

Temptations, Stances, and Masses: Appraisal of a Likely Discrepancy

Saeed Shoja Shafti

Emeritus Professor of Psychiatry, New York, USA.

*Corresponding Author: Saeed Shoja Shafti, Emeritus Professor of Psychiatry, New York, USA.

Received date: **June 28, 2024**; Accepted date: **July 26, 2024**; Published date: **August 12, 2024**

Citation: Saeed S. Shafti, (2024), Temptations, Stances, and Masses: Appraisal of a Likely Discrepancy, *J. Neuroscience and Neurological Surgery*, 14(6); DOI:[10.31579/2578-8868/331](https://doi.org/10.31579/2578-8868/331)

Copyrights: ©, 2024, Saeed Shoja Shafti. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of The Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

Abstract

The modern era is full of ideologies and doctrines that generally have roots in academic disputes, theoretical thoughts, or ethical concerns. Nevertheless, formulations, which may be full of recommendations and calculations, or doctrines, which may be packed with justifications or condemnations, or prophecies, which may be filled with wishes or fears, may not be calibrated without pragmatic measures, experiences, or outlooks.

Keywords: temptations; stances; homosexuals

Introduction

The modern era is full of ideologies and doctrines that generally have roots in academic disputes, theoretical thoughts, or ethical concerns (Table 1). Nevertheless, formulations, which may be full of recommendations and calculations, or doctrines, which may be packed with justifications or condemnations, or prophecies, which may be filled with wishes or fears, may not be calibrated without pragmatic measures, experiences, or outlooks. Methodically, even practice may not always be sufficient for standardization because restricted experience in a limited setting may not be enough for normalization of big ideas, plans, or generalizations of obtainable extrapolations, though it may not be worthless either. For example, while historical events may be processed ideologically, like historical materialism from a Marxian perspective, or commonsensically, like customary historians, analyzing history without considering its context, namely associated sociocultural dynamics and political economy in a specific period of time (cross-sectional processes in addition to longitudinal courses), may not be constructive enough for the discovery of its concealed implications or its genuine roots. Accordingly, it demands a multidimensional exploration, which may or may not include a specific ideology or perspective as well. Otherwise, it would result in one-sided conclusions. On the other hand, followers of a specific ideology may believe why other people are not thinking similarly to them, why they have so many antagonists, why their favorite philosophy has not captured, so far, enough national and international advocates, or why their attractive beliefs have been invented so gradually or revealed so lately. Thus, is their brainpower or judgment superior to that of other people? Similarly, such an attitude may be prevalent among many of the cult's devotees' as well (1). Probably, they do not consider that their conviction is the outcome of a specific series of events,

relationships, educations, and experiences that may have innumerable variances amongst people in every community and even household. Therefore, people behave and think differently, which designates their own character and habits. Consequently, any discrepancy in the said parameters may cause dissimilar mindsets, and, consequently, different frames of mind may generate different judgments. This is the basis of cultural differences among societies, which have roots in historical, geopolitical, and international affairs, too. On the other hand, the dynamism of culture is not independent of social structure, economics, or politics. So, while there are a lot of similar social problems around the world, there are unique public complications as well, which are specific to certain civilizations. As a result, expressing comments or doctrines regarding people who have not been visited or comprehended perceptibly by the associated doctrinaire may fail to provide anticipated outcomes or right inferences (2). Allegorically, logic is not independent of locality. Similarly, a politician or decision-maker who has never understood his own society may act like a teacher who has never recognized his own pupils or a musician who has never acknowledged the preferences of his own audiences. Anyhow, there have been a lot of ideas, advice, rules, or predictions that either have never been applicable, administratively, or favorable, publicly; maybe because there has been discrepancy, obscurity, or untimeliness between them and dynamic forces, that should prepare the public minds for acceptance of such pioneering ideas. The realization of such an optimal match, as well, is not always easy. For example, while many leftists, in recent decades, have tried to understand why the typical socialistic revolution in capitalist systems, which had been introduced, supposedly, as an ultimate and deterministic phenomenon, has never occurred classically and repeatedly, so far, and collectivist groups have not attained their desired or supposed position in many parts of the world,

