




Alexandr Schatz (Autor)  
**None but America**



<https://cuvillier.de/de/shop/publications/7705>

Copyright:

Cuvillier Verlag, Inhaberin Annette Jentsch-Cuvillier, Nonnenstieg 8, 37075 Göttingen,  
Germany

Telefon: +49 (0)551 54724-0, E-Mail: [info@cuvillier.de](mailto:info@cuvillier.de), Website: <https://cuvillier.de>



## Introduction

*The distinctive feature of a civilized society is that it is constantly busy with the search of a peaceful, nonviolent resolution of the problems facing it.*

*Karl Popper*

The snowballing of contradictions, problems, crises, and conflicts poses serious questions for scientists and politicians. Unfortunately, there are no answers. There are not even any discussions on its essential nature; there is no search for a rational model of society; there is no generally accepted understanding of efficient solutions to modern society's problems. Currently, in practice, there are no social theories or philosophical and anthropological concepts that inspire confidence, within the frames of which one could characterize the current public life more or less definitively. All the social and religious, global and regional, ancient and new ideologies cannot answer the problems and concerns of the current historical moment in a more or less explanatory way. The representatives of the vanguard of thinkers, among whom I include Nobel prizewinners, are remote from practical essential problems in their thinking. Even German philosophy, which was once in the vanguard of the world's scientific thought, drowns. And numerous international forums, both economic and philosophical, have become a parody of scientific events. As early as 1995, one of the influential American philosophers, Richard Rorty, confessed that "...in the American philosophic community everybody is so much tired that they hope for emergence of something but no



one has any faintest idea on what it should be like.”<sup>1</sup> This confession remains urgent in the present time.

In the book by the American financier, philanthropist and social scientist George Soros, there is such a statement: “Our understanding of the world we live in is imperfect in itself; but a perfect society is unachievable in practice. We should do with the best we can have.”<sup>2</sup> I do not agree with this statement in principle. This is what people state who perceive the imperfection of understanding of the social world as something predetermined. What prevents people from having perfect understanding? Why can we not significantly improve our understanding of the arrangements for life in the world and in society? I am sure people are obliged to strive for perfect understanding; this is the essence of consciousness. In my opinion, the fact that we make do with a harsh and illogical social world speaks about the intellectual weakness of people. The human mind cannot justify all the hopes placed on it, especially in the public and political spheres. Science could not “invent a man” (Jean-Paul Sartre). In fact, there is no need to invent him at all. He is a biologically perfect being. Only his consciousness is imperfect, which is in compliance with the society designed by people in primitive times. Namely, it is because of intellectual weakness that in many cases our understanding turns out to be incapable of grasping the present, of soundly understanding the past, and least of all, of foreseeing the future with any accuracy. The attempts made in this direction have not achieved any of the needed practical effects. Moreover, they have increased the various ways of understanding the existing situation to an even larger extent.

---

<sup>1</sup> Philosophy: textbook for higher educational institutions. — Rostov-on-Don: “Fenix”, 1996, p. 557.

<sup>2</sup> Soros G. “Crisis of Global Capitalism. Open Society Endangered”, M., INFRA-M, 1999.



I strongly disagree with the statement that "... social sciences do not have and may never have a right for the status, which we provide for social sciences not depending on what achievements were received in public and social researches."<sup>3</sup> Actually, social sciences have never had top priority; currently, they are in the deepest crisis. This is the case for a range of world problems. But social sciences have the right to a high status. For them to rise to the status of natural sciences, they should learn to design a social world according to the laws of a natural world; they need to start positioning themselves with real public progress, with real resolution of the problems of a society, with real improvement of people's lives. Social progress is not a false idea; it is still a misunderstood idea. There are no irresolvable contradictions; there are wrong solutions. Disappointment over progress has been caused by defeated hopes: progress in technology turned out to cause ecological troubles and the danger of the physical death of mankind, while social experiments have led to iniquity, victims, and the creation of degenerated totalitarian societies. Failures in the progress toward the creation of a rational society are caused by the fact that the intellectual revolution is lagging far behind a rapidly changing world. The technical power of humans is growing faster than the improvement of their views on nature, society and man. The idea of the anti-human nature of science appeared on exactly this basis. *The sentence passed on world society is quite concrete without a grand and effective transformation of social sciences: chances for improvement, for certainty, for strengthening of global management, for efficient resolution of global development problems are zero in practice.*

