of a subversive- persuasive rhetoric as an easy prey.

"One can own a mirror; does one then own the reflection that can be seen in it?
Zettel: 670

The relevance of this Wittgenstein remark (Zettel sec:717), hints at the rhetorical language of propaganda used in the course of contemporary democracy and its links to false images of science implanted in the public consciousness in the course of contemporary science education.

With reference to recent political events following the September 11th disaster, let me examine the use and abuse of the 'Black Box' terminology. The expression 'Black Box' crops-up whenever it is necessary to elucidate an enigmatic event by transforming the covert into an overt clear-cut exposition. As related to the airplane crash in Queens NY on the 12th of November 2001, the report of that event might reveal a device for subversion of people's minds. We should ask: how is it possible that the people of NY were so easily convinced in just two hours that the event was an accident and not another terrorist attack? The fact is that the moment the announcement on finding the 'magic' Black Box (claimed to consist of ultra- digital information technology) was made, all the news channels suddenly replaced this news item with reports of the invasion of Kabul by US troops.

What is meant by a Black Box? Does it signify the urge to decipher something in order to achieve transparency, or does it specify an opaque entity, its content doomed to remain unknown?

The maneuvering of the notions imposed on the 'Black Box' metaphor, originates in philosophical behaviorism representing a locked, opaque object - impenetrable to any snooping, inquisitive investigation. All the in-put/out-put (stimuli/response) conditioning that triggered the sophistication of Nazi propaganda brain-washing is grounded in this behaviorist notion of Black Boxes.

The 'Black Box' terminology entered the philosophic vocabulary in relation to the Carnap Skinner debate around the status of theoretical terms[21]. The behaviorist argument asserts that since theoretical terms link initial input observable entities with output factual data, it is possible to skip the theoretical framework, as represented by a 'Black Box.' Hence, reality is supervised as an efficient summation of evidential reports, as long as it

---

[21] The behaviorist argument which was pointed out by B. F. Skinner in *Science and Human Behavior* (1953), was elaborated by Carl Hempel as the Theoretician's Dilemma.'

meets the requirement for predictions and explanations. This view enables to keep up with a descriptive methodology, releasing the reporter from referring to the contextual meanings in use.

Thus, cynically, the same 'Black Box' nowadays simultaneously portrays an opaque entity beside a transparent key for unveiling information. This covert/overt ambiguity provides a rhetorical mechanism for the disclosure of something that might be lost and is aimed at enhancing peoples' trust that things are firmly under control.

Rhetoric in the course of Liberal democracy manifests a positivist-behaviorist approach that complies with the truth theory of correspondence, i.e. associating a name to a thing. It links a term to sense data in order to ratify meanings by using a rule of correspondence. An alternative mode for validation of statements is to distance ourselves from observable attributes, interpreting a term by coherence criteria - where a meaning is understood in the terminology of relationship and difference.

Education can be seen as a key for implanting the correspondence theory of truth as all-inclusive. Most recent educational programs are lacking a serious engagement with an abstract theoretical terminology. Contemporary education is a bizarre blend of two rival philosophical movements namely; positivism and phenomenological constructivism. The efforts invested in instructing students to construct reality in terms of their own experience are blurred between Husserelian phenomenology and Positivist- behaviorism. While the first stresses genuine expression alongside the experiencing of pure phenomena, the second view advocates rigorous methodological conduct for the articulation of descriptive reports. The uncontrolled zealous devotion to the experiencing of solid factual data reveals the educationist's ignorance. Educational programs can be seen as a 'Hailing process' where the student is told "follow me, I am about to teach you how to construct your own reality."

Confidence in factual data is rooted in the Lockian *Ideational Theory of Meaning* referring to language as representation. Representational thinking treats reality as if it were a picture "placed before" the subject. Fallacious images of scientific thought describe language as a 'vocabulary of things.' According to this view, communication is enabled since words signify ideas in a perceptible way. Consequently language is essentially a tool for the interaction between human minds. Hence, our thoughts are

viewed as an amplification of sequential ideas that associate a vocal sound, giving it the same meaning. The link between our minds and the objects which are perceived by our senses, is mediated by the process of name giving.

The ideal of sharing a similar interpretation of the same linguistic sign concurs with techno-scientific language. This language authorizes the use of linguistic signs as clear-cut signals, narrowing the multiplicity of expressive utterances, making way for the most determined communicative descriptions or reports. The techno-scientific language gains its power due to education systems governed by scientism[22]. Education, that operates as a selective membrane for the meaning in use protects the social order by signalizing the linguistic sign.

The Freudian-Lacanian idea that what has not acquired meaning can never be known reveals a vicious circle, where the rhetorical game signalizes meanings. The scientific cover-up allocated to findings, grasped as clusters of factual data formulating a suitable basis for rational reasoning, is connected to the citizen's self-image in democratic, liberal society. Consequently the rhetorical representation of signalized, scientific language becomes part of an ideological illusion of freedom of choice. Thus, the liberal promise of emancipation is related to human beings as individuals whose rational abilities grant them the ability to judge, choose and plan their life-style competently in the framework of democratic life. Planting positive attitudes in favor of a system where given data serve as the basis for legal, moral and ethical judgments raises individual illusion regarding freedom of choice. In the western, liberal democratic milieus it is agreed that calculative thought, based upon well-established punctuated evidence, is preferential upon personal impressive verbalization. The weight bestowed in advance on digital descriptions considered to be legitimized reports is based on an arbitrary linguistic contract. Hence, the more the scientific façade of a statement is enhanced, the more its authorization is recognized. A hegemonic approach to language as correspondence (i.e.; representation) defines MEANINGS in terms of what should be included or excluded under a specific

---

[22] By 'scientism' I mean an excessive belief in the power of scientific knowledge and techniques, as well as a belief in the applicability of the methods of the physical sciences to other fields, especially human behavior and the social sciences.

term. The political conclusion is that the promise of modernity for self-realization, including some postmodernist hopes for emancipation, are mediated by an a-priori tendency to signalize the sign.

The prestigious status of scientific thought, spurred an obsessive drive in the philosophy of science to demarcate between the scientific and the non-scientific (Popper). The necessity for demarcation preserves the criteria for what is considered valid and what should be thrown-out as meaningless. 'Credible' information amasses its authority via science images that proliferate in liberal societies, namely: referring science exclusively to organized factual knowledge. The compulsive occupation with the problem of demarcation reflects a struggle for control over the legitimization of specific modes of information. Popular acceptance of the positivist images of science is reflected in the media, in the courts, in achievement assessments, in I.Q. testometry and so on.

Science is self-maintained via narrow definitions of rationality which relate judgments to a link between a concept and its experiential attributes. But in order to examine whether something can be considered 'rational,' one must utilize the concept of rationality invented by the selfsame designers of the same widespread science images. This may be compared to a situation where the police investigate itself. I would say that the same approach that plants the illusion of free choice, simultaneously blocks the possibility for emancipation.

My argument can be clarified by the illustration of a final pre-election TV. confrontation between the main rival candidates. That style of interview with the trickery, rhetorical sound bites in a ping-pong game, dictates a race where the opponents' statements are restricted to no more than ten seconds at the most. The question is: "How is the process of rhetoric designed, so that what a politician is unable to say on TV in a sound bite of three minutes, he will never get a second chance to speak about at large?

One may describe pre-second world war rhetoric as a deductive Euclidean inference relying upon axiomatic assumptions, keeping within the bounds of coherence. In contrast to those styles, postwar western rhetoric presents us with a sort of T.V. "espresso" style, defined by Arthur Koestler as 'short,' 'instant' and 'concentrated.' The politician, with the aid of P.R. companies, will succeed as long as he blends, briefly in one gulp, the proper ingredients in the right dose, so that he may be simultaneously convincing,

pleasant, and sufficiently vague to cover as many people as possible under the same umbrella. So, information is not just what is coming out of the T.V. screen, but those corresponding algorithmic modes of reasoning which pave the way to how we listen to the news.

