

By Emil Vlajki¹

Оригинални научни рад
UDC 316.48:323(100)

THE NEW TOTALITARIAN SOCIETY

Abstract: *The new totalitarian society is a euphemized expression denoting the New World Order, which in itself denotes the American globalization. The underpinning of this mindset is rationality, which is characteristic of Western civilization. Christianity engendered rationality by introducing it through St. Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle, and especially formal logic. Since it is obvious that religion and logic cannot ultimately be harmonized, this combination has proven lethal in many cases throughout history. For instance, the Inquisition, which, contrary to what happened at scholastic universities, severely berated rational thinking in practice. Catholicism helped carry out genocide against the Jews, and Orthodoxy is in a certain manner tied in with Stalinism. The new totalitarian society is anchored in American Protestantism. On the whole, Christian rationalism is a sphere of science, techniques and technologies efficiently employed to promote the West to the status of a society of plenty and the conception of human rights, which turn into their opposite and irrational behavior of the worst kind. An example of such inhumanity is the attack against Yugoslavia/Serbia in 1999.*

Rezime: *Novo totalitarno društvo je eufemiziran izraz za „novi svjetski poredak”, a svodi se na „američku globalizaciju”. U osnovi svega je racionalnost koja je osnovna karakteristika zapadne civilizacije. Krišćanstvo je iznjedrilo racionalnost uvođenjem, preko sv. Tome Akvinskog, Aristotelovih djela i posebno formalne logike. Ali, pošto je očito da vjera i racionalnost ne mogu, u krajnjoj liniji, biti harmonični, onda se taj spoj, u mnogim slučajevima, pokazao povijesno kobnim. Spomenimo inkviziciju koja je, protivno onom što se događalo na skolastičkim univerzitetima, oštro sankcionirala racionalno mišljenje u praksi. Katoličanstvo je asistiralo genocidu nad Jevrejima, pravoslavlje je, na izvjestan način, vezano za staljinizam. Novo totalitarno društvo je vezano za američki protestantizam. Sve u svemu, krišćanska racionalnost koja je u oblasti nauke, tehnike i tehnologi-*

¹ Аутор је политиколог и комуниколог, professor emeritus Универзитета у Бањој Луци, а предавао је више научних дисциплина и предмета на многим универзитетима у бившој СФРЈ и иностранству, потпредседник Републике Српске.

je bila izuzetno efikasna, koja je Zapad dovela do društva obilja i do koncepcije ljudskih prava, zna se prometnuti u svoju suprotnost, u iracionalno ponašanje najgore vrste. Jedan od primjera takve nehumanosti je i napad na Jugoslaviju/Srbiju 1999.

The great German philosopher Kant said once that human existence contains essentially two things: billions of stars above man and the morality inside of man. Fifty years later another German philosopher Nietzsche thought that God (thus morality) was dead due to the prevalence of Judeo-Christian civilization and democracy. Stalinism, Nazism and today's "free world" democracy causing millions of death each year, prove well the prophetic words of Nietzsche. When God is dead everything evil is possible because those, temporarily the most powerful world actors, substitute themselves to God imposing their egoistic interests as divine and universal ones. In fact, their highly sophisticated existence, far from being divine, appears as a brutal dictatorship, their words justifying their "rational domination" are shameless lies, and resistance to their "divinity" results by innumerable military interventions and useless death.

A. Origins, History and Appearance of the New Totalitarian Society

1. Religion and "doublespeak"

Some elements of rationality like formal logic, responsible for scientific and technological progress, or Utopian thought, are indispensable parts of humanitarian development. But the profit-oriented relationship does not fit with humanitarianism. On the eve of modernism and industrialization, three possible ethical orientations were contained in victorious rationality: catholic, protestant and orthodox social development. It was shown that in the last instance and concerning the most powerful states, Protestant societies gave birth to ruthless capitalism, (England, the US.), catholic societies engendered "social-capitalism" and "Euro-communism" (France, Italy), and orthodox societies opted for communism ("scientific Christianity", state capitalism, Russia). Once again, this **enlarged and reinterpreted Weberian thesis** appears as a main tendency in a history of modernism but not as an absolute rule. One has also to stress that the three important elements of rationality: 1) formal logic (leading to progress of science and technology), 2) Utopian humanitarianism, and 3) competition (leading to the market economy), are contained in all of three religious tendencies of Christianity but not in equal "quantities".

