

Hate speech & self-hate

I remember very well the days when 'the Berlin wall' fell, and the totalitarian paradigm of multinational-socialism collapsed. Multinational-socialism is indeed an appropriate name for the ideological backbone of the now demised Soviet Union and its satellites. It had been thought up by Josef Dzhughashvili, who foresaw the failure and impracticability of international socialism, proposed by intellectuals, whom he deeply hated. He wrote his defining ideological document in 1912, when he was living as an exiled communist activist in Vienna. He celebrated his authorship of this document by signing it with a new surname: Stalin. Five years later the bolshevik putsch triggered the long plunge of Asia into an abysmal nightmare. In the immediate aftermath of the Bolshevik putsch and the civil war that followed it, to many desperate souls Stalin's paradigm seemed to be the only way to wake up from the nightmare and recover some resemblance of normality.

The horror that Stalin institutionalized could generously rival with the terrorist reign of Timur – whose name means 'Iron', as a matter of fact. The rise of Stalinism was first made possible by the chaos after the revolution, then was advanced through the use of terror and universal distrust as a means of domination, and finally seemed to be justified by war – at least if one forgot Stalin's own responsibility in causing the war and aggravating its effects. But when the societal and personal sense of responsibility had been broken sufficiently, and the reminders of transcendence had been evacuated from public life, the paradigm could finally not escape the immutable laws of nature. After the death of Stalin, its reign passed through three decades of stagnation and then just disintegrated. To anybody having at least an intuitive sense of nature, this was simply inevitable. It had to happen, no exterior cause was needed. And thus, there is only one amazing, even mysterious, aspect of the collapse of the Soviet Union, namely the complete surprise of western politicians, intellectuals and mass media as it happened. As Soviet citizens woke up in a ruined reality, the so-called free west gazed and gasped, perplexed.

Amongst my brothers in my religious community, during those days we had many discussions about the collapse of the Soviet Union. Where would the definitive failure of its paradigm lead the peoples that had lived under its rule? One of my brothers remarked: "It's terrible, we have nothing to offer." And indeed, so it was: the west had nothing to offer. The powerful of the west were too confused. But then, having nothing to offer, they started looking for what they could *take*. Apart from some decorative humanitarian reveries, the principal objective became the expansion of their own free market economy. Post-soviet societies first of all were considered to be new markets, where more products could be sold and cheaper raw materials could be bought. Only in Christian, especially Catholic circles, the question was still raised: what can we *offer*? And given the spiritual crisis of the Church in western Europe, there was not much.

On the western side of the Berlin wall, it was and still is hard to imagine what life in the multinational-socialist society really meant. This ignorance did not appear spontaneously. Sympathizers of various offshoots of marxist ideology managed to brush aside any mention of the reality behind the wall. Moreover, for the general public it was more reassuring to consider the armistice of 1945 as a complete victory over the sole enemy of mankind, Adolf Hitler, and over his exclusively evil belief system, nazism. This byname was preferred to the original name national-socialism, which was too easily associated with other forms of socialism, both in vogue and in power everywhere in the west. This simplistic view on the war and on the flawed peace since 1945 has had an overwhelming influence on education and has shaped the world view of several generations west of the wall.

Things were very different on the other side of the wall in the Soviet Union or under Soviet domination. Obviously, there was no ignorance about the reality there. Despite totalitarian brutality, some resistance emerged. The catholic Church was one of the notable places where the supernatural inspiration could be found that was needed to resist and persevere. Unfortunately, because in fact an ideological tradition was lacking in Russian culture, like the theological tradition was deficient in its Orthodox Church, there was no significant ideological or intellectual resistance in this country. The main resistance was practical and pragmatic. The underground economy, often inseparable from organized crime, allowed individuals to retrieve at least some measure of dignity and responsibility for their own lives, without any utterance that might offend the idolized socialist paradigm. Black humour would fill the remaining silence. In an absolutely inclusive society, where the state had stolen absolutely everything, the distinction between dissident and bandit had evaporated. No one was left standing, qualified to judge a thief. Under the cover of a utopian spectacle, mankind was returning to complete barbarity.