By choosing a substantial word (such as evil, or terror) and charging it with a univocal meaning, optimal obscurity is achieved

Identification of the indicators of a successful rhetorical blend presents to us the subtle role of education that disappears from view precisely because of its importance. It is education that fixates the false images of science, which support the rules for how science should be presented to the public .

By using Lyotard's terminology of the 'Differend' I argue that the victims of science images are unable to make a claim against scientism, because there is a latent web of rules which imposes shared agreement about 'what science means.' I propose that not only is education itself safeguarded within the patterns of scientism, but also that education fortifies scientism, establishing a self-maintaining system by the dissemination of its power.

The distinctiveness of western propaganda is founded upon the fact that both liberalism and the scientific revolution came into the world arm-in-arm. The main characterization of western propaganda is that latent commitment to support pervasive statements by well-established, evidential proof. Actually, all those I-philosophies (from Descartes to Husserl) that stress that human rational ability can facilitate a close correspondence between the realm of abstract meanings and the realm of reality as perceived by the senses, have supported and protected liberal democracy ever since.

Taking the Heideggerian stance regarding the human subject as being shaped by language rather than by his mind and his personal experience, undermines the human self-image as an individual empowered with the capability of rational free choice. Since the concept of individuality is the cornerstone of liberal democracy, Heideggerian philosophy endangers the whole texture of the western rhetorical machine. Heidegger's view of language as the 'home of being' affords us an innovative gaze into the route taken by propaganda for trapping peoples' minds in the webs of the hegemonic discourse.

In the name of "scientific neutrality", scientism confuses science with technology, and thereby the definitions for" rationality" and "objectivity" are narrowed. This is how liberal democracy becomes entangled with scientism by virtue of the praise given to human, calculative, sovereign reasoning. But this reasoning illusion is manipulated by the behaviorist approach that treats the human mind as a Black Box, conditioned by the stimuli/response procedure. In other words, in this way kidnapped meanings, which correspond with overt, evidential reports, replace scary covert warning alerts. I assert that this subversive manipulation of human minds is an unethical act. It is another version of brain washing in the framework of liberal democracy, which even more intensifies the gap between calculative reasoning and ethical judgment.

 Lyotard titled' the Differend' as "The case of conflict between two parties that cannot be equitably resolved for lack of a rule of judgment applicable to both arguments." The ' Differend' illustrates precisely the logic of the dominance of discourses that are relied upon, and at the same time support experiential evidence. As such, it marks a point of incommensurability. Scientism is typical of genres which attempt to increase harmonious consonance by ignoring alternative discourses that confront us with an absence of rules for a clear-cut judgment. The legal system, in the course of liberal democracies, relates to harm assessments and evidential proof in order to validate statements. But, there is no simple viable route for moral or ethical proof. Even if there are rules for what should be described as judgment, they are inaccessible because of their ethical nature. When the issue at stake is justice, legality, which has to do with the complications of statutes, belongs to a calculative culture, so it needs proofs, supported by factual evidence, but for moral judgment there are no simple proofs.

In the course of the liberal paradigm, the variety of interests and traditions necessitates a state apparatus accepted by all. Secular liberalism established the civil legal system as an all-embracing means for stabilization, the resolution of conflicts and the legitimization of its rule. Thus, in liberal regimes, rhetoric turned from being concerned with how politics is supposed to cope with ethics, into trickery, an instrumental maneuver attempting to find the means by which to adjust the law to politics. According to the utilitarian approach, ethics became a calculative apparatus for the assessment of harm caused by the 'evil other.' Liberal democracy put a barrier between morality and ethics on the one side

and legality on the other. Even the notion of the word innocence as related to terror(ized) victims is weighed in accordance with the ideological affiliation of the victims. In reference to Israeli spokesmen, democratic civilian victims are innocent compared with Palestinian kids (always killed by mistake).

Liberal democracy's obsession with evidential proof in pursuit of the validation of statements ends with disregard for ethical judgment. Contrary to the doctrines of legality, the ethical judgment cannot be learned, neither cannot it be taught. The ethical judgment must be exercised, "for more we judge the better we judge" However escape from the rhetoric of the referent involves misery, agitation, and insomnia. (Lyotard). To endorse the proofs provided by 'smoking guns' in favor of insomnia becomes the turning point where people start to behave like restless night watchmen, who stay alert to the vicious abuse of language.

There is relief in the act of philosophizing "even though one is not a philosopher. The populist current view referring to reality as a 'vocabulary of things,' i.e.: representation, prevents an encounter with the sublime. The 'Black Box' propaganda style blocks the ability to contemplate vague positions that entail doubts and uncertainties. Thus, the citizens of liberal democratic countries are left defenseless as an easy prey in the hands of a subversive- persuasive rhetoric.

Faith in clusters of data presented by 'Black Boxes' expertise leads to civic irresponsibility and alienation. I would say that despite the song of praise to 'democracy' we are likely to find ourselves withdrawing to the pre-democratic era!

This paper was presented at the International Conference on Arts and Humanities
 Honolulu, Hawaii, 2003
Ariella Atzmon©

LEGAL POPULISM: or the way to 'post'-multiculturalism

abstract

This article is a discourse analysis of the terminology of multiculturalism in relation to legalism vs., morality and ethics, viewed from a philosophical perspective. The ambivalence inherent in the vocabulary of multiculturalism is discussed in the context of the political power game where the meaning of legalism is confused with notions of morality and ethics.

The use of the prefix 'post' points to the elusiveness of the term multiculturalism. The word 'post' can be understood as the act of posting, that is 'to deliver', 'to announce', or bring before the public. Simultaneously, the prefix 'post' implies what comes 'after', what is 'laid aside', or 'finished with', in other words, what is 'postponed'. By putting 'post' in proximity to multiculturalism, the contradictory nature of the term is revealed. By presenting 'the nation' as a unitary, homogeneous formation legal populism operates as a vehicle for '**posting**' the message of multiculturalism (i.e., that all cultures and religions are worthy of respect), and postponing it in one and the same breath.

Legal populism or the way to 'post' multiculturalism

This article is a discourse analysis of the terminology of multiculturalism in relation to legalism vs. morality and ethics, viewed from a philosophical perspective. The ambivalence inherent in the vocabulary of multiculturalism is evident in the political scene where the meaning of legalism, inspired by scientific thought is confused with notions of morality and ethics. The term "multiculturalism" which has to do with language and political correctness (or incorrectness), amplifies populist clichés regarding cultural equality and moral norms. Western jurisprudence, bound to morality and ethics, is essential to the way we interpret the notion of multiculturalism.

A discourse can be seen as a set of practices that systematically define the rules which permit certain statements to be made. A discourse analysis of multiculturalism, from the perspective of educational curricula and other contents organized around the term, exposes liberal democracy's tricky game regarding non-western cultural norms. The fictitious populist view of science as an ideal model for human reasoning lies at the root of the affirmation of the legal system as autonomous, independent of any supplementary discourse such as morality or ethics. "Multiculturalism" as a gentle and tolerant expression actually presents a pair of opposites, declaring the ethnic minorities' empowerment of cultural manifestations on the one hand, and on the other, thoroughly identifying these same groups in terms of socio-economical and cultural guidelines quite distant from them. The use of the expression post-multiculturalism hints at the role of multiculturalism as a safeguard for the new liberal democratic state.