Europe will make its integration not only because of geography but also because Catholicism and Orthodoxy are fundamentally (not politically) close to each other. Preserving the essential of the human part of Christianity, both are more sentimental and romantic than Protestantism which is

rather cool, inhumanly rational and efficient. During the NATO attack against Yugoslavia it was the Catholic and Orthodox countries (especially Italy, Spain, France, Greece, Ukraine, Russia) that in different ways opposed intervention. Protestant countries, in particular, the US. and the United Kingdom made the systematic destruction of civilian targets something to be proud of it (e.g. from the daily US-NATO rapport on bombing: “another efficient day”).

Historical circumstances and the extremely high efficiency of Protestant countries in doing business, building weapons and installing rational (Weberian type of) bureaucracy, led the US to become the leader of the West, imposing totalitarianism as a main relationship and way of life worldwide. While former totalitarianism was geographically limited (e.g. Nazism, Stalinism), today no one civilization, state or people can avoid the “international community” control. Global market, “free trade and exchange”, international monetary institutions (World Bank and IMF), multinational corporations, United Nations, “Echelon” (global network able to intercept all international electronic communications), news agencies and media, all of these institutions and mechanisms are for all practical purposes under the control of the West.

The new world rulers responsible for most of brutalities, have a serious problem. Because they named themselves the “free world” they have to present their totalitarianism as being humanitarian. It is not a simple goal to achieve and it includes several premises:

- * “Newspeak”² insisting on very simplified concepts (e.g. “right-wrong”, “good-bad”) reducing that way mental habits and modes of thoughts.
- * “Doublethink”³ meaning “the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously and accepting both of them” (e.g. “humanitarian bombing”).
- * “Double dealing” corresponding to the activity that aims at making a mess into the enemy's mind and behavior, inciting it to take wrong moves which would serve as a rationale for possible “humanitarian attack”.
- * The “Ignorance is strength” strategy⁴ applied to a large public who due to upbringing, education and media, does not know too many things about mechanisms of neo-colonial exploitation, fabricated rationales, covert actions and the like.
- * The canard, or “Duckspeak”⁵, a word having, in different circumstances different meanings. “Applied to an opponent, it is abuse; applied to someone you agree with, it is praise” (e.g., during the Gulf War in 1991,

² Orwell, George, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Penguin Books, p. 241, 1949.

³ *Idem*, p. 171.

⁴ *Idem*, p. 150.

⁵ *Idem*, p. 47.

Iraqi missiles were always “murderous” and American ones were “elegant, technically perfect, precise” etc.).

* The “State's Secretary of love” (“Ministry of love” in “1984”)⁶ able to assert to the people under attack (bombing, sanctions, etc.), that it is loved by its aggressor(s).

The “Ministry of defense” (“Ministry of peace in “1984”)⁷ which main characteristic is aggressiveness and main activity the waging of wars. It also produces “peacemakers” and “peacekeepers”, human robots assuring the totalitarian domination all around the world.

Thanks to these premises introduced on the world-wide level by the New Totalitarian Society, “traditional” moral, history, words and institutions completely lost (changed) their sense. Permanent wars (e.g., against Iraq and Yugoslavia) with sanctions and military occupation have become the “necessary road to peace”, lies have become a truth, killings of civilians and destruction of countries have become a “love” and humanitarianism and starvation of entire peoples have become “collateral damages” of the inevitable “economic adjustments” imposed by international monetary institutions to the poor.