It is hardly surprising that in this situation no one east of the wall could grasp the historic evolutions of the west, on the other side of the wall. For while the Soviet system was disintegrating irreparably, cultural developments in the west had been passing ever further beyond the scope of human imagination. And actually, they are still continuing - no one knows how this will end. The west has now transgressed horizons inaccessible even to black humour.

First of all, before the fall of the wall, revolutionary thinking had moved from the domain of labour and the distribution of wealth to the domain of sexuality. The working classes no longer needed to be liberated – apparently, they were oppressed no longer and they were increasingly wealthy. From the sixties onwards, intellectual revolutionaries turned their attention to the sexual passions, still shackled by the risk of procreation and by the responsibilities of family life.

The decadence of western thinking was a phenomenon that had been seen before in the history of mankind, but never in a way that was so grotesque and serene at the same time. Notably in France, whose culture is not marked by an exaggerated fondness of self-deprecating irony, philosophers continued to take themselves seriously, long after their sun had set beyond the horizon of common sense. Some admired their own intellectual enlightenment in outlining a path of 'de-construction', where everything, even the search of meaning, became meaningless. In Germany and the United States, leftist intellectuals, who had fled both Stalin and Hitler, created a school of 'critical theory', also known as the Frankfurter Schule. Leftist liberalism became a way of thinking, where any human relationship is defined as a power relationship. Contradiction must be used constantly to liberate the individual from whatever enemy. Carried away by the flood of the sexual revolution, the continuous revolution passed from economic and political society to the natural family and the domain of sexuality. It has culminated in the formulation of yet another utopian pseudo-science, this time concerning the human body - the ideology of genderism.

What will happen if in the sexual domain, where passions are extreme, eroticism is reduced to a power relation? Obviously, it is unavoidable that love becomes impossible and pleasure becomes entangled with violence and abuse. It is not surprising that for some time politicians of both left and right favoured all kinds of sexual inclination and even paedophilia. They were not ostracized and some are still in power, though rather oblivious of their own former stance. Finally, the relationship to oneself also became a political power relationship and the revolutionary mindset transmuted into self-hate. Philosophic de-construction favoured this by eroding the sense of a meaningful life and the self-image. The acceptance of naturally being a man or a woman was now considered obsolete, and gave way to a

destructive rebellion against oneself and one's own unborn child in the name of freedom. An emblematic representative of this was the influential French philosopher Michel Foucault, whose writings were a morbid intellectual echo of his ruinous sexual life style. The chaos of his private life showed a terminal stage of revolutionary thinking, where one's own body becomes the ultimate dictator to be eliminated.

How in the west the plethora of revolutionary ideas fused into a common obsession with sexual identity – that's a mystery in itself. It could very well be, that it is actually the unearthing of the subconscious substratum, from which those ideas originally erupted. But even this does not explain, how genderism has become the dominant ideology, demanding total focus in the fight for freedom. It is universally accepted. Generations of parents have renounced their responsibility in the sexual education of their children. They find it perfectly normal that their children are being indoctrinated at school and by the media with the ultimate revolution against one's own flesh. There is no term in the tongues of man for this treachery of the innocent. Is it perversion? Is it decadence? Or is it terminal despair?

These developments in the west, which started long before the end of Soviet rule, are still deepening and spreading, and no one can tell when and how they will reach their unavoidable denouement. It should be stressed however, that the transmigration of the *revolutionary* paradigm from labour and productivity to eroticism and non-fertility is not the only major change in the west that the peoples living east of the wall had missed when it fell. The *free market* paradigm of distribution and consumption had changed also, albeit less conspicuously. Means of production were no longer an immediate measure of wealth and enrichment. Industrialists had lost their responsibility to shareholders, who were increasingly hiding and securing themselves in holdings and hedge funds. In these structures of wealth and power, both workers and their produce became increasingly irrelevant. What was shared by shareholders had ever less to do with reality.

Traditional money as a reference had lost its value to financial assets like bonds and derivatives, whose true nature is beyond the comprehension of the public and often beyond reach of the law. The actual distribution of wealth was decided by powerful magicians pulling golden rabbits out of their hats, to keep the billionaires amused. In fact, the free market place of the economy today is no longer trading things, but virtual money. Money is made by inventing new methods of printing money, without them being recognized as such. Thus, responsibility within the economic sphere has been obliterated. The 'masses' that genuine marxists once hoped to liberate are no longer a class enslaved by industrialists, but are collectively enslaved by a silently approaching tsunami of debt.

