

SCIENTIFIC VIEW ABOUT THE INFLUENCE OF ANTISOCIAL SYSTEMS ON THE STATE OF NORMALITY

Theoretical
article

Keywords

State of normality
Political normality
Social normality
Social power
Social self-regulation.

JEL classification

Z13

Abstract

This paper is trying to prove how social normality should start from a prescriptive, judicial reflection of democratic rationality in social-economic relations instead of starting from the generalization of exceptions under the form of normativity.

From the point of view of realistic systemic knowledge, “real levels” and “necessary levels”, as well as the rational interaction between them can be determined sufficiently accurate for all social sub-systems, based on present knowledge. The necessary and sufficient condition is that self-regulatory decisions are independent from the speculative groups of the society (i.e. of politics and oligopolies). There are numberless approaches for separating governance from politics but the social power which supports these approaches is still incomparably smaller than the power of those who do not want social normality.

University education is meant to explain this theoretical dualism that reflects, in fact, real economic – social dualism and to propose solutions toward really democratic, social normality to new generations. Therefore, if each university specialization does not receive a minimum information level on patterns of social self-regulation and social normality, the rapid progress to such a state is permanently hindered by the groups of interests that control the power of states.

Scientific View On The State Of Normality

Social normality is determined by economic and judicial normality. It could be defined and quantified more clearly in an assessable way, if higher education, *a generator of scientific elites*, would explicitly purpose this. I think much broader thoroughness of social, economic and managerial sciences is necessary in relation to the following aspects:

- All knowledge is a subjective process, dependent on concepts, terminology, theories and models used by each science on its object of study. In this regard, a selection of theories and models is imposed so that the reality reflected in knowledge is not more complex than reality itself. The main basic criterion of selection could be their correspondence with the reality described, the identification and correctness of the results of their application in real life;

- The most recent and credible philosophy of knowledge, in general, and of the society, in particular, is systemic philosophy, based on the two models of self-adaptability: cybernetic realistic (see the course for Educational Systemic Management). It seeks to achieve previous desideratum;

- From the point of view of realistic systemic knowledge, **for all social sub-systems**, based on current sciences, REAL LEVELS and NECESSARY LEVELS, as well as the rational interaction between them can be determined with sufficient precision. *The necessary and sufficient condition is that self-regulatory decisions are independent of the speculative groups of society* (i.e. politics and oligopolies). There are countless approaches to separate government from politics, but the social power that supports these approaches is still incomparably lower than the social power of those who do not want a social normality;

- *Social normality should start from a normative, legal reflection of democratic rationalism in social and economic relations and not from the generalization of exceptions under the form of normativity.* Some examples may be suggestive:

- In order to decrease (eradicate) underground economy (tax evasion, smuggling, organized crime, money laundering, etc.), the power of state should *rationally - democratically (to the interest of majority citizen)*, (by legal rules and enforcement structures), **act to eliminate the causes** (extermination of criminals), *not to protect majority citizen against their effects* (as acted in “free” economy);

- To eradicate poverty, **legal modification of the redistribution of national income between social categories** (e.g. between employers and employees, between economic sectors, between specializations, etc., according to non-speculative rules), **between states is sufficient, instead of “social assistances”, requests for donations from rich people, remission of national and/or corporate debts, etc.;**

- In order to decrease (eradicate) homicides, **killers should be exterminated** (as an “exception method” to the social exceptions, considered a threat to existential, physical and psychological security of majority citizen), *not to be guaranteed the right to life, of the “concern of not sentencing to death an innocent due to a judicial error”.* *Instead of focusing our effort on the improvement of legal procedures to avoid errors, the current “democratic reason” transfers the function of individual and collective protection to individual and local level, although the fundamental source of crime is at central level.*

- To implement fundamental human right to a decent life, we should remove from higher education the “morality of speculative economy”, *according to which the sense*

of economic progress is given by the maximization of profit (implicitly, the minimization of real income of majority citizen, the only payer of profit and other impositions), **which is not less harmful to the state of social and natural normality than the communist theory of absolute egalitarianism!**

- **The reversal of money functions, form negative inverse connection of economic self-regulation to permanent positive inverse amplification connection of the wealth of some interest groups, reflected by international commercial and financial-banking law, is probably the most important cause of current and future state of total abnormality for mankind.**

All scientific – democratic theories have counter theories created and supported by the corresponding groups of interests.

University education is meant to explain this theoretical dualism that reflects, in fact, real economic – social dualism and to propose solutions toward really democratic, social normality to new generations!

If each university specialization does not receive a minimum information level on patterns of social self-regulation and social normality, the rapid progress to such a state is permanently hindered by the groups of interests that control the power of states.

