

Christian Lira Gonzalez

Critique on:

Societal Constructs in the Hyper-Individualistic Post-Modern Era: The need of a Transcendental Economical Revolution



- Man, The Controller of the Universe by Diego Rivera

"The passion for acquisition, which is erroneously promoted and extolled in economic systems, is only the passion for acquisition of time, power, and ease. This should not be mistaken for great passion or for love of humanity." (Nietzsche)

On Property and Inequality:

"From this Equality of ability ariseth equality of hope in the attaining of our end. And therefore, if any two men desire the same thing, which nevertheless they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies". (Hobbes, p. 75)

Said the Philosopher in his magnum opus, a revolutionary masterpiece of its own time and of literature history, the "Real" (In many spectrums and realms) Social Construct: "[The] Leviathan" where Thomas Hobbes stated the very origins of an idealistic state. In this quote Thomas Hobbes describes the equal ability that all men possess in the attaining of their individual goals regardless of some minor individual differences, stating that no single person has an overwhelming advantage over another to achieve their ends. Hence, everyone has roughly equal hope or expectation to achieve their desires or goals.

It is understandable that for Thomas Hobbes this is the main reason for the need for a societal construct, despite these differences, everyone is equally able to threaten others to obtain what is only enjoyable by one and only one. Thus, putting at risk what property as in this context is defined and disrupting "the natural state" into a "state of war".

Here as far as the author of this brief critique essay is concerned, we have the root of the great dilemma of our modern and post-modern times, one that philosophers during the enlightenment faced: "Inequality". This is the main focus of the discourse in this essay, not the mere critique of modern philosophy to build social constructs in order to answer the question on the right of property but to pass unseen and let pass unheard how these societal constructs that provide protection on the individual property do not provide the ability to possess or else gain possession in other words "Inequality of means".

For the purposes of this critique (although the author personal tendencies towards Materialism as the definite way to describe the causations and relations within societies) admits the intertwining of the Economic and Political concepts but focuses its critique primarily on the first to better understand the second.

Having said thus, we may continue to the very substance of the essay: The author's critique.

The Individual: The End, The mean, or The Enemy?

Where the means is taken for the end, only an insatiable and anxious spirit remains, one that strives for one thing and is unsatisfied with everything. So, the passion for acquisition must be put in the service of a passion for something higher: a passion for knowledge, for truth, or for human development." (Nietzsche)

On this matter (whether the individual is the end, the mean, or the enemy) we will consider two different perspectives about Ownership, Hobbes', and John Locke's:

Hobbes, in his political philosophy, emphasizes the need for a strong central authority to maintain order and prevent the "war of all against all" in the state of nature. He argues that individuals willingly surrender their natural rights to the sovereign in exchange for protection and social stability. In this context, ownership is not seen as an inherent right, but rather a construct established by the sovereign for the sake of maintaining order and preventing conflicts. Hobbes' perspective does not place the individual as the end or the mean but instead emphasizes the need for a strong authority to regulate and control individual behavior.

In contrast, John Locke's philosophy provides a different perspective on ownership. Locke argues that individuals have a natural right to acquire and possess property through their labor. According to him, individuals own their own bodies and by extension, the labor they exert. By mixing their labor with natural resources, individuals acquire rightful ownership of the transformed property. Locke's view emphasizes the individual as the end, granting individuals the right to acquire and possess property as a means of securing their own interests and well-being.

Both perspectives have implications for the relationship between the individual and ownership:

While Hobbes' perspective emphasizes the role of authority and the relinquishing of natural rights for the sake of social order. Ownership is a construct established by the sovereign to regulate and prevent conflicts between individuals. And Locke's perspective sees ownership as a natural right derived from an individual's labor. Ownership becomes a means for individuals to secure their own interests and well-being. The irony of our post-modern era lies in the juxtaposition of both Political Systems here described.