The Kosovo conflict illustrates perfectly the given manipulations (“double-speak”, “double dealing”, etc.) performed by the leader of the New Totalitarian Society, in order to justify the further destruction of one sovereign country:

* In 1998, the US. special envoy Ambassador Gelbard branded in Belgrade the KLA (Kosovo Liberation Army) as a terrorist group (“I know terrorist when I see one and these men are terrorists”, he said).

a) The US encouraged Serbia to launch attack against the KLA.

b) The US later took the Serb attack against the KLA as a pretext for the war waged against Belgrade.

* Concerning the US KLA relationship:

a) Formally, Washington was against the independent Kosovo (the KLA's main objective).

b) The US actively supported KLA in its guerrilla against Serbia.

* In regard to the deal made between Washington and Belgrade over the withdrawal of Serb forces from Kosovo in October 1998.

a) The US promised the monitoring of KLA activities by the OSCA.

b) The US prevent the OSCA monitors to enter Kosovo for a month permitting KLA's terrorist activities.

⁶ *Idem*, p. 172.

⁷ *Idem*, p.172: Like in “1984”. In the U.S. there is no “Ministry of war”. Also, NATO's role is a defense. However, the U.S.-NATO conglomerate does not stop to wage wars!s.

c) On the other side, KLA once again concluded that in spite of the US official statements, this country in fact backed the KLA's goal for independence.

* Connected to Rambouillet:

a) “International community” organized so-called “peace talks” on Kosovo.

b) Proposal to Serbia of the “peace agreement” made by the “international community”, was such an incredible ultimatum that could not be signed by any sovereign state in the world. In fact, preaching the peace, the “international community” did everything to provoke a war.

* About the NATO attack against Yugoslavia:

a) The “international community” justified the attack saying that it would prevent “Serb brutality” against Albanians from Kosovo.

b) But it was easy to foresee that the real suffering of the population could only start and worsen with war.

c) Besides, extreme right-wing in Serbia openly declared that in the case of NATO attack, the Albanian population would be chased from Kosovo.

d) Besides, it was quite clear that the Yugoslav army under war conditions would be obliged to clear strategic villages from the KLAUS-NATO supporters.

e) The increasing suffering of the population actually served as a *post factum* legitimization of the NATO attack!

The presented set of manipulations introduce us to the “**philosophy of absurdities**” inherent to the New Totalitarian Society which “newspeak”, cynicism and brutalities afflict particularly developing countries.

2. The spirit of the human kind, survival, violence (or: introduction to the philosophy of history “for dummies”)

Contemporary totalitarianism emerges from Western society, its uniqueness, and spirit. Its beginnings, situated around the Bible, have created a history with no equal, full of aggressiveness and Utopian humanism. These two tendencies, united by rationality, have been the base of a civilization which over thousands of years, has finally imposed itself on the whole world.

Historical and non-historical violence

It is especially important to understand the sense of violence which has marked Western history. Roughly speaking and according to the Western thought, there are two kind of violence: historical and non-historical. It will appear that historical violence has been leading to the accomplishment of

today's progress and that another sort of violence (non-historical) has to be treated as a part of criminal behavior.

But the New Totalitarian Society gave to these notions a particular meaning ("Newspeak"). For instance, when NATO members bomb developing countries like Sudan, Afghanistan, Iraq, etc., it is seen as a "historical violence" because the bombing allegedly leads to the "new kind of humanism" (the "new world order"). By contrast, when the Yugoslav army fights the terrorism trying to preserve the integrity of its country, it must be rather the "non-historical, criminal violence" going against the NATO understanding of "human rights". **In sum, it seems that any violence against NATO is "non-historical" and "criminal" and any NATO violence is "historical" and "humanitarian".** In order to clarify this kind of arbitrary views, we will first focus on the **spirit of the human kind**.

Obedience to the contemporary God

Human kind and its multitudes (groups, nations) have a certain property that distinguishes them from any other sort of existence (plants, animals). This property is the self-consciousness, which means that (for example, today) all "intelligent people" are aware in a rational way of our existence as an integral part of God (the "international community") desires.

Rationality itself is an extremely complex notion. However, for our purposes we can say that —before the appearance of the New Totalitarian Society — it consisted in use of historical and contemporary (scientific and common) knowledge, common ethical principles, in the checking through different sources of new information, and in coherence (logic) in talking, writhing and thinking.

