

A NEW DEAL BETWEEN DEMOSES AND THEIR ELITES NECESSARY TO SAVE EUROPE

Janusz Węgrzecki*

DOI:10.24193/subbeuropaea.2018.1.03

Published Online: 2018-07-01

Published Print: 2018-07-15

Abstract:

The article focuses on social, political and cultural evolution in Europe. It describes and interprets the deepest – cultural – cause of observing social and political changes. It analyses gradually a picture of the new demos and the elite that is beginning to emerge. It compares the ideological character of these demoses and elites. Previous one, his ideological character is democratic-liberal-leftist. Later one, his character is democratic-liberal-right. It analyses the new demos and new elite democratic-liberal-right that come in the political stage in EU. It proposes a new deal between both of demoses and elites necessary to save political peace in EU. If EU could survive it needs be a new deal between left and right attitude. Europe needs a new consensus establish new rules of a law-governed state, establish new values as liberal-left-right and establish new form of democratic state as liberal-left-right democratic.

Keywords: European Union, Ideology, Liberalism, Left, Right

In the article, in form of essay I focus on social, political and cultural evolution in Europe. First, I describe and interpret the deepest – cultural – cause of observing social and political changes. Second, I analyse gradually a picture of the new demos and the elite that is beginning to emerge. Third, I compare the ideological character of these demoses and elites. Previous one, his ideological character is democratic-liberal-leftist.

* Janusz Węgrzecki is a professor at the Institute of Political Science at Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland. His field of research is Political Theory, especially contemporary theory of power, nature and core ideas of ideologies, theory of democracy, religion in public sphere.

Contact: j.wegrzecki@uksw.edu.pl.

Later one, his character is democratic-liberal-right. Fourth, I analyse the new demos and new elite democratic-liberal-right that come in the political stage in EU. Fifth, I propose a new deal between both of demoses and elites necessary to save political peace in EU, peace between EU and member states, peace in member states and peace between member states.

Contemporary political and cultural evolution in Europe

We can see political changes. New political actors appear. New leadership and new political parties. Some examples. Jarosław Kaczyński and “Law and Justice” party in Poland. Marie Le Pen and “Front National” in France. President Trump in USA. Elections in 2017 in Czech Republic and in Austria, even in Germany where important position has AFD party.

New political actors are very different to liberal-left in ideological character. But they are not homogeneous. The question is: what is the reason for political evolution that we observe in many countries in EU?¹ If the deepest reason is on cultural level? If political evolution is a sign of evolution of identity comparable with the one symbolised by the year 1968?

If it is a move away from cultural identity symbolise by the year 1968? I give answer yes for all the questions.

What is the nature of this cultural evolution? In the first sight it has anthropological and social character. This is evolution symbolised by the year 1968, so to new self-knowledge and social meaning. This new cultural identity focus on relations like families, local, national and religious societies. In positive way it refers to classical European tradition that symbolise three capitals Jerusalem, Athens, Rome. This cultural evolution has to do with classical universal values that were formed by Ancient Greek philosophy, Roman law and Christianity. According to the authors of “The Paris Statement” the role of Christianity is: “The true Europe has been marked by Christianity. The universal spiritual empire of the Church brought cultural unity to Europe, but did so without political empire. This has allowed for particular civic loyalties to flourish within a shared European culture. The autonomy of what we call civil society became a

¹ From many works see: Jan Zielonka, *Counter-Revolution. Liberal Europe in Retreat*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018; Douglas Murray, *The Strange Death of Europe*, London-Oxford-New York-New Delhi-Sydney: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2017.

characteristic feature of European life. Moreover, the Christian Gospel does not deliver a comprehensive divine law, and thus the diversity of the secular laws of the nations may be affirmed and honoured without threat to our European unity. It is no accident that the decline of Christian faith in Europe has been accompanied by renewed efforts to establish political unity—an empire of money and regulations, covered with sentiments of pseudo-religious universalism, that is being constructed by the European Union.

The true Europe affirms the equal dignity of every individual, regardless of sex, rank or race. This also arises from our Christian roots.

