

*Except for the last passage farthest down, this paper is a compilation of revised texts from earlier  
blogposts and forumcomments*

070517

# Why democracy\* never really was born,

and why ideology is Not left and right  
and ”something” in between,  
but still, why in the end, there is still hope ...

by

Oscar Berven

... but first, how to interpret

Language is image \*\*, an image of reality, just like a map. And maps are obviously never the same size as reality, but in a scale, hence it is not complete. But there are further subtle levels in language and we can add mathematics and semiotics and naturally all other ways we can think of to express ourself, art, music and dance etc. There are things we can touch or physically walk upon, but try to grasp the smell of forest or the knowledge of mountaineering. When we enter solely theoretical realms and idea-worlds we can only rely on images of it, so language must be used wisely, unfortunately I often see the opposite. Even if many would argue that a lot of people certainly can have a common understanding of specific words in a given point of time, it is always on the move, always evolving and to make things even more complex, the arguments that will follow later in my text, concerning what we study in school and individual knowledge, language is even more deeply Individual. It is only a

few steps from our inner thoughts. It is natural then, especially with my closest friends, to seek to narrow down as much as possible, find more and more delicate ways of explaining things, grasping for 1:1, reach wholeness in our arguments. I mean if we did not spend time to at least try to do that, why should we at all bother? In trivial and humorous matters it is actually the other way around, there we can even consciously create misunderstandings just for the laugh. One would think that I among my friends, do not need words at all, and yes many things need no explanation and the more we talk the closer we come to silence. But I'm not finished yet, and this is serious stuff indeed, so let me illustrate within the context of this paper.

Individualism does not, at least in my way of gauging the term, incorporate egotism, by these following points. True individualism is to be seen as a sovereign being with as much enlightenment as possible, or the urge and strife to reach it. With that strife, egotism could not or should not get any stronghold whatsoever. In that way, when one being interacts with another, or when individuals commune in a collective, dictating a truth is not possible, It simply isn't there. If we agree that a sovereign entity does have a strife for, let's say, cultivation of oneself, could that actually incorporate egotism? Does not egotism "require" you to have pride and vanity towards the next person? The comparison of everything, that shouldn't have to do with anything concerning development of ones sovereign self, or? Can a person really be narcissistic in a solitary existence?

So from where does egotism emerge? To put it as simple as possible I would say it all boils down to "Competition", the comparison of everything.

The moment you become aware that you can be Better than someone else, you begin to compete and unfortunately most often, it becomes a first corrupt step in your strife in life. It all of a sudden becomes very important what you say, how you look, what shoes you wear, what workplace you have. This is the judgmental world we see, you or somebody else can judge someone for not being equally good. A romantic view could be that we Can compete With each other not Against, or rather a more appropriate word could be to Evolve, or Develop. But what I think is being done is that society, with its conventions and traditions, consciously trigger Our ego through our instinct. Survival has therefor become corrupt in a very superficial way and depend on superficial epithet, titles and other careerism factors, a hierarchy. The judgmental part in all this is very dangerous. Somebody grant someone to judge another one. Has such a structure ever withstood corruptible forces?

I jump ten meters, you only five. Why does ego has to come into this equation? If you lay out all the details, my bone structure, my lung capacity, the fact that I jump five times a week and you only once etc, then one should agree that there is nothing in this that is "better", but what you have is a myriad of "factors", nothing else. Besides You focus on making damn good espresso instead of jumping very far, and that again is "just" a factor. So, skillfulness in all its variety and form is possible without judging.

I'm saying we are Not here to all be the same, equally good on a number of things, created from the same mould. We are here on totally equal grounds but with infinite possible ways to exist and develop ourselves.

By collectivism, I wish to refer to a generic term as much as I can, so you understand my viewpoint. "... the individual is seen as being subordinate to a social collectivity such as a state, a nation, a race, or a social class." From Encyclopædia Britannica.

Democracy, as I grasp the meaning, must be seen as By the people, or by the rule of the people, and my distinction is that it can only be through direct democracy, i.e. from the individual.

## Why ideologies faces its inevitable corruption!

How can collectivism at all work, if we don't have individualism, at the SAME TIME? Or rather, on what grounds can any ideology claim to be more correct than the other without actually falling for the most classical trap of them all, (the trap that humanity always seemingly falls into, prove me wrong please) namely to inevitably become a "dictate-ideology"? Yes I could call it fascism or despotism etc, but I prefer a more neutral term so as to prevent terminological bashing. I believe no ideology can work if not founded on TOTAL individualism.