By putting 'post' in proximity to multiculturalism the contradictory nature of the term is revealed. The word 'post' can refer to the act of posting, that is 'to deliver', 'to make known, to announce', to advertise or to bring before the public. Simultaneously, the prefix 'post' alludes to what comes 'after', what is 'laid aside', or 'finished with', in other words, what is 'postponed'. Bear in mind that multiculturalism proclaims that all cultures and religions are worthy of respect. So by grouping legalism together with morality and ethics under the same umbrella multiculturalism is concurrently postponed. If moral codification has to do with group cultural norms, then by celebrating the supremacy of

legalism as an empirical entity, while ignoring moral considerations and personal ethical reflection, signifies that any possibility for cultural pluralism is called off.

By presenting the 'nation' as a unitary, homogeneous formation, legal populism operates as a vehicle for '**posting**' multiculturalism (i.e., that all cultures are worthy of respect), and **postponing** it in one and the same breath. As long as multiculturalism is blind to the existence of 'many moralities', modes of assimilation and integration prevail upon negotiable hybridization, where cultures are viewed as retaining their distinct characteristics and yet form something new. Our generation has produced more refugees, migrants and displaced people than ever before. The question is how should national institutions respond to this diversity? By an attempt to assimilate distinct cultural norms under the command "melt or get out of the pot." or by trying to generate a hybridized cultural identity?

Regardless of diverse moral norms, multiculturalism enfolds everything under the cover of ethnicity, as if ethnicity is the key for handling multiculturalism better. Opposing this view, I shall stress the idea that 'the discourse of the law' as predetermined by words, and common phrases coined by the hegemonic culture, is obscured. The idea of moral universalism that fuses in its amalgamated spirit political, legal and philosophical terminology leads to the confusion of ethics and morality with legalism. Opposed to the melting pot model, it is cultural hybridization, where cultural incommensurability and interstices between cultures should be explored.

Morality has to do with cultures and group norms, while ethics addresses questioning and response-ability. Ethical judgment is the challenge of one's self in the face of the Other. While morality is a body of norms concerning what is right and wrong, with respect to human conduct, adhered by a professional or social group, ethics never signify closure. As legalism is inspired by scientism i.e. an exaggerated trust in the efficient methods of the natural sciences, it is distinct from ethics and morality because of its claim to universality. This obsession with scientism turns the whole western legal machine into a binary system where statements are verified on the basis of observational proofs. Since testimony in western legal systems means validation of statements in correspondence with empirical evidence, we come to realize how latter day western regimes are steeped in documents and intelligence reports.

The fact that every society is comprised of a variety of interests and communal norms necessitates the foundation of a social apparatus that will be accepted by all. In seeking legitimization of its rule, the liberal paradigm turned to the legal system as its main source of stabilization. Thus, by asserting that legal, rational reasoning emanates naturally and autonomously from moral intuitions liberal secular ideology constituted the civic legal system, as an all-inclusive means for the resolution of conflicts. It is the culture of 'reason' that replaced the rule of power. In the course of liberalism, rhetoric turned into an acrobatic pursuit of how to contain politics in accordance with the law. According to this utilitarian approach, ethics are relegated to being interpreted in calculative terms for the assessment of harm caused to the 'other'. By this argument I contend that liberal democracy, supported by scientific rhetoric, put up a barrier between morality and ethics on one side of the divide, and legality on the other.

In view of recent events where governments are occupied with 'the legal justification of the war' the role of **THE LAW** is better understood. The liberal assertion of moral universalism where the category 'legally valid' is equated with 'morally right' paves the way to 'post-multiculturalism. It exemplifies the way in which the legal system blocks any encounter with cultural, moral considerations and silences personal ethical judgments. By highlighting legalism and equating it with morality and ethics, liberal democracy sustains its power.

Actually, multiculturalism is a sophisticated form of social control which talks in two voices. It praises cultural pluralism, while only scientifically approved phrases are acknowledged. The privileged status of scientific thought, is reevaluated in keeping with the idea that autonomy and rational judgment, promise redemption from deprivation. People exchange prior cultural, spiritual and moral bondage for access to the portal of enlightened legalism. Inspired by scientism they are converted to a new belief in facts, reports and evidential findings. Thus, the melting pot metaphor is a cover for a new type of oppression. The only way to melt in the pot is to assimilate - to become similar – to the dominant culture under the hegemony of science. But science is not just a selection of contents; it is a set of metaphysical assumptions about reality and knowledge. Science is an attitude for the legitimization of knowledge. By taking the bull by the horns, science filters the contents of knowledge from the educational curriculum to the legislative

system. Thus multiculturalism turns into a safeguard protecting western culture from becoming contaminated by too strong a dose of other rationalities. Science determines the inferiority of those who do not follow its modes of thought. Thus multiculturalists' openness regarding norms, beliefs, religious worship turns out to be another hypocritical falsehood.

A declaration made by an Israeli Supreme Court judge that: "All can be judicially accountable", points to one of the most crucial cornerstones of liberal democracy. This phrase assembles ethics and morality under the legal system. Since legalism acts in reference to conformity with a book of laws, the moment legalism is declared all inclusive, multiculturalism is dismantled. The two threats to the authority of the legal system are: subjective moral intuitions and interpretation In Stanley Fish's words: "Interpretation has to do with the ethical judgment which is an inter-subjective consideration regarding what ought to be done".

The legal system represents a public commitment to view conflicts as something that should be judged by legal means. But what does public commitment mean? If it is a commitment to all communities existing in the public sphere, then does it accord with the cultural norms that correspond to non-representational modes of thought? Defeated multiculturalism can be viewed in Israel where the majority Jewish population, comprised of immigrants and refugees, intolerant of each other, dominates a minority, indigenous Arab population. It is a case where cultural incommensurability between Western law and Jewish Halakhah seems to be insoluble. The multiculturalist demand that all cultural groups have the right to bring their cultural norms into the marketplace of ideas is unfulfilled, since many vocabularies constitute a threat to liberal legalism. This is why multiculturalism appears to the world wrapped in liberal legalism and why the two discourses support each other.

Multiculturalism should be a way to guarantee equality for moral norms and for witnessing many vocabularies. It suggests taking the path of hermeneutic interpretation, interpretation that establishes the meaning of a phenomenon, which, by its very nature, is fragmentary and incomplete. The underlying bloodthirsty wrestling in the political rhetoric for harnessing meaning is a vital tool in fortifying consent in the democratic sphere. Ethics have no rules for justification. There is no viable route for an ethical proof.

Even if there are rules for what should be described as 'the real truth' they are inaccessible by their ethical nature. Since legality belongs to a calculative culture it needs proofs, supported by factual evidence. While legalism is committed to statutes and the regulation of the law, ethics and morality are released from presenting proofs. Since morality is bound to ethnic, religious, or cultural group norms, it should be contiguous with the discourse of multiculturalism. Liberal democracy's obsession with legal assessments and evidential proof, with the aim of justifying dubious political acts, ends with a disregard for ethical judgment, and the POSTPONING of multiculturalism. Ethical judgment cannot be learned by adding ethnic content to school curricula. It cannot be taught, but is generated by internalizing the essence of hybridization.

The way legalism is confused with morality and ethics, becomes apparent when prescriptions for professional behavior are distributed to the public as ethical codes (medical doctors, lawyers or teachers). In Israel a renowned philosopher produced a document entitled the IDF Ethical Code. Erasing distinctions between ethics, morality and legality leads to a dependence on juridical committees for the assessment of what is right and what is wrong, in cases which should be regarded as purely ethical. Leaders, who should reflect upon their own clear or bad conscience, would be more respected if they leave the court and be judged according to inter-subjective ethical imperatives. Despite this, we are witnessing a current, democratic, judicial routine: where a salient ethical and moral judgment is needed. The political leadership appoints judicial committees in order to examine their deeds in the face of further accumulations of evidential findings. It is the philosopher's task to draw attention to the sly legal game that veils political maneuvering. That's what Stanley Fish calls the "amazing trick", by which the law re-builds in mid-air without ever touching down.

