

General and specific

This title identifies an overarching opposition. Under this heading, various pairs of concepts can be listed, such as collectivism — individualism, deduction — induction, natural law — positivist law ... In this presentation, we deal with questions of social order, a topic that is currently heating up the minds in certain detailed questions. However, we will not deal with such detailed questions here and will only deal with matters of principle.

Steps of consequential thinking

In order to be able to move mentally in this way, so-called axioms are necessary. Axioms are fundamental statements that neither need to be proven nor can be proven. I call them "primary plausible statements". They are addressed to "natural reason", whose existence is in turn assumed as an axiom and is perceived by the fact that statements that are axioms are plausible to it without further means of persuasion. It follows from this: Axioms are recognised by natural reason, and natural reason is recognised by axioms. That's all you need to know to understand why the (Austrian-born) philosopher of science Karl (Charles) Popper (1902-1994) confessed towards the end of his life: "We know nothing, and not even that we know so properly." This brings us back to Socrates. Consequential thinking does not protect against ignorance, but exposes it to the light. At least Popper acknowledged this insight with humour. I guess you need that to keep yourself psychologically upright in this world.

It is remarkable that the current (philosophical) understanding of the term "science" is based on Karl Popper's theory of science. Apart from the insiders and a few interested people on the periphery, hardly anyone else obviously knows this. It is not surprising that the mass media and politicians do not like to bring this understanding of the term to our attention. Consequently, they would be fighting their own eagerly desired, but feigned credibility. But it is

precisely the real one that they would gain if they presented this fact honestly. But they fear it like the lost soul fears the Last Judgement.

Enduring themes

The tension between the general and the particular has never been removed. This is why the topic of "social policy", for example, has proved to be a perennial favourite. Here, the umbrella title (general and particular) manifests itself in the two phenomena of "collective" and "individual". The collective is society, which is formed by something in common. Opposite the collective is the positioned individual, to whom it makes certain demands.

One might think that society (the collective) represents the general and the individual the particular; but the matter is not that simple. It can be illustrated by the example of legislation. There are different ways of forming laws: Laws according to economic or social requirements, laws according to the wishes of the majority of the population, laws according to the norms of nature, laws according to the interests of minorities, laws according to religious rules ... When laws are derived from unchanging religious statutes, we speak of deductive or derived law-making. Here, the principles are the general and the laws derived from them are the particular, which in turn are to be applied to the particular.

If, however, legislation is based on the needs or wishes of individual people, be they consumers or lobbyists — however many or few they may be — then legislation is inductive. In doing so, one moves from the particular (individual) to the general (collective). What is then considered lawful for the collective does not stem from a generally valid principle, but from the interests or wishes of individuals. Understanding this difference is important.

For the reasons mentioned above, inductive or "positivist" lawmaking is always associated with an unknown degree of uncertainty. In the end, one never knows what to expect and whether this uncertainty will not tip over into arbitrariness at some point. State or national constitutions may have the purpose of keeping this uncertainty in check, but if they themselves have

been created positivistically, they can only have a relativistic effect. Distortions in society and its orders are therefore inevitable; this is certain, however, so that one could speak of "negative security" at this point. It consists in the inevitability of insecurity, including the danger of falling into arbitrariness.

Insecure societies

Societies are uncertain at least to the extent that their principles, statutes, laws and regulations are. When principles change, they prove their inconsistency. However, if only deviations from them occur, while they themselves remain, at least a return to solid ground is possible. The fickleness of man, which is considered undeniable, forms the anthropological basis of insecurity and becomes all the more dangerous the more the legal order is anchored in the particular rather than the general. A democratic society whose individual members are not rooted in general rules is sooner or later subject to arbitrary rule, and to perceive it heralds the hour of great disappointment.

Being freed from a deception, however, establishes a new chance - the chance to go elsewhere. Ideas are born that consist of other society-building elements and are meant to produce a different kind of society. But whether these elements are sustainable depends, as we have already seen, on their stability. In other words: If they are again taken out of the particular, it will lead to the same result in the long run as before.

We do not want to go back too far historically in this context, i.e. only to the social movement of the 19th century, which split into two directions in the 20th century, revolutionary socialism and evolutionary socialism. In the face of serious social problems in the industrialised countries of the 19th century, minds rose that sought a transformation of political society that would eliminate the conflict between corporations and workers. The privatisation of the means of production was seen as the "sin" of humanity. Therefore, the socialist movement set itself the goal of a "Great Reset" to the so-

biological conditions that allegedly prevailed before that supposed fall from grace.