Our gentle virtues are of an unmistakably Christian heritage: fairness, compassion, mercy, forgiveness, peace-making, charity. Christianity revolutionized the relationship between men and women, valuing love and mutual fidelity in an unprecedented way. The bond of marriage allows both men and women to flourish in communion. Most of the sacrifices we make are for the sake of our spouses and children. This spirit of self-giving is yet another Christian contribution to the Europe we love.”²

Similar is the thought of Schuman, one of the fathers of European Union. According to Schuman: “During this long and dramatic process of Christian civilization, the most decisive democratic process was not and is still not always achieved by total believers. Christian ideas survived in the people’s subconscious and influenced men who gave up practising a dogmatic religion, but who were nevertheless inspired by its main principles. These principles have become the features of our civilisation, owing to which the XVIII century rationalists proclaimed and made popular human and citizen’s rights, which are essentially Christian.”³

Demoses and elites

First, we have to distinguish between demos and elite. Demos is the society whose members are citizens who have strong ideological identity.

²The Paris Statement

[https://thetrueeurope.files.wordpress.com/2017/10/parisstatement172110_english.pdf], 30 May 2018.

³ Schuman, “For Europe”, pp. 43-45, in Mariet Krijtenburg, *Schuman’s Europe. His frame of Reference*, Leiden: University Press, Leiden 2012, pp. 169-170.

Demos has a strict relation to citizenship. The main factors civil European identity are cultural, religious, national and ideological identities.

Political elite is formed, on the one side, by politicians, political leaders, on the second side by around-political persons who have political influence. In the last group are persons express their opinions about political life like professors, judges, journalists, celebrities.

Second, what we can see is rather the clash of demoses and elites.

On the one side is demos and elite close to identity symbolised by the year 1968 On the second side is demos and elite that rebel against liberal-left identity and at the same time express own, positive identity.

This identity is not always clear and mature as political project of Jarosław Kaczyński and "Law and Justice" party in Poland or Victor Orban and "Fidesz" in Hungary.

Does general law about relation between demos and elite exist? We should answer yes to that question. There is a close relation between demos and elite. Specific domos, from identity point of view, is compatible to own elite. What we can observe now is that the main factor of evolution is political ideology, not religious or ethnic components. In both demoses and elites, liberal-left and liberal-right, their members are from the same denomination and nationality.

Now, we can ask about relation between democracy and political ideology. Democracy in EU countries is only procedural. This is rather a substantial democracy. What is this "substantial" mean? The main element is political ideology. From the year 1968 and with previous social and political processes only one ideology to get a status of hegemonic leader.

Contemporary democracy enter into matrimony with liberal-left ideology. In effect identity of demos and elite become liberal-left. But there are rather three dimensions. First, democracy. Second, liberalism. Third, cultural identity that symbolise the year 1968. We have to do with liberal-leftist democracy. Not only with procedural democracy but with substantial democracy. This "substantial" democracy has not only liberal character. Classical liberalism recognise individual reason as only and final authority decide what is rational, right and beneficial. Contemporary democracy is not as liberal as classical liberalism says. We can name this outside liberalism factor as leftist. This left identity has different to classical liberalism final authority that decides about criteria of rationality and decide how an individual has to think and act. This non liberal final authority determines border of correct thinking and acceptable action.

Political correctness is this device of liberal-left identity. Political correctness decides that there is a flock of citizens who think and act in the same way. It means that not individual reason decide what is rational and right but rather political correctness. According to Michael Foucault there exists power over reason, thinking, language and in effect over actions. We can say that political correctness is some of that kind of power.⁴ According to Rousseau similar role has "Censor of Republic". So political correctness is a "Censor" of contemporary democratic life. According to Jürgen Habermas political system colonise free communications between citizens.⁵

We can say then, liberal-left identity colonise classical liberal identity. This is left identity that turns into non personal power over reason, thinking and action of citizens, specific "Censor" that colonises, reduces and gains control over liberal identity. In effect members of demos and elite are democrats, liberals and have left identity. These three dimensions shape axiological, moral and political rationality. Nowadays we observe relax identification demos to is elite. Demos expect a partial exchange elite. But one is constant. Liberal-left demos identifies only with liberal-left elite and accepts liberal-left democracy.

Is it right conviction, quite often articulate by supporters of liberal-left democracy that there is only one democratic demos and democratic elite? Are demos as supporters "Law and Justice", president Trump, Marie Le Pen, Brexit not democratic? Is elite connected with those demos not democratic? In their declarations they are democrats by all means. The right question is not: are demos and their elite democratic but rather: for what kind of democracy they are in favour? Is this liberal-not left democracy? We should answer yes. What is the most adequate correct name? It seems that acceptable name is liberal-right democracy. But rightist is amalgam attitude conservative, patriotic or republican. Rightist is different from country to country. Rightist vary between Great Britain, France, Czech Republic, Poland or USA.