I take it that most would agree, when looking at art, the phrase; –Beauty lies in the beholder; would be the most neutral, open minded and thus individual right, Right? If we are to be serious about ANYTHING concerning us, humanity, we certainly should agree that ideology lies in the beholder too! The word "idea" in ideology can ONLY be individual. Would you otherwise actually give away your own belief to someone else? Let that someone think for you? As soon as you give away the right to YOUR idea, you will submit, succumb, to this "dictate-ideology" to "govern" you. This is not to say that we are to disagree at all times, to become anarchy, but rather agree many times and agree to disagree some times, with mutual respect.

When I look at the school-system, it clearly begins with collectivism from the very early stages of your life. At the age of six, you learn upon collectivism BEFORE individualism! And not until ca. 16-19 years of age you are in a sneaky fashion "allowed" to think creatively or even critically. Some might argue I'm wrong 'cause we actually Do have a diverse and varied set of "subjects" and "freedom of thought", and by the time of high school and graduate school we have a multitude of more pathways to chose from, numerous possibilities to extend our professions and scholarships. My take on it is, we have the illusion of it. First of all kindergarten and elementary school

gives you No choices at all. Again an argument could be that it is a Catch 22, how can you make choices if you have no knowledge? Fair in one sense, but what happened to the ever so questioning and curious child? Are they being encouraged to inquire for example, why a history book might be wrong in some ways, that a (hi)story might have many different truths behind it? Is it not the smartest thing for a child to search for as many sources as possible to create a balanced view of any given historical event? I think it is so obvious why we do not have philosophy, psychology and history of ideas, from the first grade. I mean already the first question-mark, to question The History book, is looked upon as, the troublesome kid, the eccentric one, and very soon the parents are called in for "talks". If things continue even more, tougher penalties come to pass and final solution is the expelling from school. What a waste of personal achievement and rights to your own thoughts and cultivation of the individual.

*"The point of philosophy is to start with something so simple as to seem not worth stating, and to end with something so paradoxical that no one will believe it."*

Bertrand Russell

Russell is not necessarily on the wrong track, but rather, his logic comes out backwards. For me the difference is enormous, so I'll take the liberty of turning it upside down; "The point of philosophy is to start with something so vast, complex and paradoxical as to seem worthwhile stating, and to end with something so simple that everyone will comprehend and believe." The child is a perfect match for this "young philosopher". Ask all those great questions, but for heavens sake, continue to do so your entire life. With this "model" you can expand exponentially and your frame of reference is becoming less framed. The following passage however, tells of the opposite. It is the framing that increases exponentially.

So If I must, for the sake of argument agree on the earlier Catch 22. What happens next? If we now have been giving incentives for the young person to finally ask tough questions. To stir and to make a difference. Do we actually get this possibility? We're again being handed the illusion, and as I see it, despite the agreement of the Catch, it actually gets Even worse! In the efforts to fulfill your career, to perfect your profession-identity or your academic path, you are really narrowing down more and more your realm of knowledge. You know less and less about the whole and more and more about your specialized compartment. The smaller your compartment the better, the more specialized and subsequently, more esoteric, more attractive and the more money. It is seen as something good of course. You are pinpointing, "expertising" or spearheading yourself. You are peaking in your field! And hurray, you are also up to your neck with loans and time spent, (very much a compelling force to make more money btw) and consequently making a "second thought" ever so difficult to make. Very few can afford to have a number of different careers. Even if money is no issue,

it might be frowned upon, not really ethical, simply put, not tactical. This is the collectivism trap. We are compartmentalized in absurdum, a highly dependable system. We have no clue what "new economical methods" might mean, what really is gravity? How do you grow wheat? Why time is relatively slowing down the faster we go? Well, you can always go to the expert!

So the big questions arise, can we be collective at all? Do I have to be autonomous to claim my individuality? Is cooperation impossible? There are hopeful trends especially since internet entered the classrooms and more source seeking possibilities are becoming natural for students. And My own experience of school system is of course narrowed down in a specific western pattern and in a specific time frame.

There is not necessarily anything wrong with socialism, communism, democracy or monarchy in itself (terms mostly flung around without proper consideration). It is how it is being used, how it is valued and how it has been dictated collectively. WE have always come last. In other words, all means to build a society, ought be manifold. In fact as many as there are people in the world, and it must come first. Subsequently, some common methods can be collective. That could well be taken for a paradox, if you are pessimistic concerning my utopia, OR therein lies the unifying and possible future. If we were to build a society, it would NEVER work if the individual would not be strong and independent enough to actually handle a collective society. So, no society should never ever, govern on a collective foundation. I have not mentioned spiritual belief, because I take it by now, you understand my viewpoint concerning ANY opinion, belief or doxa. That is my Utopia, sadly though, most likely impossible, BUT I wish to emphasize, it is what we MUST strive for. None on Earth can claim to "know the truth" in a dictating manner, but we can continue to strive for it! But only individually!