I am sure that only America can change the world for the better. The book is addressed to those who wish for this and

---

<sup>3</sup> Soros G. "Crisis of Global Capitalism. Open Society Endangered", M., INFRA-M, 1999.



can contribute to it. Its main idea is to suggest to the healthy (and other) forces of America that they should look at their society and the world community from the viewpoint of a different understanding. It is absolutely not a hostile idea, criticizing American values. It is a businesslike, well-intentioned proposal to have a look at its foreign and internal policy, to think about its society from the viewpoint of different thinking. It is a proposal to comprehend oneself in a different way. I do not absolutely exclude the possibility that some changes could improve the American model of society as a result of the comparison of proposed and available scientific and political thinking. This is extremely important, not only for America but for the whole world, because the USA sees its historic mission to be reforming the world according to its own model. If we judge, according to the dominant opinion, that “a perfect society is inaccessible in principle,” then foreign policy cannot be rational. The historic mission with an imperfect basis becomes inadequate. That is why I find the conception of my book to be exceptionally positive, aimed at activating the search for a peaceful, non-violent resolution of the problems facing society and the world community. Switching the scientific community to a rational system of world-view and values will make the USA attractive to other countries.

The content of my book is the representation of my understanding, which has been formed in the process of rethinking various aspects of the developed culture. Having removed the glasses of pseudo-rationality, I saw that not everything that exists is sound. A society is absolutely not a part of nature, in which strict laws of development act inexorably. A society is an organized structure of natural elements that is a product of human activity. A society organized at people’s discretion, far from perfect understanding, cannot be a creation in which objective laws of development are entirely inherent. To create a rational society, one needs to understand the logic of the natural



world and act in terms of this knowledge regarding the building of a harmoniously developed society. Social sciences can only model a non-contradictory society on the laws of nature, because the consciousness of their representatives will not be burdened by prejudices resulting from their previous experience. That is, one could call those sciences objective; toadying to anyone (authorities, people, nation, religion or personality) will be alien to them. *A rational society is a society in which economic, social, and moral development are parallel.* That is, in the logic of the natural world, I was searching for a landmark for the creation of a sound social world. Only such a method can minimize doubts over the rationality of views. Using this as a supporting point, I proposed an attempt to draw an outline of a non-contradictory society in this book: an outline that differs from the existing perceptions of another structure of particulars. The new philosophy appearing on the basis of this method reveals the imperfection of liberalism, the illogicality of Marxism, the inefficiency of social democracy, the primitive nature of synergetics, and the absurdness of postmodernism. It justifies other dialectics, puts another main issue for itself. The new philosophy using principles of natural rationality is able to eliminate all the basic contradictions of capitalism economically, resolve the issue of ownership, and create preconditions for demanding a cooperative type of economic and, accordingly, social relations on all levels. The new philosophy draws in detail the vision of a perfect market economy, in which such problems as unemployment, inflation, the shadow economy, corruption, detachment of poor people from the results of their labor, and information closure of power and business are not objectively inherent. Such an economy is able to resolve social problems without the active participation of a state and to function without cyclic crises.