"The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie." (Marx)

The Author continues to explain: Liberalism, as espoused by thinkers like Locke, emphasizes individual rights, limited government intervention, and free markets. It promotes the idea of individuals freely pursuing their interests and owning property. However, in the context of capitalist fundamentalisms imposed globally, there can be a departure from these principles. Locke's principles of individual rights and property ownership can be undermined in a system where capitalist fundamentalisms prevail. As capitalism expands globally, it can result in the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few, creating economic inequalities and limiting opportunities for individuals to exercise their rights and acquire property. The global imposition of capitalist fundamentalisms can lead to the exploitation of resources and labor, undermining the principles of individual freedom and autonomy that Locke advocated.

This imposition of capitalist fundamentalisms globally, often driven by powerful economic and political interests, can resemble Hobbes' description of a strong central authority managing the affairs of the bourgeoisie. It can prioritize the interests of a small elite and reinforce social hierarchies, potentially leading to the erosion of individual rights and freedoms.

So is the Individual the end, the mean, or the enemy? The author's conclusion is that the individual is not to be found at any of these on a "State of Nature" and only when Political systems come into play and Material conditions are set the individual forms part of the "Social Construct". To be more concise, the author's pose is that the Individual is inexistent on himself, and therefore cannot be any of them until society exists, thus giving birth to economics.

The Hegemony of an Economic system is the Hegemony of Ideals, in other Words "The Ring to rule them all". In Other Words: The Perpetuation of "The Last man"

"Everywhere we remain unfree and chained to technology, whether we passionately affirm or deny it. But we are delivered over to it in the worst possible way when we regard it as something neutral; for this conception of it, to which today we particularly like to do homage, makes us utterly blind to the essence of technology." - Martin Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology."

It is crucial to understand that the Political systems exist based on Philosophy systems since the latter is not influenced by the first, but independent from it. Such as the excellent Aleksandr Dugin points out:

"Politics without Philosophy is not possible at all." (Dugin)

What does this mean for us? As the author pointed at the beginning of his critique there exist an Intertwinement of both the Economical and Political systems; throughout this excerpt the author has been able to represent the independency of Philosophy and the dependency of the other two. Based on this the author proceeds to lay the foundations of the conclusion:

"Economical along with the political systems are defined by the principles exposed by philosophy and although this last one possesses the independency of the two first is easy for, he that possesses the means and abilities to self-benefit from it and mask the true morals of any given social construct."

In other words, the author's critique to the economical systems is not in opposition to the natural desire of development propelled by technology, but instead the usage of technologies to possess and capitalize the right to Ideologize, thus, to later impose these reasonings on other social environments destroying the multipolarity of the construct as whole hence Hegemony of ideas, Hegemony of capital, Hegemony of Politics. In definition "A ring to rule them all"

Under such a hegemonic system, individuals are pressured or conditioned to conform to the prevailing norms and values. The aspiration to question, challenge, or transcend the status quo might be suppressed. As a result, people might be pushed towards a state of complacency and mediocrity, focused only on immediate gratification and personal comfort, embodying the characteristics of Nietzsche's "The Last Man".

Thinkers of the world, Unite!

As Marx called for a revolution of the classes, The author implores for a revolution of ideals. Just as Marx saw the need to upheave a system that entrenched class disparities, The author observes a pressing need to dismantle the structures perpetuating a monolithic ideology that breeds inequality and complacency, the characteristics of the "Last Man".

By encouraging a revolution of ideals, the author does not advocate for chaos or anarchy, but for a renaissance of thought. A recognition that we are not bound by the constructs imposed upon us, but that we have the power to define our own ideals and values. To create systems that foster real equality, that value diversity, and that allow every individual to thrive.

In our postmodern era, faced with myriad complexities and challenges, let us not succumb to the easy path of complacency and unquestioning acceptance. Let us rise, thinkers of the world, challenge the status quo, shatter the hegemony of a singular ideology, and redefine our societies in ways that truly promote freedom and prosperity for all.

Thinkers of the world, it is time to unite. Not against a common enemy, but for a common purpose: to challenge, to rethink, and to revolutionize. The revolution of ideals begins with us. This is the true Economical Revolution.



- "Frozen Assets" Diego Rivera

"The pigeons started feeding the people in Central Park."(Groucho Marx)

Links and other References

Images:

- [Man, The Controller of the Universe by Diego Rivera](#)
- [Frozen Assets by Diego Rivera](#)