After digesting thus far I'm sorry to have to go back to the starting point. Collectivism is not beginning in the schoolroom, but really the day you are born. Whether we like it or not, we are at day one, interfacing with language. I'm also sorry to say that although language is yet another Catch 22, we "must" have It, to learn new knowledges to communicate and interact and by the same means teach others, it is also the number One responsibility-laden tool and consequently the most dangerous one. It is like a knife. It can really cut through matter and create new tools. It can build you things and it can save your life in more acute situations. The sharper the more accurate. Just like language. A better vocabulary, a better grammar, the better the communication. A more fine tuned inter-com system for the people, the better the understanding. But let's turn to the dark side. What we have, despite all the benefits and niceties we can think of, the full spectrum of communication and by usage of such, our achievements and innovations, is de facto a tool for control. It is today such an extreme edge to this apparatus that it can cut through people like butter and in vast numbers. We see it as public relations, i.e. propaganda, via commercials, product placements, celebrity

endorsement, sports, religious mission and other everyday conventions and traditions. Mind control in short. However, language is not the bad guy. It is a tool and can be used for infinitely many things. Speaking of infinity, there is another Catch ...

... a favorite illustration of mine is the Zeno paradox. The one that tells of the impossibility of motion. The movement from A to B seems all fine till you add intervals to it, like miles and meters. Let's say you have a 100 meters from home to your bookstore, you must first walk half the distance, 50 meters, but wait, first you must walk half of that, 25 meters, and there you go. Half of everything and so on. There are no real problem even if we include even finer increments, like micrometer, molecular or even subatomic intervals. The problem lies in what happens in between these gaps or frames, like in a film. Do we disappear, and mysteriously come back? Or are there more, still finer dots and breaks? My guess is the latter one, even finer dots, and here is one part of the paradox, infinitely more!

I will not delve in to the meta parts of this illustration but, a bit boring turn back to the gauging, the comparison of everything, the judging. The One being the authority of distances, language and ideologies etc, is the one ruling. The ruler is the one that is imposing or dictating the frames of references and geometry of ideas on to others. I believe there is no coincidence about the etymology of "ruler", the grand measurer! I certainly don't think God (if one exists) would mess around with earthly tools and frankly not with Godly tools either. So I would want to believe that YOU, are the righteous authority! It quite does not look that way.

## The fundamental wrong with Profit

*or In he beginning was the Parasite?*

The perpetually running working-wheels wants to make a buck, perpetually. The businessman would want to make an analogy that taking energy from one source and make profit, is just like natures way, like building a dam and get electricity and subsequently money out of it. Pure and common sense and nothing unnatural and absolutely not unethical. But here is what might make the wheels squeak and cry. The "money part" is subjective! We should even use the word arbitrary. Yes, we should really argue that Everything is subjective, but the "man-made" aspect here, Money, is so very telling. But that is also natural isn't it? My five bananas is definitely worth two pineapples. That is just the point, if we left it at that, arbitrarily, as in; -I can trade as I like without a third party to come along; I think it actually would be a good thing. Who is to otherwise decide a specific value of a specific commodity at any given time? Your boss? The politicians? The bankers? Could we agree that this is the key point

right here? Do You actually want to give away Your right to appointed governing parties (albeit "elected") to balance and gauge just about everything? This relates to the earlier talk on ideologies as much as value of commodities and the grave problems in judging and these are indeed VERY corruptible forces. If One says; –The Market is the righteous subjective; (by dubious whim now called objective). I hope you will agree, that it is the same as saying "Yourself". In fact, no matter how we look at it, the bankers and the politicians are really also "the market". So yes of course you can "sort of" give your rights to someone, if you could ever trust them! Well, do you really?

If you of all sorts reasons have surplus, like saving acorns as a chipmunk and let's just say for now, that this is OK and natural. We could call it, survival. In the summer you have surplus, in the winter you have savings. But you could only have so much surplus as your body can work for (it costs to collect acorns) and in the end you need that surplus in the winter and your stock will eventually be out again next spring. Is it then natural to still have a surplus till next summer? I mean sometimes you might, but as a goal? In a community you, as a professional, create tremendous surplus due to effective machinery and later trade with it. You don't sit on it!? First of all, if you do, it becomes "moldy", at least symbolically. One can see it as obesity, too much salt in the stew, addiction of any sort or decadence, simply, unbalance. Is unbalance what energy is about? What has mother nature to say about this? Or in a cosmological scope? Motive, should act as a great indicator, whether profit is for profit sake, or a more healthy, profit for investment and development. So, some surplus sometimes is perfectly natural, but when the actual AIM is for more and more in this perpetual wheel of profit and wealth, it should not be seen as natural. Still not agree?

A top-notch-famous-jogging-shoe-brand makes their products in southeast Asia. The workers get virtually nothing an hour and we are talking long hours. The product yields thousandfold percentage profit and the shareholders run the streets cheering (clad with top-notch-famous-jogging-shoes). If we shall talk equilibrium, this is not it. This is profiteering at it's maximum and it should be called parasitizing. It is even worse than parasites found in nature, because this is parasitizing exponentially!