Normally, (before the appearance of the new "humanitarian" language and the NATO reinterpretation of words) coherence should not permit the use of false statement composed of notions that excludes each other. If, for example, civilians are killed by bombing, it is not possible to say (as the NATO does) that this bombing is humanitarian because the killing of civilians and humanitarianism excludes each other. Thus, this statement is false and can not be trusted. At the time, this triad —man, self-consciousness, rationality— was brilliantly expressed by Descartes in his saying: *Cogito, ergo sum* ("I think, thus I am"), but today Descartes would say: "I think, thus I am obedient".

First, we must survive

What could be the aim of this kind of (obedient) rationality? Nowadays, it seems evident that the first value which counts for the poor is to preserve themselves, to survive (e.g. bombing, sanctions, embargo, covert actions). The rich and powerful aim to be individually and socially immortal like "communism", the "Third Reich" or the "free world".

Anyway, before thinking (before being human), as Aristotle said, one has to eat, drink, dress, live somewhere, etc.- existence precedes the essence. Medicine, a great deal of politics and humanitarian work, as well as many other human activities, are concerned with elementary survival especially in the exploited (“developing”) and bombed countries. We know that Freud, in his early phase of psychoanalysis, believed that the two fundamental human instincts are the *survival of the individual* and the *survival of human kind*. Later, facing the Nazi totalitarian society, he reunited these two instincts in one, naming it *libido (Eros)* opposing it to the *instinct of self-destruction (Thanatos)*. At any rate, if there is a spirit of the human race, its first concern is to maintain itself physically.

However, man's maintaining of existence is radically different from what animals do. Essentially, real animals and “contemporary animals” (e.g. “Serbs” who are “genetically criminal” and “need a occupation of their country and denazification”⁸) have to adapt to their environment (to the “God's will” and neocolonial “paradise”), while Western man (“democratic”, “free world”, kind), creates in a constant manner his own (the brave, new) world, creating at the same time himself as invincible and “*tiber alles*” (above all). By assuring his own existence, he achieves it always in a more complex way, and on a “higher level” (nowadays, you can bomb anybody without risk from 15,000 feet). In other words, man carries out the progress whose unfolding potential of (self)destructiveness is called “history.” Nevertheless, whatever the social and technical period is (Stone age or Nuclear age), it seems that survival is always first, it constitutes at any time the ultimate goal of human activity.

“Historical” and “non-historical” peoples

If the survival of human kind (which seemingly couldn't be assured in any other way but with the unlimited progress of science and technology) is the highest goal of humanity, not all nations and all civilizations participate in the same proportion in the realization of this task. For example, for some specific reasons Africans or Ancient American societies (e.g. Inca, Aztecs) did not develop the same kind of rationality as the Western one. The result of it was that their development of the science, technology and appropriate social organization was stopped at some stage which finally caused their destruction by the “more rational” civilizations. It is only in this sense that some of societies could be called “historical” and others “non-hi-

⁸ Johnstone, Diana. “Hitler”. *Analogies betrav both past and present*. Extra!-maga- zine of FAIR. July/August, 1999: “In mid May, the BBC posed its question of the week: Could Serbia reform itself? No, said a British academic, Mark Wheeler, who was of the opinion that Serbia would have to be occupied militarily, like Germany after World War II, and ‘denazified’”.

stical” (especially, when you disappear under bombs, you are obviously not any more “historical”). Following this logic we are talking nowadays of “developing (*non-rational*) countries” always ready to be sacrificed for the further “humanitarian” progress, and “developed (*highly rational*) countries” deciding what the humanitarianism is and who is the next to be sacrificed in that name.

The “new world” rulers and their generals, politicians and journalists are all of them “excellent philosophers” having the astonishing knowledge of the evolutionary history (*“from monkey to missiles for monkeys”*). During the Vietnam war, general Curtis Le May proposed the bombing of Vietnam *“back to the Stone age”*. Recently, in the middle of the destruction of Yugoslavia, a journalist of the “New York Times” (April 23 1999) Thomas Friedman also urged NATO to put Serbia back into the stone age with a series of escalated bombings (*“You want 1389? We can do 1389 too”*).