Political View On The State Of Normality

Political normality is dictated by political doctrines necessary for guaranteeing the interests of the economic groups that support these doctrines

- **The state of social political normality starts from the implementation of the “legitimacy” of political governances, through the “Constitutional right” created by each political regime between the two**

doctrinaire extremes: extreme right (neo-liberal, which promotes the extremism of private property, free enterprise, profit maximization, decentralization, speculation, “regulation of deregulation”, etc.) **and extreme left** (communist, which promotes total abolition of property – the cause of social inequalities, absolute egalitarianism, total control of the society by the state, etc.). Obviously both extremes are far from social normality, as the majority citizen would want!

- **Each type of political governance, based on constitutional “legitimacy”, has institutionalized** (legislated) the main social – economic components: state structures and their influence, predominant type of property, civil, commercial and banking relations, deviations from legality and their sanctioning, rights and duties of citizens, and so on, **using, most often abusively, the right of “political representation”** ;

- **All types of political governance deem normal to oppress their opponents by any means:**

- Autocratic socialist regimes by arresting in prisons or labor camps the representatives of “exploiting classes” (political prisons and labor camps for the construction of Danube-Black Sea Canal – in Romania, Soviet gulags in Siberia, etc.);

- “Free democracy” regimes”, by the corruption of union representatives, bribery of governors, physical extermination of political personalities (Gandhi, J. Kennedy, S. Hussein, N. Ceausescu, etc.), secret camps (CIA, including in Europe), unlimited detention camps (Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib,);

- socialist political regimes and those of free democracy have also oppressed violently the violent actions of dissident and/or protestant social groups, constituting specially trained intervention forces and with adequate means (the latest American achievement: “microwave roll-off trucks”, in experiment).

- **From the economic point of view** (of the redistribution of national

income), “capitalist governances” facilitate the accumulation of wealth by numerically insignificant social groups (“strategic investors”) on the account of majority citizen, “socialist” governances oppress the social groups of rich people, reinvesting the profits to increase the public domain and for the social protection of majority citizen. All the other real forms of economic self-regulation are positioned between the two extremes.

Extremes Of Real Condition, According To The Quality Of Governance

Society has known several types of governance:

✓ **“Unwritten”** – based on the traditions of natural evolution (still found in isolated tribes): all citizens are equal, submitting themselves to the decisions of “eldership”;

✓ **Monarchical** – autocrat, based on the divine right recognized by clergy (specific to feudal period): the monarch has the right of life and death on vassals;

✓ **Monarchical** – **constitutional**, based on constitutional judicial formalization (England, Japan, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, etc.): the nation is governed politically, the role of monarchy being apparently formal;

✓ **Religious** – based on religious beliefs (Vatican, Iran, Tibet, etc.): there are no legal rules, but moral ones, according to religious dogmas, and they confirm religious morality where they exist (Iran, Taliban Afghanistan, etc.);

✓ **Political** – based on the representation system [**“Representation kit”**], I quote:

- *“The components are:*
 - *Citizens have the right to vote;*
 - *Parties that gather votes;*
 - *Candidates who transform immediately into “representatives” of electors, by winning votes;*
 - *Legislative bodies (parliaments, diets, assemblies, etc.), in*

which the representatives make laws by voting;

▪ *Leaders (presidents, prim - ministers, party secretaries), who introduce raw materials in law-making machines, under the form of politics, and then apply the laws produced.”*

Each “political power” legitimated itself under the form of governances situated between the two doctrinaire limits: **the autocratic one** (capitalist – Hitler’s model, monarchical, etc.; socialist – Stalin, Ceausescu, Gaddafi’s model, etc.), **pro-democratic** (capitalist – prewar Japanese, Finnish model, etc., socialist – current Yugoslavian, Chinese model, etc.). Extreme **“democratic”** form is just a desideratum, if not a utopia in the foreseeable future!

The model of political representation is a progress towards democracy in relation to the preceding ones, but it is far from representing the sense of democracy perceived by majority citizen. I quote: *“However, even from the beginning, the representative government has nowhere near kept its promises. Regardless of our imagination, we cannot say that it has ever been under the control of people, whatever its definition is.”*

Influence of antisocial (antidemocratic) systems on the state of normality

Existence and negative influence of antidemocratic systems on the majority citizen can not be questioned, primarily because **the institutionalization at the scale of all nations of state structures for their combating** (directions for combating organized crime, drug trafficking, white slavery, etc.), extended by INTERPOL at global level.

The main effects target the lowering of living standard of majority population (through the corruption exercised on some members of the governments, in order to extort public money), the increase of violence by copying and multiplying mafia models, drastic decrease of physical and

psychological safety of the individual through increased crime, of drug trafficking and modern slavery (white slavery), etc.