Citizens of the democratic free world should become more engaged with ideas and the way these ideas are articulated by words. But to cease being indoctrinated by evidential proofs, means taking an alternative path of being attentive to citizens' moral and ethical considerations. This alternative option does not fit with the liberal image of unprejudiced rational reasoning, free of emotions and the torment of the soul. The gloomy conclusion is that liberal democracy invented multiculturalism in order to tranquilize minorities' aspirations for attracting attention to their moral or ethical thought. By providing endless,

observable referents in the name of superior scientific thought, populist legalism crushes any chance for ethical judgment or for a diverse, cultural moral norm to be heard. This is how positivism, phenomenology and constructivism became the leading philosophies in liberal democracies. How Habermass's consensual communication, Rolls' reasonable judgment, and Chomsky's innate universal grammar, became leading figures in university curricula. As the guardians of the democratic deceit, their treatise prevents us from being alert to the deprivation of non-calculative modes of thought.

Making a distinction between an object of cognition, and objects of ideas, points to the cleavage which threatens human society. An object of cognition refers to a cognitive category - its existence can be validated or refuted by testimonial means. Objects of ideas have to do with reflective, contemplative thought. Legalism conforms with objects of cognition where a statement about reality can be validated according to a common rule. Ethics and morality comply with the realm of ideas which evade factual findings. There are no protocol procedures for establishing the reality of an object of an idea. And thus, **a statement regarding an object of an idea cannot be legitimized by legal means!**

The minute a person or a site on the map is defined as evil it is predicated as an object of an idea. And as such it cannot be validated or refuted by legal means. It can be examined solely in moral or ethical terms. So when Bush's advisers coined the expression 'axis of EVIL' they elevated Saddam to the heights of an object of an idea. Thus, however, they were caught in the trap they laid for themselves. By referring to Saddam as an evil, they ruled out their chances of justifying the war against Iraq by legal means. From a philosophical perspective, they lost the case of portraying the acts against Iraq as grounded in a cognitive discourse, thus all intelligence reports, documents, and testimony regarding the existence of WMD became useless. There is no way to hold the stick by both ends: to declare rational reasoning grounded within the cognitive genre on the one hand, and to validate an abstract idea by cognitive means on the other. This conduct means being irrational while at the same time claiming rationality. For the cognitive genre it is impossible to quit the conditional demand for binary logic. It is impossible to deliver a guilty/not guilty sentence. There is no way to be rational and irrational at the same time! Any attempt to elude this claim is totalitarian. So how dare enlightened people establish the multiculturalism project if they themselves are oblivious to their own

norms? How dare liberal leaders democratize other societies, whilst they themselves are unfamiliar with rational thought portrayed by scientific reasoning?

The concept of the Differend coined by Lyotard illuminates this theme clearly. A *differend* is a case of conflict between two parties that cannot be resolved for lack of rule of judgment applicable to both arguments. A *Differend* takes place when the one who complains about a wrong done is denied the means to prove the damage. The *Differend* is signaled by an inability to prove, when the victim is reduced to silence. But, to be able not to speak is not the same as not being able to speak. As Lyotard put it, "There is no non phrase. Silence is a phrase". When 'one can not find the words', one might express oneself by a 'negative phrase', by silence, by non-verbal aggression and acts of destruction. The captives of the cognitive genres are left in the remorseless limbo of a futile blind alley. The option available to the victim is to turn the state of being able not to speak into a benefit, to start a wordless fight outside the cognitive genre. Letting the ideas talk for themselves by killing the referent.

Multiculturalism under the hegemony of legalism means lip-service that supports the reality of the *Differend* as natural and indisputable. In order to stop being victims of populist rhetoric, and thinking of multiculturalism not in ethnic terms but as a moral issue, people should renovate significations and explore new expressions. Let's dream a reality where the victim of the cognitive genre is able to dwell in the zone of the *Differend,* get involved in the art of deconstruction. and thus, gain access to expressing the wrong done by using new phrases.

The idea of freedom, tolerance, leadership and responsibility, being good or being evil, is not conditioned upon phrases which are related to referents of knowledge. Instead of preaching multiculturalism under the guise of science and calculative thought, more space for ethics and morality should be made available. This could generate genuine empathy for immigrants and diverse ethnic or religious communities, and bring 'cultural pluralism' to the public agenda and to schools. Thinking of language hermeneutically, putting all texts under the magnifying glass of deconstruction, might let in some light and deconstruct the texts of multiculturalism!

A bothersome question to ask is: what is the reason for the dubious conduct of western philosophers who do not criticize their political leadership on philosophical

grounds; disclosing their ignorance, shouting to the world that 'THE KING IS NAKED'?
What is the use of multiculturalism if they turn their back on justice - *could it be that*
popularizing legalism is the way to postpone multiculturalism!

This paper was presented at the "New Europe at the Cross Roads" conference, Munich summer 2004.
Ariella Atzmon©

Facing Democracy: A Long Journey into a Nightmare.

abstract

Liberal democracy has failed to keep the promise of emancipation.
This article tackles the rhetorical language of propaganda used in the course of contemporary democracy and its links to the illusions of sovereignty and freedom of choice. The narrative of emancipation from ignorance and servitude through knowledge and egalitarianism turns into a reckless belief that someone else is in charge. Trust in professional experts means civic irresponsibility and alienation. Thus, despite the praise for 'democracy,' we revert to the pre-democratic era! I would argue that cynical politicians manage to achieve their goals because the 'new believers' ignore the abuse of the meanings in current use.
Reading of Kant after Heidegger and Novalis, triggers some insights into ethical, moral and legal judgments. Within liberal democracies, rhetoric turned from being engaged in politics as related to ethics, into a utilitarian, instrumental pursuit of how to maintain the law within the constraints dictated by politics.
The connotation given to the word terror makes my argument clear. The word 'terror'- which means the use of fear to intimidate people, especially for political reasons - was first used by the Jacobeans (1793-1794) to execute anyone considered a threat to their regime in pursuit of the principles of democracy, freedom and equality. They called themselves terrorists without any pejorative connotation. Thus, a rigorous analysis of the distinctions between terror and counter-terror is needed. 'Liberation terrorism' - for instance - the violent struggle of a people to achieve freedom and power in their homeland can be viewed as counter-terror, which should be seen as legitimate resistance and morally justified in terms of violation of the law. Disregarding the distinctions concerning "liberation terrorism" enables for instance the inclusion of Palestinian resistance within the 'Axis of Evil.'

Liberal democracy's obsession with legal assessments and evidential proof to validate statements ends with disregard for ethical judgment. Since, contrary to the doctrines of legality, ethical judgment cannot be learned but is exercised (Kant), escape from the rhetoric of the referent involves misery, agitation, and insomnia. (Lyotard). But, spurning the proofs provided by 'smoking guns' in favor of insomnia is the turning point where people start to think ethically, staying alert to the vicious abuse of language. The question is*: How ready are we for such a long journey into night?*

"*You cannot hear God speaking to others; you can only hear Him when he speaks to you*"

The relevance of Wittgenstein's remark (Zettlel sec:717) hints at the rhetorical language of propaganda employed by contemporary democracy and its links to illusions of sovereignty and freedom of choice.

Even though we are accustomed to praise democracy, to suggest that everything that happens in the course of democracy is right, and whatever is related to other regimes entirely evil, we all agree that propaganda plays a major part in each and every regime.