⁴ Michael Foucault, *The Orders of Discourse*
[https://monoskop.org/File:Foucault_Michel_1970_1981_The_Order_of_Discourse.pdf],
30 May 2018.

⁵ James Gordon Finlayson, *Habermas. A very short introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 200, pp. 56-7.

Post-democracy versus populism

Supporters of changing call the current cotemporary form of liberal-left democracy “post-democracy”. Supporters of status quo of liberal-left democracy, call this new social and political order “populism”. They refuse to recognise populism as one of the kind of democracy. They preserve the late name only for themselves. Is it fair that supporters of the new political order are deprived the name of democrats? Or, they rather should be named as supporters liberal-right democracy? According to them contemporary liberal-left democracy turned into liberal-left post-democracy, in which relation between liberalism and democracy is important.

According to Patrick Deneen “while cultures are many and varied, their common features almost always include a belief in the continuity between human nature and the natural world; the experience of the past and the future as embedded within the present; and assurance of the sacredness of one`s place, along with depths of gratitude and responsibility to the care and preservation of one`s places. Liberalism was premised upon a reception of each of these constitutive aspects of culture, since to recognize continuity with nature, the debts and obligations attending the flow of time and generations, or a strong identity with one`s place was to limit one`s experience and opportunity to become a self-making author.

Culture was the greater threat to the creation of the liberal individual, and a major ambition and increasing achievement of liberalism was to reshape a world organized around the human war against nature, a pervasive amnesia about the past and indifference toward the future, and the wholesale disregard for making places worth loving and living in for generations. The replacement of these conditions with a ubiquitous and uniform anticulture is at once a crowning achievement of liberalism and among the greatest threats to our continued common life. The very basis of liberalism`s success again ushers in the conditions for its demise.”⁶

We can say then, first, we have to deal with redefinition of liberalism. On the level of social practice contemporary societies although call liberal, is not as pluralistic as classical liberalism says. Quite the opposite there is more and more a consensus of opinions and conducts.

⁶ Patrick J. Deneen, *Why Liberalism Failed*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2018, p. 90.

This is a sign that “liberal light culture” won the position of hegemon among ideologies. This culture is mixt, on the one side liberal and on the second side left values represent by Gender, LGBT, Feminism, Ecologism. All of them are kind of evolving post-Marxism. This present amalgam liberal and left values is euphemistic call “liberal values”.

According to supporters a new social and political order some of these liberal values: and their defence have a face of fundamentalism. The post-democracy through mechanism of political correctness restrict freedom for these citizens who not assimilate so called liberal values. It means that “liberal light culture” claims the right monopoly about freedom. Revolt against it is called populism.

Democracy has changed into post-democracy when liberal values married left values. Demos loses its role and position then. Elite has more power but demos is of marginal significance. The power of demos and national parliament falls. The power of international corporations, judges who through the mechanism of activity not only interpret the law but rather do politics, increase.

In post-democracy the will of majority is not really important. In place of demos comes elite. According to supporters liberal-right democracy the power of elite guarantee mechanism mental cruelty and political correctness. Then demos acquires and not loses liberal-left character.

What does this situation mean? The correct answer is that there is a clash of values and appropriately the clash of different kind of democracy.

On the first hand the clash of liberal-left values with “liberal-right values”. On the second hand we have the clash of liberal-left democracy” with “liberal-right democracy”.

Liberal-right democracy

What kind of redefinition does the idea of democracy need? There are four rules of contemporary democratic state. First, democratic procedures. Second, human rights. Third, law and order. Forth, welfarism.

The supporters of liberal-right values are not against these rules but they have a strong belief that such rules need to be redefined?

Democratic procedure. This area is not discussion. But in it there is tension between the role of demos and the role of elite. Liberal-left democracy give elite the power deciding about democratic procedures.

Rather there is no public discussion with participation of demos. In opposite to this, supporters liberal-right democracy are for considerable participation of demos in shaping legally binding democratic procedures.