If you really ponder about this and compare your family to the whole globe, or If we equal hard core business with friendship, I think everyone would become dark-minded quite rapidly. Two good friends are giving and taking, sending and receiving, but we very quickly sense unbalance when one is pulling too much, craving and wanting. Maybe even deceiving and manipulating; –Please can you help me with my loan; –Take care of my son just this weekend too; –I'm so sorry I slept with your ... and so on. If the soul purpose was to suck the energy out, get trust and not give back, why, this is from my point of view, what I see happening globally today.

Both currency and commodity in itself has become so virtual and so separated from primary survival that I honestly wonder how we Can survive at all! So, how do You

value your shoes you're walking in, or value basic survival about those five bananas and two pineapples? Or lastly, your good old friend in southeast Asia? To have a "third party" or in fact "not yourself", evermore valuing and balancing your life, your commodities or your knowledge, is very much None dynamic, none free trade, or rather (without any political buzzwords) NONE FREE. Do you believe we were parasites in the beginning? Or do you want us, humanity, to end like one?

## The crux of the biscuit, a contemporary bad

There is a world out there, and it is in a deep slumber, numb and nevermore critical. It's a great pity. These wars we see today, are NOT built on real argument and real dissidence, but they are controlled and provoked and exasperated by a few who can control the masses!

Think just for a moment what chain of command really means. And think for a moment Who is commanding. When you see the western military apparatus rolling in over mid east, dare you claim to see a just democracy sweeping over and cleansing the lands? I so much hope, people would agree, democracy can never ever use fascist means to be imposed on to peoples. Herein is "the crux of the biscuit" I would like to say is the real discussion.

Concerning weaponry, picture the diet-food market. Diet food companies must naturally have the interest in its customers and buyers NOT to lose weight, their market segment is otherwise out the window. Dare I mention market interests in health care? I guess I did. The same in weapon sales. There are no "sound" market interests to build up defenses. Defense, the trick word here, is the grand argument, the ethical aspect of building armies and weaponry in the first place, but with the twist that there is "always" a potential attacker. If we otherwise would only do just that, defend ourself, then the incitement would lose its meaning. So follow the market interests! Who benefits utterly on dissension? Who can increase its power by dividing others? By all means with bad language! Bad ideology! The bigger collective against another collective, the more money and better control. Diversity is really our strength, not our weakness. War becomes less and less possible the more you see Individual beings in stead of groups, communities, ideologies or nations to represent them.

There are certainly corrupt elements in every corner of the Earth and in the bitter end, the majority of all humans are all misled, used, enslaved or literally slain. When we humans will realize, ideologies and belief systems cannot be seen as one dimensionally "left and right" but must be seen as omni dimensional just as the Universe itself. First on that day can we begin to talk pure Freedom.



*Below is a text I wrote two weeks after 9/11 2001 and I have left it unrevised*

## A short plead to just about anyone on this planet

Amidst all the horrors, wars and terror acts that occur around the world, be extremely alert to what you read, hear and see in all different media. Although conspiracies are all too popular to fling in the debate, it's important to consider, especially when so many different powers naturally pull to their own advantage. Who owns the media? Who endorses who? What government wins the public opinion? And sadly, what religion? It is so easy to become blind by your prejudice thoughts even though you Think you are unprejudiced.

In the end, fear is the One true dangerous force and it is being misused by governments, powers in the name of religion, dictators and many other parties that have something to profit by controlling the masses. Think again and again, because no One else can do it for you.

The summary! Who is to judge with a look at the Human history? This vast and complex history of human actions and reactions is simply beyond our capability to scope. I for one, am not willing nor able to do that.

Oscar Berven

Published on: Monday, 7 Rajab 1422 (24 September 2001) Shianews.com' (the only one at the time to publish my Plead, sorry to say.)

\* I admit of seeking a punchy headline. Democracy could naturally be claimed to exist since we are in fact discussing it. It might therefor have been born and maybe metaphorically not been able to grow up, yet. The grand argument through my text is nevertheless that, democracy is "only" a word, and that if I'm correct, that All living on earth deep inside most of all seeks freedom, and that you can not really put words to such an "ideology", we should profoundly rethink our predicament, namely, that we Are not free! The text later on is hopefully illustrating this.

\*\* Definition of language within this text is "something you emit through one or more of your five senses and likewise with one or more receive". I am not saying that language literally is just image but rather, image-like, we imagine. Language is eye contact, vocal communication, written text, body language or smell etc. The important point is that however we use our senses, they are only an interpretation of something, an illustration, it is not reality itself. Even if we include exformation, (a subconscious level of what lies beneath information) and if we also take in paranormal perceptions, it does not even then, show reality.