even in some of democratic systems, they have tried to solve their dilemma scholastically, and to find their replies in other scientific fields, like psychoanalysis, critical psychology and cultural studies, and, at the same time, to rely more on workers' group and unions, social movements, academic debates, or existent and never-ending formulaic class struggle (3, 4). They may think that if they could invent newer tactics, incentives, or beautifications, they might gain a higher, better, or more stable social position and political power, especially in democratic regimes, which are based on balloting and straight social feedback. The said question is a regular concern of many leftists in many liberal-democratic or social-democratic systems, in competition with their political contestants. The same quandary, as well, may have caused cognitive dissociation and hopelessness in many leftist intellectuals who have lost their faith in promised inevitability, determinism, or revolt. Disregard for the accuracy or unreliability of collectivism as a basis for sociological, financial, and political analysis of events, and due to its frequent revisions, divisions, or historical rise and fall, no doubt, leftists' expectation for critical restructuring of society and re-distribution of power and resources and turning class-conscious societies into classless communes has not been accomplished due to a lot of reasons that demand careful study. But one of the most important prohibitive reasons that seems to have been missed many times in academic debates is the role of deep states in different systems, which may act overtly and aggressively or covertly and diplomatically (5). No established system, whether conservative or liberal, may be expected to tolerate the threat of an upcoming riot for the sake of others' ideological stances. They see themselves, sincerely or insincerely, in service of the majority of people, whether sophisticated or gauche, elite or hoi polloi, industrious or user, devotee or traitorous, minority or majority, etc. They have information, power, resources, and their specific cliques, and they try to bypass approaching threats or unrest by suppressing and forbidding radical groups or activists or marginalizing and neutralizing them. On the other hand, skilled deep states usually know how to stretch, complicate, or transform the game of power so gradually, disguisedly or astonishingly, that it may eventually persuade people to believe that this is the society that takes distance from radical groups, not the system, which is, apparently, running fairly and robotically, without any attention to radical campaigners. Therefore, maybe class struggle could lead to basic alterations if deep states permitted changes to happen smoothly. Though radical views usually have populist magnetism, especially for people who are bigotedly or fervently in search of fast justice, equality, or freedom, the passage of time and the circulation of resources, which are, in general, managed by deep states, may change the game so delicately or fantastically that neither opponents nor allies may actually differentiate their companions or antagonists. So, it is not surprising that some social democratic systems are among the best allies of capitalist regimes, and some socialistic administrations are among the favorable partners of fundamentalist organizations. This, once more, shows that, contrary to ardent ideologists, who believe that human beings should be in service of philosophical objectives, ideology may be, unconsciously, in service of hegemonic administrations, especially when their intranational or transnational circles collaborate, covertly and globally, for attainment of their shared political objectives, and trapping, defacement, marginalization, deletion, neutralization, or deactivation of troublesome criticizers or meddling radicals. Therefore, leftists who ask why their favorite revolution has not occurred so far in their own society may find some important answers, too, in the delicate and systematic maneuvers of correlated deep states, in addition to their own liabilities or shortages. Similarly, there are many social or political

activists who, while they may announce logical or understandable protests or intentions, may fail repeatedly because they may ignore over and over again the sociocultural physiognomies of their target communities. For instance, a historian may ignore the demographic characteristics of a nation in a specific epoch, which, for example, may have experienced fatal calamities, and, consequently, may try to analyze preceding happenings with present-day evidence or judge others' predilections and attempts through their own yearnings. Such types of analysts may easily accuse the victims per se as the cause of past mishaps and present misfortunes and project their subjective inner conflicts as objective reasons for occurrences. Though history is, emblematically, a one-sided pathway between the past, present, and future, it is not like a monochrome identity and involves a mixture of people and ideas, which may end in different events. Nobody can condemn past failures without considering the dialectic of dynamics that have caused a social deterioration, regression, or incident. Similarly, no success is analyzable without a multidimensional approach. Another example of inaccuracy, overstatement, or meddling, which may have turned a radical view into a social protest, may include their advocacy respecting free love and homosexuality in the last epochs, which may have centrifuged or dwindled some potential followers, who might see Marxism as an avant-garde political ideology rather than a psychosexual campaigner or theoretician. Though Marxism was indeed a radical outlook regarding politics, sociology, and economics, its obsessive overlaps with unlike items, like sex and homosexuality, may act reversely on potential supporters who belong to different social classes. While the working class constitutes, quantitatively, the majority of dynamic people in every society, homosexual and transgender people are among the minor (sexual) groups of every community, along with their own preoccupations, stigmas, or social challenges. On the other hand, existent gossips regarding the hostility of Marxism to the traditional structure of the nuclear family, which may not have been addressed correctly by such theorists, may produce a milieu that is full of mistrust, misapprehension, and mistaken belief against leftism or leftists. Though leftists may have faith in unlimited broadmindedness with respect to personal and public opinions and conduct, even up to a stateless anarchistic level, the masses, as the constituents of every society, may not handle that so straightforwardly or intellectually. On the other hand, while normalization of abnormal patterns, if not impossible, is not stress-free, the side effects of deviation, too, are not continuously unobjectionable. The same inference may be applicable to similar normalizations like unisexism, which tries to bypass gender-specific traits or peculiarities, and transgenderism, which may fill the practical gaps of unisexism, though gender dysphoria is still a psychiatric disorder (Table 1). Therefore, though the Marxian approach may consider itself a critical tool for the re-assessment of prevalent totems and taboos and the sociological intervention of current cultural stereotypes, it should also be aware of the great political costs of such needless interferences. On the other hand, though some intellectuals, elites, or theoreticians may have faith in the eventual convincing of the world by similar propaganda and schemes, they should not forget that groups, which could not yet convince the majority of their own people, seem unlikely to convince the majority of people in the world. Cultural globalization, too, which might have been supposed initially, by some intellects, for the universalization of innovative outlooks, does not seem to be guaranteed without vigilant consideration of sociocultural predispositions or insights (6), a likelihood that may end in unwanted social cleavage, disgust, or tension. Frequent rise and fall of sociopolitical processes may show that neither cultural