From 1905 onwards, there were attempts to implement this idea through a revolution in Russia, but it was not until February 1917 (according to the Julian calendar) that the revolution could take hold, as a result of which the Soviet Union came into being. According to socialist theory, a new social order should emerge as a synthesis (according to dialectical) from the conflict of interests between entrepreneurs ("bourgeoisie") and the working class ("proletariat"), in which the means of production are the property of socialist society.

Socialist social theory is a construction based on the premise that Hegel's (1770-1831) dialectical three-step¹ must be applied to sociology. If the validity of this presupposition falls, the intellectual edifice of the socialist idea collapses. Instead of the hoped-for socialist world revolution resulting in the death of the individual states, as the theory implies, the division of the world into a socialist and a capitalist sphere is established.

Here, thesis and antithesis could not present a clearer opposition. Towards the end of the 20th century, people began to create another synthesis out of this opposition; this time not with a reset to the fiction of a primeval classless society, but — sociologically speaking — to the feudalism of the early Middle Ages, adapted to current and medium-term expected technologies. This synthesis is touted by expert propaganda and political programmes as a solution to manifold problems. However, the implementation is not yet taking place in the form of a revolution, but in small steps, evolutionary, also within areas of socialist dominance.

A legitimate question is: Where does the chain of dialectical three steps end in social theory? Must we be surprised after each synthesis whether it is

¹ *This is understood to mean the elimination of an opposition by something in common. Example: A silhouette that is interpreted by someone as that of a man, but by someone else as that of a woman, is defined as the silhouette of a human being by eliminating the opposition. The dubiousness of this method is shown by the fact that it could also be a statue or a sensory illusion.*

not turned from an antithesis into a thesis? Moreover, we can ask: by what route does sociology get caught up in this chain of dialectics? The answer is simpler than one might suppose: by the path of inductive thinking, and this can creep into any field, simply for the reason that this kind of thinking has shown itself to be human-dispositional. It is innate. Therefore, the basis of Alfred Adler's individual psychology² is probably the best founded and most empirically tangible.

Inductive thinking pushes aside or denies the existence of a concept of law anchored in nature. In its radical form, it does not grant human reason the ability to discover a right that can be taken from nature. Logically, inductive thinking cannot be expected to proceed or research deductively either. This is due to the very nature of the matter.

Socialism has never been able to prove itself in its "pure" form. It could not. Impressive proof of this was provided by the "grey market" in the former Soviet Union, which was not only tolerated but was also important for the supply of goods. Its products grew on small plots of land that farmers were allowed to cultivate privately in addition to their obligations to cooperate.

Basically, this was a concession to natural law, because it is difficult to deny that every human being is entitled to cultivate a certain area of arable land for the purpose of self-sufficiency in food. But we are far, far away from that. The relationship of human beings as part of nature to nature itself is hardly likely to be questioned by anyone, and not being allowed to cultivate this relationship must therefore be seen as a sensitive lack of an immanent consistency in nature, which probably also makes those affected feel it as an unjust punishment, presumably often suppressed by superficial contents into the unconscious, from where it can arouse psychological disorders.

This example alone illustrates how close to arbitrary rule we are. The legal order lacks stable, constant and thus reliable foundations. Security exists only to the extent that it is the safe path to tyranny. Where society shapes

² *This psychological school is based on man's striving for a feeling of superiority and power, even godlikeness, which is fuelled by feelings of inferiority in a neurotic (disturbing) way.*

itself into a collective, the particular on which it is built levels the individual. It is robbed of its spiritual dimension like a body which, projected onto a sheet of paper or a screen, becomes a deceptive two-dimensional representation of what its original is. A flat world of illusions is created, the hypostasis, the substance, the essence of the human being is blanked out, ignored, suppressed, switched off.

The collective is now the body formed by the surfaces of the units fused into it. This condition replaces individual responsibility with collective responsibility, which, however, cannot exist because it conditions collective guilt, which in turn is neither justifiable nor does it exist. It is a delusion like the whole entity. Reality only arises from truth, and that lies outside of man. He only participates in it through its realisation.

Therefore: There will only be a change if the principles originate from an existing, unchangeable common good.

[\(back to the subject area\)](#)