Despite all the political statements, the inefficiency of the structures for combating the existence and action of antidemocratic systems *can only be explained by the legislative and executive tolerance in relation to such social exceptions*, due to their direct and/or indirect influences on all governance structures.

The fact that movies and many of the news of newspapers and broadcast media promotes violent and/or dangerous models for the majority citizen, models that trap especially young people, is a practice already ruled.

Educational system, primarily higher education, should treat this reality of social-economic disturbance, which exceeded long before and by far the state of exception.

Known dimensions of the phenomenon are treated by the conspiracy sciences and independent investigation press (where it still exists).

Stretchiness Of Social Tolerance (Sustainability) Level

“At the end of the 2nd millennium global antisocial systems (organized crime) have financial and technological means higher than those of national states and have become the main obstacle to democratic progress worldwide. The globalization of financial markets weakens the rule of law, sovereignty, its ability to respond”.

This harsh reality can only be improved in favour of majority citizen by increasing his cultural level, by raising awareness about the causes of this condition and identifying solutions to stop such international and national evolutions.

Essentially, antisocial systems only know two “fears” that might impede their negative activities:

a. **The fear of losing their life.**

The causes of such indubitable dangerous situations are:

✓ *spontaneous mutinies* or / and organized by non-governmental protection systems. Their source is drastic decrease of the poverty of majority citizen. Because of the social power they have (“triad of social power”), antisocial systems can control “the level of minimum poverty” borne by the crowd and they try the “stretchiness of this level, with the complicity of political governances, through all sorts of procedures meant to maintain the maximization of profit. Among these, the following are visible:

i. Increase of wages, interests, etc., **below** or **later** than the increase of inflation, controlled by them;

ii. Grant of subsidies from the budget (not from profits) for part of the population below the subsistence limit;

iii. “Apparent clemency”, by which they announce “necessary drastic” price increase of some primary commodities and then its reduction to a “bearable” value, in instalments;

iv. Deformation of the perception on the real value of some goods, by advertising such as “30 % free”;

v. Grant of reductions of “seasonal” prices;

vi. Initiation of projects to “help” certain disfavoured social categories, or some disfavoured geographical areas, which do not solve the cause of these conditions;

vii. “Remission” for paying interests on interests;

viii. Media propaganda that poverty was due to the “laziness” of the population, its inability of having private initiatives (as if there could be a society composed only of business people!), against statistical laws of large numbers or / and Vilfredo Pareto’s law: 80/20 % (relating to the distribution of national income between owners and employees and its inverse to the contribution of state budget formation);

ix. Classification of information on

abuses, frauds, fraudulent contracts or / and conventions, exaggerated values of profits, and so on, that could scandalize public opinion and thus would somehow force the justice to intervene;

✓ **The existence of death penalty, in the penal code**, for economic, biological and premeditated. Through arguments in the field of “plausible absurd”, *antisocial systems have determined European governments and from other countries, to eliminate this provision* from National penal codes and from the draft of European Constitution (one of the reasons why better informed population from France and other countries voted against its enactment). *They have thus guaranteed the right to life of criminals* paid for violent settlement of economic conflicts, biological criminals, economic criminals who undermine state power and the existence of national being by biological genocide due to poverty, etc. and have *consequently abridged the right to life of presumable victims = majority citizen*.

b. Fear of losing their wealth.

Majority citizen does not want more than a job from whose revenue he can build and furniture a decent house, have individual transport means necessary for the family (1-2 cars), provide proper education of children and to be able to spend free time in a more enjoyable way. It is simple to confirm the above by any organized scientific opinion survey. For this reason, fortunes of million € or \$ are simply fantasies to him.

There is genetically a social minority (up to 10%), inclined to the domination of fellow humans, without limit and without morality. In order to meet this behavioural abnormality it is willing to risk anything but life and wealth. This minority has own culture and civilization, [Aculin Cazacu – Sociology of education, 1992], of defying rule of law, of despise for common person, of displaying ostentatiously the social power

it has, etc. Public political disputes are a confirmation of this situation.

Due to the social power it has, this minority managed to control the powers of state and media from “free” economy countries so that **the main concern of legislative and executive is the elaboration of the legislation for guaranteeing private property against the public one and with priority in regard of all the other fundamental human rights** and sometimes against them.

E.g. in Romania legal provisions issued as a result of centuries of experience regarding the property changed, provisions such as the Civil Code of 1924, were not changed by communists in its original formulation, but by current promoters of liberal democracy, in order to be able to extort national wealth at will of elite groups.