Whatever it may be, the notion of progress is an ingenious Occidental construction meaning industrialization + computers + “free market” + “free elections”. If you are not able or if you refuse to deal with it, you are not “historical” (but “communist”, “anarchist”, “fundamentalist”, etc.) and deserve the “appropriate humanitarian punishment”. It seems that in the modern world those who could be generally considered as “non-historical” (peoples, individuals or groups) are living in a rather disadvantaged situation and are frequently the object of domination, exclusion, social assistance and extermination.

Master and slave

Before going any further, let us deal a little more with the kind of violence that could be called “historical”, in a sense that it is at the base of the substantial accomplishment of “humanitarian progress”. We already know Hegel's famous story of the master and slave described in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*. One conscience is able to find its identity only struggling with another conscience. The winner becomes master by imposing its identity on the loser, who becomes a slave.

In this sense, the following situation is imaginable: Two states (say the US and Yugoslavia) have different opinions on the same subject (e.g., human rights in Kosovo). Because they are anxious to assert their identity at any cost, neither of them will renounce its point of view. On the symbolic level, to accept the other's opinion means a loss of the one's own identity. Thus, compromise is not possible. Hence, the future relationship results from the mutual struggle (say Kosovo 1999), with the outcome already known and described: the creation of the relationship masterslave and occupation of the “slave country” by the “humanitarian” military troops.

Therefore, real freedom in this “humanitarian” world has to be conquered by force. However, theoretically, this struggle may have different

forms and characteristics: physical, political, economic, psychological and radioactive. It can take place on all levels: individual, group and institutional, between nations and civilizations.

We know that the first serious conflict within Western thought was the one that occurred between God and man. While the latter was ignorant, God kept him in paradise. When man acquired the ability to become God himself, God chased and cursed him. In fact, He always needed an enemy being his equal both intellectually and in a powerfulness. Otherwise, God would not be able to constitute his own identity. In this perspective, we could be certain that God wanted man to eat the forbidden fruit in order to become (divinely) conscious of his own existence, because one cannot really make oneself manifest to a being who lacks self-consciousness.

There is a modern, simplified version of this story. When God (the “international community”) wanted to attack Iraq, He first sold to Iraq modern weapons. After that, God proclaimed Iraq “the forth military army in the world” (almost equal to God) and then attacked and destroyed Iraq!

On this symbolic basis (“masterslave”), Western progress continued its pace through ideological, political, economical, and physical battle. The constitution of the West, encompassing Jewish, Greek, Roman, and Christian thought, had to undergo also the schism between Protestants and Catholics. Further on, the development of liberal capitalism created enormous social problems. Working hours were too many and labor was poorly paid. People had no social security and lived in homes that hardly deserved the name. All of this led to massive dying of the poor population. At the same time, colonial conquest was going on, being equally deadly and reintroducing slavery in liberal social relations. In this sense, Hegel talked about the death struggle between two kinds of consciousness where the more rational peoples (civilizations) would take over the less rational ones. The West did not miss this road, it won the battle by submitting many nations and civilizations to its domination.

Hitler could be everybody

The struggle for progress in the West reveals one particular fact: the symbolical confrontation of two kinds of consciousness does not apply to everybody. There are, for example, relatively few persons who actually struggle for their identity. The majority follows its leaders. Thus, because of the “passive subject” (Sartre) which is a public, a new element is introduced in the struggle that could be called “cunning.” *Cunning Reason* (Hegel) wants the messages intended for the masses to be simple, almost uniform (e.g., “Noriega is Hitler”, “Saddam” is Hitler”, “Milosevic is Hitler”; in fact, any leader of the country attacked by NATO is “Hitler”; this message is “simple and understandable”). Apart this example, other “simple notions” like liberty, democracy and equality could serve as a basis for any

ideology. The use of these words always pays off! Let us take the example of the Western society. Christianity engaged the masses under the slogan of love, leading to feudal conservatism and Inquisition. The Bourgeois Revolution invented terror. Millions of people exalted by revolutionary “communism” perished in concentration camps. And nowadays “international community” permanently wages wars against developing countries in the name of “humanism”.

