

Jan Josef Szczepanski

Text to Arthur Miller's article „Uneasy about the German's“

The main question about Germany's future in Arthur Miller's article concerns democracy. Will democracy persist there, will it exercise a beneficial influence on Germans' mind? In this respect it is advisable to remember, that in the early thirties Hitler and his Nazi movement came to power through democratic procedures. Therefore democracy by itself doesn't seem to be a sufficient safeguard against totalitarianism.

One has to remember, that the basic principle of democracy the role of the majority contains an innate danger. Everywhere the majority consists of the so called masses - of primitive and uneducated people. In times of economic crises, of unemployment, of hunger, they become restless and restless and susceptible to demagoguery. The reverse of classical democracy founded on compromises - a strong and ruthless leadership, intolerant toward any kind of opposition becomes a logical solution. If, moreover this trend is fortified by a feeling of national frustration and xenophobia, the ground is prepared for the extremist ideology of „Blut und Boden“.

Recently Germany, the richest country of the continent, seems safe from such eventuality, but we can watch a similar phenomenon developing nowadays in Russia, (not mentioning the processes going on in many Third World, and specially Islamic countries.) Therefore to count on democracy alone isn't enough.

The totalitarian regimes, together with their nationalistic components, lead directly to criminal abuses on a massive scale.

It isn't necessary here to remind all the atrocities, committed by the Nazis during the war. Nor the (numerically) even larger repressions in Soviet Russia, together with the extermination and tormented resettlement of whole ethnic groups. The main point is, that both the regimes favoured the criminal and sadistic elements of their societies, more numerous than one could expect. To think, that this situation is today done with once and for ever seems to be a mistake. The returning popularity of the swastika emblem (like in the case of Zyrinowski), the existence of Neo-Nazi movement in Germany and Scandinavia, show that the virtual danger isn't yet over.

True - most of those movements are confined to small, and politically unimportant minorities, but so was Hitler's movement in its beginnings. It is important to note what kind of audience responds to the totalitarian temptations.

In the West it is mainly youth, young people, who don't remember the past, who don't feel responsible for it, and who generally have difficulties to find a place for themselves in actual reality: In the east, and especially in Russia, those ideas are popular among middle aged and old citizens, who are disillusioned with the economic reforms, and are longing for a stall of things, when only the state was responsible for their low level, but stable well-being. They grew up accustomed to live without individual ambitions and commitments, without the need to have personal opinions.

In both cases the basic reasons seem to be economic, although the mental motivations may differ. What can be the remedy for it?. The simplest answer is: education. But, at the same time it is one of the most complex problems. It involves not only practical philosophy, but also a new, objective approach to history, to reality (??), to culture. What has been done in this respect? I'm afraid, that the main task is still before us.