Human rights. For all is important right of freedom. But rightist supporters are for changes in relation between demos and elite. Demos should has a higher status, to be more subjectively treated. There is strong opposition to subject of demos through social engineering using liberal-left values. According to Zbigniew Stawrowski: "in recent the dynamics of revolutionary change has greatly accelerated. The ethical resources of Europe, which for centuries were presented to the rest of the world as a universal civilizational model, are now being squandered. Telling examples of this tendency are recent legal innovations, which are irreconcilable with values that were once obvious. Seemingly, the new proposals are introduced in the name of freedom. Their proponents are apt to congratulate themselves, and to stress that they are in the vanguard of the truest and most progressive representatives of Western civilization.

However, heir specific definition of *freedom*, and especially their blatant breach of the value of charity (understood as caring for others), forces one to perceive their activities as a modern-day barbaric invasion.

This time, the barbarians are not primitive hordes coming from remote steppes. In the middle of the affluent and cultured world, there emerged *sleek Huns*, who are bent on destroying the foundations of western civilization, fuelled by an unwavering belief that they are blazing the trail of progress."⁷

Redefinition human rights denotes redefinition anthropology and meaning of society then. The human being is cucumber in local, regional and national society. Cucumber in cultural tradition, patriotic to territory, people, tradition and culture where he lives. Larger identity, for example European could be only based on narrow but more fundamental, local or national identity. There is expectation that human rights should be more objective and based on human dignity. In effect it means return to ONZ Declaration of Human Rights and rejection of voluntarism, subjective, arbitrariness recognition what human right is or not.

⁷ Zbigniew Stawrowski, *The Clash of Civilizations or Civil War*, Krakow: The Tischner Institute, 2013, p. 71.

Law and order. According to supporters liberal-right values redefinition should take rule check and balance. But the most important difference between left and right attitude concerns on judges. In liberal-left democracy special position obtain judges. They have status of elite. They are autonomous and they are upholders of democracy. They are active in their interpretations of the law, so their decisions in some cases have a strict political meaning. The not only interpret but establish laws. Liberal-right democracy is strong against activity of judges because it is not legal dominance elite (judges) over demos. Judge in Rousseau meaning is not a Censor of the will and expectations of demos. According to liberal-right attitude redefinition should be reference to relation between legislative, executive and judiciary. In EU relation between Brussels and member states. In these specific relations member states should be more sovereignty, domestic parliament should be more powerful and federal EU should be rejected.

Generally, there is primacy society over power and politics. Government and policies should be a wide emanation of the will of demos. Elite should follow demos. Ideally, it should be concordance the will of elite with the will of demos.

Welfare state. Main values are equality, solidarity, sustainable development. Liberal-left interpretation of these values goes to policies multiculturalism and immigration. Liberal-right redefinition says that multiculturalism should be only a natural social process but not a specific policy. Immigration movement need immigration policy but based on different rules as liberal-left. Territory, culture, religion is joint property, heritage. The people who live in this territory is homeowner.

The clash of left/right liberal democracy

The current models of law-governed state, constitutional state and interpretations of these models and theirs rules were established by liberal-left elite. The role of guard these rules fulfil political representations, media, authorities and celebrities. If it is the last moment when it needs redefinition of model and interpretation of rules of a law-governed state. If it is the moment when it is need a new interpretation rules of constitution that are different from liberal-left?

Nowadays we have rather political war. If dialog is possible? If it is possible redefinition rules in democratic order, rules of a law-governed state? If EU could survive it needs be a new deal between left and right attitude. Europe need a new consensus establish new rules of a law-governed state, establish new values as liberal-left-right and establish new form of democratic state as liberal-left-right democratic.

Bibliography:

- Deneen, Patrick J. (2018), *Why Liberalism Failed*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press
- Finlayson, James, Gordon (2005), *Habermas. A very short introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Foucault, Michael (1970), *the Orders of Discourse*,
[https://monoskop.org/File:Foucault_Michel_1970_1981_The_Order_of_Discourse.pdf], 30 May 2018
- Krijtenburg, Margriet (2012), *Schuman`s Europe. His Frame of Reference*, Leiden: Leiden University Press
- Murray, Douglas (2017), *The Strange Death of Europe*, London-Oxford-New York-New Delhi-Sydney: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
- The Paris Statement (2017),
[https://thetrueeurope.files.wordpress.com/2017/10/parisstatement172110_english.pdf], 30 May 2018
- Stawrowski, Zbigniew (2013), *The Clash of Civilizations or Civil War*. Krakow: The Tischner Institute
- Zielonka, Jan (2018), *Counter-Revolution. Liberal Europe in Retreat*. Oxford: Oxford University Press