Violence and morals

In the majority of cases, talking about violence, one refers to **traditional, metaphysical morals** condemning violence and based on the laws of Moses (“do not kill”, etc.).

Another moral that could be called **“imposed”** and **“circumstantial”**, is based on the positive law system established and changed arbitrarily by rulers. The good example is the NATO officials statement in April 1999: “we are not going to bomb TV” and ten days later it bombs Serbian TV. Or, it is written in the NATO charter that this military institution is purely defensive and, in spite of it, NATO bombs one sovereign country which did not commit any aggression against NATO's members! It is understood that from the naive point of view, these two morals: “traditional” and “circumstantial” (“not to kill” and “the killing is a humanitarian act”) are often in contradiction.

The third, **Utopian moral**, proper to the West and divided in several tendencies (Christianity, natural right, Marxism), preaches humanism and its progress but only if you comply with the “historical bearers” (Inquisition, Communist party, NATO) of these moralities.

It was Nietzsche who wanted to get rid of human morals (“too human”). He found it hypocritical, adapted to the demands of the herd, to mediocre people being everywhere in the majority. He understood that the ultimate goal of human being is survival. He believed that history is a cyclic, eternal returning of those who are strong and rulers by nature (*Übermenschen*: Supermen). But he did not see the progress and the dialectics of the human spirit and its history. That is what Hegel developed in his *Lectures on Philosophy of History* saying that the future belongs to the Western civilization which would dominate the whole world through its rationality. However, Hegel did not identify the real nature of his epoch. Marx concretized Hegelian thought by determining the essence of human spirit as a development of means of production (science, technique, and technology) that could only take place in the framework of Western society. One should not forget Marx's correct observation that both the capitalist and the worker function under the rule of capital. The capital relationship is the result of the profit-oriented mind making work (analytically) broken to pieces so that workers (intellectuals or others) behave essentially like parts of social or real machine.

Now, we reunite all the elements of our discourse which will be explained in a classical way out of the new totalitarian language. Let us repeat the essentials:

Human kind has (in the first place) to survive. That is the ultimate goal to which everything else is submitted and which also determines corresponding morals. Consequently, the main human efforts were for a long time directed towards acquisition and production of the means of living. Scarcity, uneven distribution of resources, individual differences, and many other circumstances, made human relations based on force (hierarchy and authority) which, in various periods dominated as politics in the broadest sense of the word (ruling minority + ideological servants + repressive apparatus + dominated masses).

Within the West (including the old-Greek, Judeo-Christian, and capitalist epochs) the mind, although (in the periods of slaveholding and feudalism) subjected to force, was given the place of honor. In the web of historical circumstances, through development of means of production and productive forces, the anti-dogmatic attitude, individualism, natural law and, finally, through the reformist separation within the Catholic church, the Western spirit led to the victory of the bourgeoisie and rationality. It permitted today's scientific and technical progress — the only one diminishing constantly the risks of the disappearance of human kind. In that sense we can call this civilization historical.

From the Western viewpoint, the existence of other civilizations was necessary but merely as a “material for progress.” Following the Hegelian idea that the identity of one consciousness could be accomplished only through the struggle with another one, the Western civilization had to take the same way. Putting rationality at the top of human values, it affirmed its historicity by submitting through fighting other civilizations to its domination. It has become evident that, essentially, social relations are relations of force and power. In this perspective, the use of violence (historical, ontological) is quite normal. But, if in the past man could not control his history (before achieving the necessary progress it was just a “passive subject”), today he is able to succeed. In other words, something has to be done in order to overcome the irrational profit-oriented mind dominating people and processes. The domination of this kind of rationality today means a pathological world which brings people(s) to such a condition that they have developed the means of destruction, including permanent wars and genocide, as the only possible way of the “normal” living.