values nor sociopolitical activities have enough stability for over-all formulations or one-sided anticipations. Limitless modernism may not be applicable without considering the mindset of the silent majority, in addition to the sociopolitical attitudes of campaigners and their aficionadas. But why do ordinary people, in general, avoid people with aberrant sexual inclinations? Perhaps, because: a) normalization of such aberrancies may endanger the traditional borders of the nuclear family (father, mother and children), while it concurrently thwarts quantitative growth of community due to its uncultivable consequences (7, 8, 9), b) it may interfere with normal development and identification of their children with their own parents (10), c) it may affect normal orientation of adolescents with identity problem, who are prone to mental turbulence, d) it may induce false impression in some simple-minded people, who may, fallaciously suppose that exhibition of sexual aberrancy may be a hallmark of innovativeness or open-mindedness, and, perhaps, e) normalization of some of sexual aberrancies, does not dismiss the risk of further decriminalization or normalization of other anomalies, which may compromise safety and comfort of silent majority (8, 9). On the other hand, some leftists, too, were not devoid of such aberrancies. Hence, while, in line with utopian socialism, some leftists supposed that a person's sexual flavors had nothing to do with a man's political character and all sexual expressions should be enjoyed as long as people are not abused, and, in addition, affirming one's difference may actually enhance social integration, other similar thinkers were accusing homosexual people as persons who are extremely against nature and were warning against such types of theorization and social advocacies, while they were prohibiting too much emphasis on issues that were unrelated to class struggle. Likewise, some socialist intellectuals warned communists of the

dangers of same-sex love and labeled it as upper-class, metropolitan, and imported corruption. In the same way, while some anarchists demand freedom in everything, including sexuality, and believe that homosexuality could lead to a healthy sense of egoism (11–14), there were other anarchists, as well, who believed that nature had provided a perfect answer to human relationships and that an anarchist must avoid any relationship with homosexuals (15); standpoints, which seemed to fade again after World War II and the repealing of Nazi-era anti-sodomy laws; denial of fascism or totalitarianism (16); appearance of neo-Marxism; and blossoming of liberalism and neo-liberalism. Similarly, the assumption of unbreakable parallelism between atheism and materialism, while the materialism dialectic was proposed essentially for taking into account the tangible facts for analysis of history, surroundings, and manners, could be accounted for as another example of slipup by some leftists. The said immoderation has possibly dropped, over the years, many potential followers who might suppose leftism as equal to profanity and leftists as instinctively corrupted people. To sum up, any sociologist who cannot polish his theoretical considerations with pragmatic experiences and real facts may never attain objectively what he had supposed subjectively. The end result of such a failure may include half-done formulations, mistaken theorizations, and, maybe, turning fortune into famine. Though knowledge may provide necessary context for cerebral elites to ponder better and analyze in depth, the library and literature may not replace streets and lanes if theorization is supposed to be in support of the masses, not power, and tries to solve the existing problems, not dumping the general common sense, for gaining oligarchic profits (17). The dichotomy between elites and the masses may provide a gap that may not be filled easily by law or lectures.