The distinctiveness of western propaganda is founded upon the fact that both liberalism and the scientific revolution came into the world arm-in-arm. The main characterization of western propaganda is a latent commitment to support pervasive statements by well-established, evidential proof. Actually, all those I-philosophies (from Descartes to Husserl) that stress that human rational ability can facilitate a close correspondence between the realm of abstract meanings and the realm of reality as perceived by the senses, have supported and protected liberal democracy ever since.

Taking the Heideggerian stance regarding the human subject as being shaped by language rather than by his own mind and his personal experience, undermines the human self-image as an individual empowered with the capability of rational free choice. Since the concept of individuality is the cornerstone of liberal democracy, Heidegger's philosophy endangers the whole texture of the western rhetorical machine. Heidegger's view of language as the 'Home of Being' affords us an innovative gaze into the route taken by propaganda for trapping peoples' minds in the webs of the hegemonic discourse.

The language of propaganda reflects a fierce clandestine battle over meanings waged by all ranges of socio-political and cultural thought. Highly politically charged words such as' democracy' or 'terror' are continuously

changing their meanings. Hence, by getting lost in the ocean of echolalia, we become deaf to the kaleidoscopic nature of the meanings given to words. Words become materialized through the media in the form of narrated events and thus people are blunted to the trickeries of the text/context game. In other words, their competence for gestalt switching is mislaid.

Liberal democracy, launched with a vast belief in human rationality, critical reasoning and the freedom of choice, ends here and now with the conviction that it is an inherent machine, maintained by professional experts, supposed to convey us through the obstacles of life. As long they provide us with evidential reports, what is left for us to do is to extrapolate and jump to the 'right' conclusion

I would argue that the more citizens are dependent upon professionals supposedly supplying digested information as a foundation for the ' personal' process of decision making, the more they lack a sense of self-responsibility for their own fate. Enlightened western citizens put their lives in the hands of medical doctors despite the fact that they lack an understanding of the kind of treatment they are getting. In the same negligent manner people relate to their bodies, they are led by the nose to fight nebulous enemies, and are asked to sacrifice their lives in unnecessary wars. Faith in clusters of data presented by professional experts leads to civic irresponsibility and alienation. I would say that despite the song of praise to 'democracy' we are withdrawing to the pre-democratic era!

Liberal democracy is epitomized by a principal malady - a constantly growing tension caused by individuals' attempts to extend their freedom of action within the limits of the social order imperatives. Liberal democracy protects itself by establishing a consensual environment where citizens are totally dependent on the professionals' analytical reports. Therefore, the

more people are tied to the apron strings of the pundits' expertise, the more they fail to interpret political, social, and economic revisions by themselves. The gloomy conclusion is that liberal democracy has failed to keep the promise of emancipation. The narrative of emancipation from ignorance and servitude through knowledge and egalitarianism turns into a reckless commitment, to keep in harmony with the democratic rule as an aim in itself. I would argue that cynical politicians manage to achieve their goals because the' new believers have lost the capacity to criticize governmental decisions according to a coherent system of ideas. To put it bluntly, I would say that the majority of the population in the free democratic state is incompetent when it comes to developing a proper deductive inference. For instance, this is the reason for holding most of the press conferences before and during the war against Iraq around the disclosure of evidential findings, air maps, and the pitiful farce of exhibiting discoveries of missiles and remains of chemical or biological material. Even the inspectors' failure to prove, did not stop the political leaders from repeatedly pushing on in an endless attempt to trace those hidden treasures for mass destruction

Those millions of people taking to the streets to demonstrate against the war felt defeated when G.W. Bush declared the end of the war. The question is whether the protests were against the actual operation of attacking Iraq, or were morality and ethics the matters at stake? If we assume that the reason for the huge mass marches all over western metropolises demonstrated disapproval of the arrogant crushing of ethical values, then we should ask: how did it happen that all those masses disappeared from the streets and did not shown up since then [23]?

---

[23] We should bear in mind that people are demonstrating in the name of political lobbies

It may be asserted that we are triggered to react to the concrete, actual events while remaining oblivious to the process of the keyword formation. Following Heidegger I would contend that the maladies of democracy stem from obliviousness to the abuse of language. In the essay "The Way to Language" Heidegger asserts that human beings are not in a position to commandeer language but simply respond to it[24]. Responding blindly to rhetorical devices manifests peoples' ignorance of being 'spoken' rather than autonomous speaking subjects.

By taking Heidegger's path, we may say that post-structuralism inverts the traditional Marxist model about base and superstructure so that what we used to think of as superstructure, namely culture, language and political institutions, actually takes precedence over what we used to think of as basic. Contrary to the Marxist view that culture and language, including its coordinates, are reflected by the economic system, it is stressed that language authorizes reality. Using the notion of 'super-structural-ism' for the 'poststructuralist' overview (Herland (1987)[25], language is seen as the basic ground for marketing and pricing. We shall reveal that the invisible battle on the signification of the linguistic sign determines, at the end of the day, the exchange value of the oil barrel. The semantic notion imposed on a verbal sign triggers the power relations in economics and politics. The meaning we impose on a word is the departure, point from which rhetorical dribbling gains its momentum.

---

[24] Heidegger's writings thematize the topic of language in a unique manner. Other great thinkers like as Wittgenstein, Carnap, Russel and Austin also stressed the same subject of language.

[25] Herland., R. (1987), Superstructuralism: The philosophy of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism, (London: Methuen).

Terrorist words' according to Roland Barthes are not words such as 'fascism', 'dictatorship' or 'despotism,' that trigger instant aversion, but rather .words such as 'autonomy' 'democracy,' 'emancipation' or 'liberation,' which are currently enjoying a positive aura. In this way their elusive-subversive character is veiled. Those words which by their appealing connotation pre-determine peoples' attitude to distributed messages are in fact the main tool for blurring our awareness to the subversive power of rhetoric.

As we have seen in the two gulf wars, imposing a positive or negative connotation on a word predestines the value of consumer goods. It specifies who is going to trade in these goods and who is excluded from the game. The connotation given to the word 'terror' entails embargos, which are followed almost simultaneously with a reward to the 'liberators', in the form of contracts and access to the best of the third worlds' natural resources. The connotation given to the word terror makes my argument clear. Taking account of the complicated, tricky relationship between words and facts calls into question some moral, ethical and legal aspects of the meaning of terror and its vicissitudes.

The word 'terror,' which means the use of fear to intimidate people, especially for political reasons, was coined by the ruling Jacobeans, dominated by Robespierre (1793-1794). In order to overthrow the old regime in the name of 'Fraternite and Liberte' for all people. The Jacobeans enforced the age of terror, by ruthlessly executing anyone considered a threat to their regime. The word terrorist was originally applied to those who

advocated violence in pursuit of democracy and equality. They titled themselves as terrorists without any pejorative connotation[26].

The question to be asked: do some current western leaders, who openly declare their attempts to democratize people in other parts of the globe by means of violence and aggression, consider themselves terrorists as well? The meaning of the word 'terror' has been changed to and fro during the years. It has altered ambiguously from the coercive act of putting people in terror in order to achieve political aims, to the notion of counter-terror, where those who are terrorized try to rebel against their oppressors in a violent struggle. Thus, a rigorous analysis of the terminology of terror and counter-terror, is needed. 'Liberation terrorism,' for instance, should be defined as peoples' acts of resistance directed against those who violate basic human rights (visibly or invisibly), in order to maintain beliefs, traditions and lifestyles in their homeland. A people's violent struggle to achieve freedom and power in its homeland can be viewed as counter-terror. This should be seen as legitimate resistance, and morally justified in terms of violation of the law.