If we accept that the Western interpretation, historical (ontological) violence has a certain justification - in the sense that it permitted the unlimited progress of science and technology, the current violence has no humanitarian justification. In fact, what can be drawn from Western theory and practice is that the violence which does not serve historical goals, which is egoistic, serving only the private interests of individuals, groups and insti-

tutions, or which is performed without any apparent reason (a sadistic outlet), that this sort of violence could be considered as criminal. Actually, with today's relations of domination imposed by rulers of the New Totalitarian Society and their pathological aggressiveness, it is only possible to talk about crime and not about historically justified violence.

3. The Notion of the New Totalitarian Society

The New Totalitarian Society is about the political, economic, military and cultural forms of inhuman domination of profit-oriented rationality over the entire world, whose main victims are mostly peoples from developing countries. We already said that history as a whole has tried to bring out rationality as the main social value, subjecting all other values to its rule. Although all societies possess the same possibilities in developing this main human quality, the first civilization to succeed in accomplishing this task was the Western one, becoming at the same time the most powerful civilization on earth. In order to achieve this goal, the Occident has destroyed many other civilizations and peoples. In most cases, explain both "free world" theorists and Marxists, historical violence was quite necessary for the development of this kind of rationality. They are referring, for example, on the colonization of North America. For them it is obvious that Canada and the US of today, as highly rational and developed countries, would never have appeared without the conquest of this territory by white Anglo-Saxon and German immigrants. In this sense, despite atrocities and suffering of colonized native peoples, the history of rationality as a main human quality aiming for power cannot be seen as moral or immoral; it had been just like that, and nothing could (or can) reverse what was inevitable and what is already here.

One of **the most important aspects of rationality, which is the limitless development of science and technology**, had to start from feudal society. When the social framework of feudalism began to prevent this development, the bourgeois revolution became necessary. Actually, man had to become free from the feudal attachment to land, and free from the means of production. The bourgeois revolution accomplished this double freedom by making the feudal serf the potential industrial worker and bringing rationality to power; it was the first time in history that rationality (that appeared as economy) took over politics. In other words, liberal capitalism based on competition of individual capacities replaced the rigid feudal system of which the main social value was heredity (any idiot born as a noble automatically belonged to the ruling class); the merciless competition of intelligence and skills on the market (social Darwinism) became the most productive system in history (rationality in power = modernism = capitalism = limitless progress of science and technology).

The very beginning of liberal capitalism was, socially speaking, extremely difficult for most people. Little by little, working conditions were improved, parliamentary democracy developed, and social security was established, aiming at some kind of earthly paradise, which came to be called the “consumer society”. Along with this process, national emancipation of former colonies occurred and the competition between socialist and capitalist systems created some advantages and hope for the majority of developing countries.

Unfortunately, this situation could not have lasted a long time. The welfare state began to dissolve, many people in developed countries lost irreversibly their jobs, along with their future, and their identity, the antihumanistic profit-oriented mind prevailed, and different sorts of eugenics appeared on the world scale. Nevertheless, for the time being, the life of the Western populations remains much better in comparison with the one in the Third World, but this is essentially due to the new forms of domination and neo-colonialism.

Profit and militarism

Although the beginning of liberal capitalism was marked by profit-oriented rationality, the stabilized bourgeois society showed two distinct tendencies primarily (but not exclusively) related to Catholicism and Protestantism. The first —the European— tendency is characterized by the more humanistic rationality, which prevailed over the profit-oriented rationality developed especially by the United States. However, it seems that profit-oriented rationality is more efficient and more aggressive. At any rate, “rational countries” have world leadership, provoking most of the ongoing emotionless brutality through numerous military interventions.