Thus, Romania reached the absurd situation that real estate property symbolic to Romanian people, such as Bran and Peles, millennial balneoclimatic resorts such as Herculane, Felix, major economic and ecologic areas such as Rosia Montana, etc., came into or are on track to come into the private property of some people who did not have and did not participate at all in the development of national civilization, and even more, they oblige the state (majority citizen) to redemption costs according to the law for maximizing private profits (costs that had been already paid by participating in their construction, conservation and development to the present level!).

The political power of the state that, by virtue of the representation right, acts against the economic interests of those who vested it cannot be qualified as pro-democratic, no matter how tolerant we are.

c. Means and methods of social influence.

The main methods of social influence highlighted in media, audiovisual art, scientific papers etc., are:

✓ Corruption of key persons in the

governance structures, a process highlighted also in the official documents of international and national structures;

✓ Blackmail of persons from decision-making structures who cannot be corrupted;

✓ Assassination of those who cannot be blackmailed or corrupted and who oppose to the private interests of some elite groups, contrary to national interests (A. Lincoln, J. Kennedy, I. Lenin, Gandhi, N. Ceausescu, S. Hussein, etc.), as a warning to all those who hold political power, on the fact that they cannot be protected;

✓ Legal oppression of such persons (Nelson Mandela, ...);

✓ Creation of opinion leaders in audiovisual media for damaging public image corroborated with other direct or / and indirect actions against “rebel” personalities;

✓ Media and judicial reversal of moral values. One of the most significant examples in Romania is Pacepa case, sentenced to death for treason in several countries, including Romania and compensated by the Romanian Government with amounts of millions of € after 1989. Whose interests served this international spy? We cannot neglect the intentional damage of the image of General Antonescu, who sacrificed his life for the good of Romanian people and assumed the risks of governing Romania in the most critical historical situation, without the support of politicians and monarchy, being dispraised both by communists and by present representatives of “free democracy”. Who are our heroes?

✓ The use of secret organizations and their means for influencing culture, morality, public figures, etc. Romanian history has countless examples, starting from N. B lcescu, Al. I. Cuza, N. Iorga, etc.

Conclusions

Most scientists, including those in

the field of conspiracy theory, agree that the **main way of approaching social normality** is **higher education**, properly transmitted to other educational and social levels.

Teaching staff in this sphere have the obligation *to make new generations aware not only on narrow professional fields but especially on the models of economic-social self-regulation in which they participate through their profession.*

Education in institutionalized forms *must be completely removed from the influence of dogmatic knowledge and management models*, especially those of a political nature, enslaved to small groups of interest. **Execution and management teaching staff must not have the legal right to join any dogmatic group (political, religious, secret, etc.)**, due to the negative social influence they might exercise on the new generations. There are also other social categories with such necessary restrictions of human rights.

Higher education system has specialists in all the fields of knowledge and human civilization, therefore it has the scientific and moral right to fight against the passivity of new generations in relation to negative and immoral models of social evolution, offering them pro-democratic models and modes of action in order to promote them.

If it were able to acquire its scientific and moral independence, higher education system could constitute “free will” of inverse negative connection structures of the society: unions, organizations of civil society, of non-governmental investigation media, etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- [1] *Alvin Toffler, Heidi Toffler: „Avu ia în mi care”*, Ed. Antet, Bucure ti, 2006
- [2] *Alvin Toffler: Al Treilea Val*, Ed. Politic . 1983;
- [3] *Alvin Toffler: Powershift- Puterea în mi care*, Ed. Antet, 1995
- [4] *Ana Bal .a. : Economie mondial ”*, Biblioteca virtual ASE, Bucure ti, 2006

- [5] *Dumitru MURE AN, Alexandru TASNADI:* "Doctrin e economice", Biblioteca virtual a ASE, Bucure ti 2007
- [6] *Jean van Helsing:* „Organiza iile secrete – Cine conduce lumea, Cartea a 3 –a, Ed. SAMIZDAT, 2000
- [7] *Jean van Helsing:* „Organiza iile secrete i puterea lor în secolul XX – vol. 1 i 2”, Ed. SAMIZDAT, 2000;
- [8] *Jean Ziegler:* „Seniorii crimei”, Ed. Antet, 1998;
- [9] *R. Boudon .a:* „Tratat de sociologie”, Editura Humanitas, 1991 (2006)
- [10] *Richard G. Lipsey, K. Alec Chrystal:* Economie pozitiv , Ed. Economic , Bucure ti, 1999;
- [11] *Teodor Ghi escu:* “Management sistemic educa ional”,Ed. MATRIX,Bucure ti, 2006,
- [12] *Theray de Montbrial:* „Ac iunea i sistemul lumii”, Editura Expert, Bucure ti, 2003