Doctrines	Good for	Bad for	Challenging with
Political globalization	Supremacy and hegemonic systems	Independency	Autonomy and Patriotism
Economic globalization	Economic regulation by hegemonies	Domestic production, economy, or currency	National economy
Cultural globalization	Universal outlooks	National values	Traditions
Unisexism	Intelligentsias, who are in search of innovative creatures	Traditional arrangements	Cultural measures
Transgenderism	Patients with Gender dysphoria	Normal folks	Historical archetypes
Decriminalization or Toleration of Homosexuality	Homosexual people	Straight people and conventional nuclear families	Normalization of abnormalities
Communalism	Lower-class people and intellects who want to create novel humans	Upper-class and capitalism	Private enterprise
Neoliberalism	Upper-class and capitalists	Lower-class	Public ownership and social equality
Expansionism	Imperialists	Colonies	Self-governance
Fascism	Ultrnationalists	Non-nationals	Internationalism
Anarchism	Willfulness	Principles	Social unavoidability and cohesiveness
Egalitarianism	Fairness	Exploitation	Traditional values
Democracy	Free thought and innovativeness	Authoritarianism	Conventionalism
Pacifism	Nonviolence	Interventionism	Power struggle

Table 1. A Rough draft of some of Contemporary Tenets.

References

1. Shoja Shafti S. Narcissism: Groundwork for Sectarian Misdemeanors. International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health 2020; 2: 08 -16.

2. Saeed Shoja S. Modernization, Anarchy and Evolving Societies: Reconsideration of a Challenging Stance. International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health 2023; 5: 17-22.

3. Shoja Shafti S. Class Struggle: A Critical Review in the Field of Political Psychology. Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research 2022; 45: 36199-36207.
4. Shoja Shafti S. Political Economy and Mental Health: A Reconsideration in Modern Era. J. Clinical Research Notes 2022; 3: 1-5.
5. Shoja Shafti S. Deep State and Attuned Democracy: Political Affairs vs Political Psychology. Journal of Clinical & Community Medicine 2022; 4: 441- 443.
6. Shoja Shafti S. Sociobiology Against Globalization: Hypothetical Battle in the Field of Evolutionary Psychology. Journal of Psychiatry Research Reviews & Reports 2021; 3 (1): 1 – 6.
7. Shoja Shafti S. Antipsychiatry Against Psychiatry: Remonstrations vs. Responsibilities. Journal of Psychiatry Research Reviews & Reports 2021; 3 (3): 1 – 7.
8. Shoja Shafti S. Sex and Radicalism: A Sociobiological Approach. International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health 2023; 5:29-34.
9. Shoja Shafti S. Secessionism vs. National Solidarity: Political Psychology of Societal Cleavage. International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health 2023; 5: 23-28.
10. Shoja Shafti S. Appraisal of a Nonconforming Childrearing: A Debate in the Field of Developmental Psychology. Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research 2024; 56 (1): 47771 - 47775.
11. Weikart R. History of European Ideas . Journal of History Britain.1994; 18:657-672.
12. Kinsman G, Patrizia Gentile P. The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), p. 65.
13. D'Emilio J, Estelle B. Freedman, Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America, 3rd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), p. 316.
14. Evans JV. The Moral State: Men, Mining, and Masculinity in the Early GDR. German History, 23:3, 2005, pp.355-370.
15. Shoja Shafti S. Human Beings and Anarchistic Inclinations: A Reexamination. Online Journal of Neurology and Brain Disorders 2023; 6 (5): 616-619.
16. Shoja Shafti S. Jung as a Fascist Theorist or Philanthropic Victim: A Second Look. Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research 2021; 38: 30160- 30167.
17. Shoja Shafti S. Nostradamus, Freud, and Apocalypse: Political Psychology of a Qualm, J. Neuroscience and Neurological Surgery 2024; 14(3): 1 – 3.h



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

To Submit Your Article Click Here:

Submit Manuscript

DOI:10.31579/2578-8868/331

Ready to submit your research? Choose Auctores and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- authors retain copyrights
- unique DOI for all articles
- immediate, unrestricted online access

At Auctores, research is always in progress.

Learn more <https://auctoresonline.org/journals/neuroscience-and-neurological-surgery>