Of course, the market place of things still exists, but one can wonder, if it still is a free market, where useful, healthy and beautiful things are being offered to free people. Retail industry has to spend ever more on commercial advertising. This obviously does not procure objective rational information to a customer, who is respected as being autonomous and responsible of his own preferences. He is simply being manipulated, cannon fodder of marketing strategies. With the help of psychoanalysis, in today's culture the potential customer's self-image is being distorted, if not destroyed, so he may redeem himself from self-loathing by buying what he does not need. Thus, through an abuse of psychoanalysis for commercial advertising, retail has become like a modern version of the indulgence trade. While the indulgence trade derailed in the excesses of Renaissance vanity, commercial advertising is ever more necessary to recompense for the lost self-image and prop up a crumbling consumer economy. What reform will set us free this time?

And so, in modern culture man's self-image is assaulted from two sides, which used to be each-others' ferocious opposites, but have now transmuted and are converging. Having

named Michel Foucault as playing a key role in the transmigration of the revolutionary left to the sexual sphere, it is fair to also choose an epitomic thinker in the depletion of meaning on the market place. The name of Ayn Rand fits in very well here. Her misunderstanding of Aristotle, on whom she claims to found her theory of 'objectivism', will probably remain unmatched for centuries to come, and may become an embarrassment to future philosophers. But for the moment, we have to deal with the present situation. Socialism and free market liberalism have merged into one political correctness to rule us all. The term 'woke' for this faceless oppression should not be seen as an invention of the liberal right to accuse the liberal left. The liberal right has fallen for the idol of the manipulative market and shares in the blame for the rise of 'woke'.

The planet must be saved, but man's own flesh is a raw material to be exploited and reshaped at will, and be punished if needed. Roaming on an abandoned market place, offering no meaningful rewards, and attacked in their very flesh by exhausted revolutions, souls looking for causes to work and fight for have nowhere to go. It is immensely sad to see young generations, indoctrinated by gender ideology and exasperated by commercial advertising, finding nothing worthwhile and no one to be fruitful with. How can a mass of individuals in search of a lost identity ever cohere into a society? How can they agree to advance together - and go anywhere at all? Where are the natural families? Where are the schools of life, where undefinable gratuity is taught, and real freedom is discovered in sharing with others and in the adoration of the Almighty?

The moment has come, that words like decadence and perversion hurt too much, especially for those caught up in the world wide web of 'woke'. The mere mention of objective truths or of natural fertility and sexuality has become unbearable for the victims of woke. Yes, they are victims, although in a different way than they think themselves. They deem to be trapped in their own bodies, which they are told to hate. The protagonists of woke know very well, that the wounds of self-hate are the best means to keep the self-hate heated. They must keep it beyond the reach of reason, which could trigger the thirst for meaning, true self-love and real freedom quite inadvertently. And so, any rational or even merciful criticism of woke and of genderism is labelled as 'hate speech'. The denunciation of 'hate speech' is exclusively emotional, annuls the obligation to account for an accusation and denies the right of defence. Faced with such absurdity, we are beyond the realms of decadence and perversion. We are confronted by a symptom of ultimate despair.

How should we react? What ice must be broken, and what light must shine in this darkness? To some extent, the peoples who lived under communist rule are less gullible than the peoples who lived west of the wall. They are used to ideological propaganda and fatally bored by accusations of being counter-revolutionary, saboteur, kulak, revisionist, bandit, racist, fascist, homophobe or transphobe. The ideological sound of hate speech accusations just does not affect them. But Central-European countries, like Lithuania, have made themselves dependent of western power structures. This is wholly understandable, given their cultural history and the ideological oppression they have gone through. But they must urgently understand, how the revolutionary ideology emerged and how it evolved in the west, while they were under multinational-socialism. It is equally urgent to discern the transmutations of the economic paradigm they have now joined forces with. It is not going to be easy. But we cannot abandon the young generations to self-hate, self-mutilation and self-destruction. Never before have the needs of truth and mercy converged so clearly. This is hardly a calling, it is an imposing challenge. Christians will have to answer with joyful courage.