To facilitate the argument about the substantial role of language in disguise, I shall refer to some expressions which have become so rampant that people have stopped being aware of the cynical, rhetorical game that these expressions signify. Before, during and after the last gulf war the expressions 'war against terror' and the 'axis of evil' were our daily bread. Such statements should raise a philosophical query regarding the correspondence between a theoretical term and its observable attributes. For

---

[26] L.M.Palmer, (Univ of Delaware, USA), 'Philosopy and Terrorism', a paper submitted to the IMISE Conference in Naples 2002.

example, how can the old enigmatic word 'evil,' as an object of an idea, be depicted as a concrete axis, laid between two points in the frame of a two dimensional map?

Hence, the word 'terror' reflects a bitter struggle waged over the canonic meaning given to a word in the political lexicon. The obscure meaning bestowed on the word terror determines the political struggle over economic power. The word 'terror' which is extremely politically charged, acquires its meaning in accord with the contemporary hegemony of power. The meaning of the word TERROR is kidnapped twice. First it obscures the distinctions between terror, counter-terror and liberation terrorism, and then it enables the demonization of Palestinian resistance, including it in the 'axis of evil.'

Reading Kant after Heidegger, triggers some insights into the moral and legal aspects of ethical judgment. It is the role of writers and philosophers because of their linguistic sensitivity, to raise public awareness to the polyphony of meanings in propaganda maneuvering. In seeking the legitimization of its rule, the liberal paradigm, turned to the legal system as the main source of stabilization. The fact that any society is comprised of a variety of interests and a communal ethos necessitates the foundation of a social apparatus that will be accepted by all. Hence, secular ideology established the civic legal system as an all-inclusive means for the resolution of conflicts.

In the course of liberalism, rhetoric turned from being engaged in politics as related to ethics, into exercising an acrobatic, instrumental pursuit of how to contain politics in accordance with the law, and vice versa. According to this utilitarian approach ethics are pushed into being interpreted in calculative terms for the assessment of harm caused and wrong done to the 'other.' By

this argument I contend that liberal democracy, supported by representational rhetoric, put up a barrier between morality and ethics on the one side of the division, and legality on the other.

In praising of democracy, the way that determines that whatever is related to terror is entirely evil, leads to the rhetorical, prevailing language of propaganda reflecting a distortion of some other words as well. An example is the notion of the word 'innocence' as linked to ethics vs. legality. We acknowledge that Israeli 'democratic' children who are killed (murdered) by martyrs are considered by official Israeli spokesmen as more innocent than Palestinian children killed or murdered by Israeli helicopters, bulldozers or by mere bombardment (always by mistake!).

It is suggested that citizens of the democratic free world should start becoming more engaged in ideas and less in searching for proof, more in analyzing terms such as weapons of mass destruction than in searching for their location. If we are more attentive to what is meant by terms such as 'weapons of mass destruction,' as related to the terminology of terror, counter-terror, resistance, liberation terrorism, we shall find that the weapons of mass destruction are easily pinpointed. We may discover them located in some very well-known sites on the western front of the Middle East.

In the glorification of philosophy, we are reminded of Kant's saying that there is relief in the act of philosophizing "even though one is not a philosopher." It is a kind of agitation of the mind that means to undertake the role of an insomniac night watchman, a vigilant sentinel who defends himself against the torpor of doctrines by the practice of criticism.

Ethics just as Aesthetics have no rules for justification. There is no simple viable rout for a moral or ethical proof. Even if there are rules for what

should be described as moral considerations, they are inaccessible by their very ethical nature. Since legality belongs to a calculative culture, it needs proofs, supported by factual evidence. Legality has to do with the complications of statutes and regulation of the law. But there are no proofs for morality. Liberal democracy's obsession with legal assessments and evidential proof in order to validate statements ends with a disregard of the ethical judgment. Contrary to the doctrines of legality, ethical judgment can not be learned at school by imitating the scientific method. The ethical judgment reflect the eternal war between the rule and the case, the doctrine and the exceptional, where the case must be found for the rule, or the rule for the case, and that is something that cannot be learned, neither cannot it be taught. The ethical judgment must be exercised, "for more we judge the better we judge"[27]

In the name of Lyotard, I will say that to be confronted with the exceptional case that necessitates the need for ethical judgment is a kind of spasm, a salutary insomniac illness, which shakes us out of doctrinal torpor. If doctrines weave a spell that prefigures death, then insomnia prevents us from the very rest of forgetfulness. In the Kantian sense, the ethical and the aesthetic experience is not an experience, but the effect of experience which is not empirical. We may conclude that to bring democracy forward by recommending that the ordinary citizen play the role of an insomniac night watchman means to stop being trapped by the rhetoric of the referent. But…to stop being persuaded by proofs, involves misery, agitation, and insomnia.

---

[27] *The Lyotard reader,*(1991) Andrew Benjamin (ed), "Judicious in Dispute, or, Kant after Marx, (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 324-360

Spurning the proofs provided by 'smoking guns' in favor of insomnia is the turning point at which we start becoming restless, insomniac night watchmen - who stay alert to the vicious abuse of language. Just at the moment when our illusion concerning freedom of choice conditioned upon findings and proofs collapses, contemporary forms of liberal democracy will give way, in favor of insomnia. The gloomy conclusion is that liberal democracy by its nature keeps us in a permanent dream, providing us with endless observable referents. This is why positivism, phenomenology and constructivism are the leading philosophies in liberal democracies. These philosophies were invented to prevent us from being insomniacs. While totalitarian regimes invented prisons and guillotines for agitated, restless people, democracies discovered more ingenious means for narcoticizing its citizens.

Hence, if after all this we choose to escape the rhetorical disguise and take the hermeneutical path regarding meanings, are we ready for that long journey into the night ?

The Diary of a Bad Decade: Mosaic monotheism and its Political Correct censors.

abstract

J.M. Coetzee's book 'A Diary of a Bad Year' is a notorious contribution to the understanding of the potentiality gained through coupling literature together with philosophical self-interrogation, in the revival of politics from the outside. In this book Coetzee juggles with the political and the cultural in a revealing way. The subjective punctuated edition of the author's 'reality' is devised in parallel tracks divided into three interrelated fictional perspectives, where each section deals with a separate dimension of the author's being. The first section of each page portrays philosophical ruminations on contemporary issues. The other two proceed with plots responding to a quasi- fictional narrator. All in all, Coetzee successfully rivets attention to the two antagonist intellectual roads of thought: the rational and predictive as opposed to insightful unbound imagination (that dovetails with the spirit of Romanticism).

Following Coetzee's device, I tackle the last decade and its vicissitude from the following three perspectives:

1) An informative list of successive events that marks the last decade. Bearing in mind the editorial element, i.e., that any informational system is imposed by a meta-level which elevate bites of information as raw materials for decision making. Hence, there is no way to say anything about politics outside politics,

2) An expository perspective that through tracing philosophical, cultural and traditional meta-systems, can disclose strategies of punctuation. Being attentive to elements of punctuation in historical narration highlights the idea that 'a decade' is merely a digital artificial entity torn out of an analogue continuum stretched backward and forward in time. The significant events of this decade are grounded in the old hostility between Hellenistic paganism, Judaic monotheism and the many versions of Christian monotheism and Islam. Writing a diary of a bad decade necessitate a dig into some intricate nuances silenced by the political correctness apparatus.

3) The third perspective is a first person account of a bad decade, responding to the political and socio-cultural situation in the Middle East and Palestine.

The last decade met us with two nightmarish threats which are a) religious fundamentalism and b) the anxiety about an economic collapse. These two apparent distinct sinister phenomena point to the same failures of liberal democracy, where the legal and the financial systems are authorized by rational calculative thought. Under the shield of the legal system of both domestic and international law the modern state silences brutally any ethical attempt for justice. Wherever the deity of liberal democracy is challenged it strikes back using the political correct hammer. The westerners' new foe is irrational, it is a sinister enemy who terrorize the rational order. What started as the fear of obscure religious fundamentalism grew into fear of loosing control on global financial systems. Are we terrorized by the fact that scientific mathematical models and probability theories for decision making are running out of control? Or the fact that our western leaders who respond in an irrational hysteria to the new reality frighten us evens more?

