

The Equivalence of Ideologies

“No matter how many instances of white swans we may have observed, this does not justify the conclusion that all swans are white.”

Karl R. Popper

The great error in the dispute of ideas is the belief in capitalism as a global social system, as sociologists put it, a societal system. It must be noted that the error is not dissimilar to the one which has attributed socialism with the same virtue. Whereas, capitalism – as an ensemble of ideas, assumptions, expectations, methods and consequences tied to capital for the purpose of profit – remains attached to a part of society, it is a component among many others. For this it cannot justify its founding as a global social system, but by accepting unidimensionality as a strict universal principle.

The error has an explanation which rather relates to the ideological influencing of individual psychology with the goal of emerging as a *psychology of the masses*.

The construction which has this error as fundament is ancient. It is an expression of the natural order as the infallibility of the birth right to power. It is the pandemic product of vertical dependence. The world has a master and/or classes with degrees of preeminence with regard to the administration of powers, alongside classes with degrees of prevalence as the object of power. “Some and others”, until the simplified positioning “I and others”, “part and whole”, in which a part, always the same, controls the whole.

In time the change was only in the procedures for occupying positions of power by one party, be it a minority, or an individual. We can find in this situation the substance of all hierarchic societal systems, including their modern forms called socialism and capitalism.

Capitalism proves to be an ideology of the same ilk as the one of socialism. Both ideologies resemble each other in the mechanism of the management of power, with one individual, group, clan or favorite class. And, obviously, they both have a similar preference for vertical dependency.

The differentiation – without reaching an essential difference – is the result of the perspective on adversity. They define each other through the method of negation. But each one utters at the same time “yes” and “no”, thinking positively of itself and negatively of the adversary.

Each one claims itself as heaven while proclaiming the other as hell. The people are usually captive in their choice, to not also consider their captivity of political state. Either way, they can only choose the master!

The emblematic equivalence is proved today by the vision regarding the neutrality of regulatory instruments. The centering of capitalism on the market – with all its historical primacy – did not block socialism’s recent option (although there have been similar attempts over time) for the same economic mechanism.

This proves once more that hierarchical systems have no moral holdbacks when they are driven by the precept of “the end justifies the means”.

The complicated part is for the people to understand the sense of the goal targeted from each side of the barricade. No longer having at present a bifocal definition of the intentions of the systems, we could have an identity as long as, at the limit, neither the end nor the preferred means differ from one ideology to the next.

After all, ideologies have a tendency to converge as long as they are shaping hierarchical systems of power. The economic function today is fundamentally the same, beyond the discourse.

The disparities regarding consequences originate on the emphasis made on one factor – capital – or the other – the force of labor – from the function of the economy. The ideological perversion through the extension of the sense of the concept of capital over the other factor as well, seen as human capital – beside being a trick meant to suggest equality of treatment, appreciation even – is superfluous for the essence. It’s somewhat explicitly a case of placing accents in an equation, though taking as a demarcation criterion the bigoted symmetrical trust in the natural rights and the output performance of either one factor, or the other in order to legitimize the preferential appropriation of the consequences. In the logic of the adversely defined hierarchical systems the “tertium non datur” is overtly applied.

Whereas, faith is the substance of ideological approaches while simplification is the method through which power excels.

In the end it is, therefore, a problem of establishing profit as a fundament of power, but the two ideologies see things per contrario: is the capital right to hold the power or is the force of labor meant to decide on the management of power.

The equivalence of essence is perfect. Just that the preference for capital distributes power towards a minority, while the inclination toward the human factor distributes power in the name of the many, without renouncing in some way the principle of the privileged minority. A true identity of methodology!

The natural hierarchy, thus, is being kept. The power is exerted by those justified by their access to resources, chosen by divinity yesterday, propelled by ingenious ideologies today.

Consequently both capitalism and socialism are in the end technologies for distributing power. In this way the ideologies have confiscated global social systems, being in themselves no such systems. They are cleverly entertained illusions with the scope of developing a logic for the adversity of the types of order.

But life has another preference: for the spontaneous order in which it finds its inclusive place and for the market freed from the demands of the adversarial systems. However – natural reaction of the human nature – in this situation tutelary ideologies are being rejected as useless.

Marin Dinu

Contents

The Administrative Convergence in the Balkan Area. Empirical Analysis of Social Policy in Romania and Bulgaria Ani Matei, Tatiana-Camelia Dogaru	5
Convergence of Croatian Financial and Budget Regulations to the Framework and Practices of the European Union Davor Vašiček, Ivana Maletić	25
Fiscal Sustainability and Social Cohesion. Common and Specific in EU Sub-models Cristian Socol, Marius Marinaş, Aura Gabriela Socol	43
Does Trade Help to Explain Tourism Demand? The Case of Portugal Nuno Carlos Leitão	63
Algorithms for the Public Pension System Reform in Romania – a Necessity Imposed by the Global Economic Crisis Carina-Elena Stegăroiu, Valentin Stegăroiu	75
Public and Private Relations – a New Philosophy of Management Nora Štangová	93
A SWOT Analysis on the Waste Management Problem in Romania in 2010 Elena Enache	101
Premises in Implementing the Common Consolidated Tax Base System Gheorghe Matei, Daniela Pîrvu	109

Note: The authors are responsible for the content of their articles and for obtaining necessary permissions.

Text revision:

Gabriela Ochiană

Computerized drawing up:

Nicoleta Bobocea

Cover:

Alexandru Ion

Subscriptions distribution:

Mircea Dinu

Tel./Fax: 021/210.73.10; 021/210.63.07

021/210.63.08

Data base indexation:

Research Papers in Economics (RePEc)

<http://www.ideas.repec.org>

Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)

<http://www.doaj.org>

EBSCO Publishing

<http://www.ebscohost.com>

CNCSIS B+

www.economieteoreticasiaplicata.ro; www.ectap.ro

Reception of texts: economia.ta@edeconomica.com