The great American sociologist C. Wright Mills remarkably described the above tendency of his own society:

“In so far as the structural clue to the power elite today lies in the enlarged and military state, that clue becomes evident in the military ascendancy. The warlords have gained decisive political relevance, and military structure of America is now a considerable part of political structure. The seemingly permanent military threat places a premium on the military and upon their control of men, material, money and power; virtually all political and economic actions are now judged in terms of military definitions of reality; the higher warlords have ascended to a firm position within the power elite of the fifth epoch”. “Of the three types of circle that compose the power elite today, is the military that has benefited the most in its enhanced power, although the corporate circles have also become more explicitly entrenched in the more public decision-making circles. It

is the professional politician that decisions, one is tempted to speak of a political vacuum in has lost the most, so much that in examining the events and which the corporate rich and high warlord, in their coinciding interests, rule”⁹

4. Hegel, Marx and totalitarianism

This simplified historical survey permits us to enter the core of the New Totalitarian Society. The notion “totalitarian” belongs to the modern era, having an essentially ideological meaning. Carl J. Friedrich and Zbigniew K. Brzezinski using this notion, described primarily two types of society: Nazism and Stalinism. Hannah Arendt, Raymond Aron, and Karl Popper argued that the totalitarian society came from Hegel's philosophy of history as a development of rationality which aimed through the Marxist and Nazi doctrine to this kind of political regime. Arendt, Aron and Popper further argued that history has no sense and that the domination of rationality is purely circumstantial. We do not want to argue over this kind of “science”, which was a mere ideology adapted to the “Cold War” period. It may be worth mentioning at this point that, just before the end of the “Cold War” (in 1989), the “great scientist” Fukuyama in his work *The end of history* “rehabilitated” Hegel by proclaiming him the pillar of Western civilization and the prophet of the end of history, leading to the free, democratic bourgeois world.

Some scholars think that current brutal American behavior indicates the new kind of imperialism of this unique superpower. But this is essentially wrong. Throughout history, the basis of each imperialism (Assyrian, Persian, Greek, Roman, French, English, etc.) was the existence of polycentrism (of several distinctive worlds). In this sense, modern imperialism was a similar historical period producing colonialism carried out by a bunch of aggressive superpowers frequently confronting each other. They ruled the world by establishing the basis of the future globalization of the profit-oriented rationality without being conscious of their historical role. The best example of the juvenile irrationality of the modern era were two world wars and the willingness for self-destruction by producing and using nuclear weapons.

Today's New Totalitarian Society means domination by the self-conscious rational and complex profit-oriented Western entity over the rest of the world, using all necessary and well coordinated institutions for the accomplishment of this task and forming some kind of world governance in order to control ongoing affairs. At the moment, the leader of the new totalitarian society is the US, but in this matter things may change. At any rate, the changeable leading position can by no means influence the exercise of almighty Western domination.

⁹ Mills, C. Wright, *The power elite*, Oxford University Press, p. 275-277, 1956.

Current, “free world” totalitarianism

Inspired by the model described by Friedrich and Brzezinski and taking into account other facts explained above, we can present the first draft of the main characteristics belonging to the New Totalitarian Society:

* An imposed “free elections + free market” ideology covering all vital aspects of the contemporary man's existence to which every individual, country, people, civilization, is supposed to adhere, at least passively. This ideology is characteristically focused and projected toward a perfect final state of mankind, that is to say, it contains a chiliastic claim based upon a radical rejection of the “non-rational” society and conquest of the world of the new one.

* A formal multi-party system which is in fact one-party system. It means that all political parties of the New Totalitarian Society whatever their names are (socialist, democrat, conservative, liberal, etc.) share the same ideology, objectives and behavior.

* A system of terroristic (secret and public) police under the control of the rulers of the “New World Order”, using classical brutality, modern science, centralized information systems behavioral psychology and military organization. It is directed against low classes and everyone who is actively opposed to the already described ideology.

* A technologically conditioned near-complete monopoly of control in the hands of the power elites and its subversive cadres, of all means of effective mass communication.

* A similarly technologically conditioned near-complete monopoly of control (in the same hands) of all means and military institutions of effective armed combat.

* An almost absolute control and direction of the entire world economy through multinational corporations, “free market and exchange”, international monetary institutions, covert actions and military interventions.