Israel as a society where deep rooted irrational inclinations overshadow any concern for ethical conduct is treated by the west with an excessive cautiousness which reflects irrational impulses of bad conscience. Since Israel can be seen as a Weberean ideal type that epitomizes the characteristics of the phenomena mentioned above, to rescue the west from its panicked conduct it is recommended it to scrutinize the Political Correct censors that operate in favor of Israel and Mosaic monotheism.

Inspired by J.M. Coetzee's book '*A Diary of a Bad Year*'[28], I entitle this following article "A Diary of a Bad Decade". It is his skill of infusing a provocative meta-message into a flow of narrated messages that I seek to highlight in this text. This quasi-fiction that

---

[28] [28] Coetzee, J.M., (2007), *A Diary of a Bad Year*, (London: Harvill Secker).

encounters a poetic insightful meditative writer with an insidious calculative rival refers to the two main roads of human thought. The plot shows how much can be achieved by coupling literature with philosophical self-interrogation. With brilliant originality Coetzee presents us with a literary work that agitates politics from the outside. Under the title of a novel we are seduced into listening to the author's 'Strong Opinions'. By juxtaposing fiction with non-fiction the author reveals an 'edition' of his subjective reality, devised in three parallel tracks. Each section deals with a separate dimension of the author's life; - In the first section of each page, Coetzee the author portrays his 'viewpoints' regarding 'world affairs'. Then, the two following more earthy sections proceed with interlinked plots that are evoked by the first section. Apparently Coetzee endorses the spiritually unbound mode of thought that dovetails with the Romanticist perception as threatened by technological intrusiveness. In a quasi-fictional fable concerning the author's autobiography followed by a love story, Coetzee plots an allegory about ethics and morality as being beaten by hostile cynicism and materialistic greed. It reminds us of the Upstairs Downstairs TV series, where the upper level is packed with provocative themes regarding human conditions, and the Downstairs 'fictional diary' is inhabited by a practical intriguer who undermines the highbrow compartment. Right from the beginning the non-fiction 'upstairs', is tracked by the author's relationships with Anya, a young woman, a neighbor to whom the author is attracted and whom he tries to hire to do his secretarial work. Anya who lives with Allan an investment contractor, and a skillful computer junkie, finds herself sucked into an ethical swirl. She is baffled between the author's self-absorbed morality, and her partner who installs spyware in the author's computer in order to take over the author's finances. Hence, Allan, greedy and cold-hearted, is provoked by Anya who is nominated by Coetzee to stagger through the convoluted dynamics plotted for the reader by the author. While Allan's voice is not heard, Anya is supposed to annunciate her decision. Actually she represents US… she is the reader!

There is a temptation to undermine Coetzee's coercing style, to flip ahead reading each dimension separately: but then the message/meta-message interplay might lapse. Coetzee guides the reader through a maze haunted by the spectres of sinuous cynicism, drawing attention to the ethical crash of western culture. The vicious plot against the protagonist

(the author himself) is a witty metaphor reminiscent of liberal democracies which in the name of progress and economic growth rob Third world's countries of their natural resources. Allan's justification for his treacherous plan, recalls the Neo-cons' ideology inspired by Bernard Lewis's supremacist doctrine which plunged countless human beings into unending bloodshed and wars.

Coetzee points to a latent threat concealed in the core of liberalism;- while the liberal state (the commonwealth) represents reason, peace, security, civil society, science and good taste, outside this political entity are war, fear, poverty, barbarity, ignorance and savagery. It is reminiscent of the Israeli separation wall that is aimed at defending Israelis from Palestinian terror but actually resurrected for the Jews the ghetto mentality. Neo-cons ideology that shifted after 9/11 from the threat of Communism to the threat of Islam, adopted Israel's strategies. But, no sooner had they started attacking Muslim countries then the west was forced to shield itself inside the walls of security barriers.

On this matter Coetzee asks: *"why should our rulers react with sudden hysteria to the pin-pricks of terrorism when for decades they were able to go about their everyday business unruffled, in full awareness that in a deep bunker in the Urals an enemy watched and waited with a finger on a button, ready if provoked to wipe them and their cities from the face of earth."* so why are they panicked by a possible nuclear power in the hands of Iran? In the past old Soviet foes might have been regarded astute but were considered rational. But while they kept playing the nuclear diplomatic negotiations game, such a global chess match does not work in the Islamic world; Islamic culture known for its scientific wisdom medicine, and astronomy never employed mathematics for applied needs. For Muslims the object of science is beauty rather than a means for accumulating wealth. Thus, they could not join the enlightenment scientific revolution!

One should remember that Judaism refers to beauty as sin, science and arts are forbidden, theater and epics are banned; so we should ask: how did Judaic antagonism against Islam turn out to be the torch of western thought? A possible answer is that the new irrational threat is inflicted by the selfsame irrational morbidity.

After discussing liberalism and its failures, Coetzee proceeds to question the truisms guaranteed by means of Political Correctness. The last decade provides us with fulsome examples of false truisms preserved by Political Correctness censors. Wherever the deity of liberal democracy is challenged it strikes back using the political correctness hammer. By means of Political Correctness Jewish fate generates Europeans' bad conscience, even reshaping Europeans' own past history. I contend that by interlinking Jewish traumatic past with the west's threatened future, the support of Israel is guaranteed.

It is since WW2 that the fear of romanticism as inciting fascism is ingrained. Hence, all levels of educational systems are buffered against Romanticist poisoning inducement. In the compulsion to confine reality within 'rational' models, spiritual elements of German Romanticism are shadowed, as if it might revive the spectre of a haunted past. What started as the threat of religious fundamentalism grew into *hysteria.* The westerners' new foe is a sinister 'Irrational' enemy who terrorizes the rational order.

While science as relating to Being opens the sign to the sublime, technology confines the sign within binary terminology. The ecstatic playful game of hermeneutics grasped in science cannot be applied to either technology or to legalism due to their prescriptive nature. Scientific contra-factual concepts are ingenious poetic metaphors that resist signalization. The false conjunction between science and technology is misleading just as identifying legalism with morality and ethics. The allegorical clash between Allan the computer expert and the poetic writer, points to the uncompromising rivalry between computerization as a binary device and hermeneutics. Oddly enough, Judaic hermeneutics coincide with formal legalism, both threatened by subversive interpretations. In ascertaining the meaning as possessed by the last word, Judaism preserves the formal status of its Law. Justifiably Lyotard asks: *if deconstruction is about something badly constructed, how can deconstruction deconstruct a text which cannot be amended?* So, Judaic attraction to legal formalism, ends in the lack of ethics.

The triumph of legal formalism is enshrined in the Old Testament which legitimizes Judaic lack of ethics. *"Your God will bring you into the land which he swore to Abraham, , Isaac, and Jacob that he would give you a land of great and fine cities which*

you did not build, houses full of good things which you did not provide, cistern which you did not hew, and vineyards and olive-groves which you did not plant. When you eat your fill there, be careful not to forget the Lord who brought you out of Egypt. Jewish religion, when not inspired by ideas, is where ethics is conceived in legal terms. Any attempt to highlight the gulf between Judaism, Hellenism, and the other monotheist religions is immediately denounced as anti-Semitism. Since liberal democracy is safeguarded by legal formalism founded on evidential corroboration, recent laundering of governmental actions by legal maneuvers exposes the democratic free choice game as a deceit. The more we are trapped by legal formalism and its rhetorical devices the more we decline the realm of ethics. Inspired by Heidegger, Lyotard spots the problem with the Jews: "*that instead of being the 'Guardians of Being', they turned into the guardians of 'not-forgetting-the-forgotten', distorting justice in the name of 'The Law'*". Only in grasping the future by anxiety and care can one grow to be a 'Guardian of Beings.

In light of Coetzee's observations as linked to Mosaic ethical impact on western thought, Heidegger's notion of time as temporality is particularly insightful. Temporality invigorates the priority of the future in terms of care and responsibility. It refrains from approaching the present from a 'distressed past' perspective, leading to an incessant urge for retaliation, evoked by merciless overtones. "*Remember what the Amalekites did to you on your way out of Egypt..... you shall not fail to blot out the memory of the Amalekites from under heaven*". It is the Mosaic, jealously unforgiving God who refuses repentance and punishes children for the sins of their fathers to the third and fourth generations. Thus with no repentance, no forgiveness, and no remorse, where vengeful drives take over, the care for Being will atrophy.

Time as continuity is artificially digitalized into decades, centuries and millennia. It is in the arbitrariness of time punctuation, that the analogue and the digital are cheating each other in a complementary way. Cultural hegemonies arrange chronologies around 'sacred' focal events. Lacking a sense of history, time in Judaism is a succession of sacred 'Grand' events which befall the 'chosen people'. For instance, the holocaust is sanctified as an apocalyptic focal event. But while pinpointing the holocaust as a crucial event, the Holodomor genocide where millions of Ukrainians were murdered by

starvation is denied and suppressed. I would ask why when scrutinized 'denials' are encountered, 'rightist' historians are silenced while leftist are mostly left on the safe side?

Viewing time in terms of 'temporality' challenges the traditional conception of time as a container in which events are arranged in chronological linear order. Temporality is marked by its ecstatic character, where present moments that emerge from a projected future, immediately swirl back into our past. Hence, still being agonized by the 9/11 earthquake, present day vindictive brainwashed political attitudes prevail, while manifesting indifference towards the future. Kant reminds us that temporality is essential for the 'universality' of the moral law: "*viewing time as 'mere correspondence' with ideological selection of events contaminates morality with interest*". The 'war against terror', triggered by Neo-cons' murderous urge for retaliation, have lots in common with the Judaic credo.

Hegemonic ideological punctuation of time weaves imaginary beginnings, resulting in racial and cultural hierarchies, justifying imperialism and colonialism under the guise of legalism and rationality. Being cautious towards editorial censors of time punctuation, we should remember that 'first was the Word'!; and facts are merely presented by meaning in use. But questioning the 'truth value' of facts undermines the superiority of scientific rationality over moral intuitions and ethical whirling. Actually, Positivism and Constructivism prevail thanks to Political Correct censors that avert a serious engagement with pre-war anti-calculative philosophies; - such as Heidegger foreseeing western universities turning from being spiritual shrines for the cogitative mind into bureaucratic vortexes for professionalization.

Mark Juergensmeyer's book '*Terror in the mind of God: The global rise of religious violence*'[29] **written in 2000**, and revised in 2003 convincingly reveals how Political Correctness ideological censors elevate events in a mere manipulation. From Juergensmeyer's portrayal of the succession of events from 1993-2000 we get the impression that the 9/11 was just one sequential event among others. Before 9/11 Israeli cities were already under assault by suicide bombers; in 1999 there were the ethnic

---

[29] [29] Juergensmeyer M. (2000), University of California.

shootings in California and Illinois, in 1998 the American embassy in Africa, on 1996 the destruction of a US military complex in Dhahran, in 1995 the destruction of a federal building in Oklahoma city, and in 1994 the explosion at the world trade center in N.Y. The French dealt with Algerian Islamic activists, the British with exploding buses in Ireland, nerve gas struck the Tokyo subway. All attacks were committed by religious extremism. On the question: how to define those violent instances? Juergensmeyer answers: "*The definition of the event is provided by those who are terrified….,and not by those who committed the act*" It is defined by the media, rhetoricians, politicians, but those who committed the acts do not leave a note, they leave us with our own reality editions. By concentrating on the term 'Terrorism' we can tell that if the issue is the scale of killings, then the 9/11 is magnified in comparison with US atrocities in Hiroshima, Iraq or Afghanistan. Isn't 9/11 one more example of a sacred focal point?

The Israeli Palestinian conflict provides us with another example of selecting explicit events for an ideological purpose. In the Israeli-Arab conflict, two different time axes are inlaid. For most Israeli Jews, the (1967) 'six days war' punctuates an Archimedean point. In order to legitimize the occupation, the holocaust secular religion is designed. The fact that both rightists and leftists share this view is a conceptual barrier militating against resolving the conflict. The naked truth that Jaffa, Acre, and many other towns and villages within the heart of Israel were indisputably Palestinian Arab's habitats before 1948 is ignored. Referring to 1967 as the departure point for negotiating the states solution overlooks the refugees' right of return. For the Palestinians who in 1948 were brutally expelled from their homes, the 'green line' is not 'sacrosanct', and the 'two states solution can't be negotiated while ignoring the refugees 'right of return'. Barak a former Prime minister and present minister of defense, complained in 2009: "*I went to Arafat to find out that he is not willing to solve the 1967 problem but rather wants to focus on1947…*"

In the spirit of temporality, stretching present events backward and forward, we must realize that the conflict did not start either in 1967 or in 1948 but originates in the Balfour declaration from 1917. Re-visiting the debate in the British Parliament regarding the Balfour declaration proves that the Palestinian ethnic cleansing was clearly foreseen: On

16.8.1917, Edwin Montague warned that *"you'll find a population in Palestine driving out its present inhabitants, taking all the best in the country"*; and Lord Islington: *"…the Jews will not be satisfied with a national home under a British mandate, they will strive for an independent state, self-governing, a strong army, that will cause an ethnic cleansing of the Arab population."* Balfour's cynical response was: *"Zionism may fail, this is an adventure, are we never to have adventures?"* It was possible for this debate to take place before WW2, before PC censorship had acquired its inexorable power. Nowadays, despite Israeli society manifesting deep rooted irrational inclinations which overshadow any ethical concerns, due to Political Correct censors Israel is treated with excessive cautiousness, reflecting European irrational twinges of bad conscience. Only an awareness of the Political Correct factor can rescue the west from its neurosis.

During this decade two nightmares have confronted us: religious fundamentalism and apocalyptic forecasts involving a collapse of global economy. Both points to the same fallacy in liberal democracy: its blind trust in the predictive power of calculative culture. Since the legal and financial systems subsist due to evidential proofs supported by factual data, politics of fear locks the human subject between WMD forensic lucidity and an inexpressible fright of 'terror to come'. People are dying in Iraq and Afghanistan, westerners are losing their jobs, homes and faith in their rational decision making. In this fear of irrational disasters, where Mosaic footprints can be easily traced, what an irony that Judaism where science and art are forbidden disguise itself as a defender of rationality. Israeli democracy supported by the most fundamentalist ultra orthodox parties, should be the last to frighten us with Islamist regimes. We should bear in mind that under the guise of supporting German philosophy Jewish thinkers subverted Heidegger's 'dwelling' philosophy into globalism, cosmopolitanism and internationalism controlling the world by proxy.

In confronting the spiritual with the cynical calculative materialism, Coetzee draws our attention to the Clash between the forensic rhetoric's and approaching the unapproachable essence of Being. It is the fear of the latter that turned the west into a hostage of Judaic Political Correctness.

This article was presented as a paper at the "New Europe at the Cross Roads" conference Vienna, summer 2010