The rethinking set forth in the book includes a great deal of criticism. Maybe too much. No doubt, the reader will pay at-



tention to the unique style of representation, neither avoiding evaluative judgments nor keeping the traditions of respectfulness and loyalty to scientific authorities. Currently, it is not the time to worship idols. Choosing the correct means for the coming inevitable global transformation of the world arrangement allows no mercy for mistakes. The daring style of representation has been selected to incite representatives of the social sciences to a more efficient search for ways for correct transformation of a social world. I do not aim at developing a unifying system of knowledge. Such a task is beyond the limits of one person. This task is for new scientists. It is the scientists of the near future—new philosophers, economists, political analysts, social scientists, and historians—who will, I hope, become main participants in the intellectual march against the critics of mind. My task is to propose a new direction of scientific thought, drawing out some traits of the consolidating world vision using my understanding as set forth in the book: a world vision that can be called axial, that is superclass, supernational, and superreligious; a world vision that will allow consensus to be reached in the sphere of state construction and interstate interaction using the solidarity of universal views; a world vision that will become able to create a solid value vertical possessing a centripetal force. That is, *the American zone of political and economic manageability as a mechanism of sustainable development of a global system*. I am not qualified to judge how I have managed to complete the task. I will be sincerely happy if others do it better than I have.



## Chapter 1

### MYTH OF THE STRUGGLE OF OPPOSITES

#### 1. History of the Idea of Opposites

*The one incapable of comprehending three millenniums exists ignorant in the dark, he has to live for today only.*

*K. Jaspers*

Generally speaking, everyday consciousness does not like to delve into the case of bygone days. It is oriented toward the current moment and a little bit toward the future—that nearest future, without taking care of which there is no way to live. However, it is commonly known that a cognitive process taking a straight, upward course only is unthinkable; it presupposes going back again and again to an initial point and justifying it by all further movement. That is why, in order not to exist ignorant in the dark, it is necessary to try to obtain an understanding of historical knowledge from time to time; so to say, to drill into layers of past experience with your thought and rethink the knowledge gained from the viewpoint of a modern and, I would like to believe, more perfect understanding. An excursion into history is needed to better understand the real reasons for the existing and, one should acknowledge, growing tension of civilization. In fact, only by understanding these reasons rooted in the remote past will we be able to develop the most acceptable way of eliminating them, from the standpoint of efficiency and general safety.

I am inclined to affirm that the social sciences are still far from understanding the reasons for the tragic nature of human





existence. What is most surprising and outrageous is that modern philosophers, economists, and sociologists do not pay serious attention to these, in my opinion, vitally important problems. To a greater degree, they service various social groups and public and political groupings that do not express any striving for the welfare of the whole society or the world community at all. It seems as if social scientists do not understand, or want to understand, that eventually the way to the welfare of an individual social group leads through the welfare of society as a whole. Various groupings, usually opposing each other, in the unison of interests of which representatives of social sciences “sing” are themselves escalators of social tension in the conditions of a contradictory system of life order in a society.

From the above, it follows that scientists, whose views are determined by the position they take in a society, unwillingly contribute to the evil continuing to possess the world; “war of all with all” continues to be a natural condition of society. It is necessary to fight against war, for “healthy” human consciousness, and I am sure that victory in this war will be achieved by evolutionary means—by the creation of a rational or, specifically speaking, a non-contradictory society.

People with kind hearts, striving for, and capable of, thinking rationally, should not wait until high-status scientists give birth to the understanding of a better world order. It is necessary to think intensively and propose one’s own, alternative options to resolve the urgent problems of a modern society. Those people who are tempted by H. Heine’s credo “Give me direct answers to damn questions” should not be ashamed. The damn questions tormenting the minds of thinkers in the present time appeared, in my opinion, as early as in ancient times. To make these questions concrete, one needs to rethink this or that historical period. As an initial point of the theoretical search, it is necessary, I think, to accept the beginning of generation of the so-called antagonistic formations.



Very many people believe that the appearance of a social system based on slavery and the slave system was a historical objective law. It is an accepted view that the general precondition of the appearance of a slave-owning formation was the development of production tools, differentiation, and cooperation of labor, as a result of which the production of surplus product and the appearance of private ownership and exploitation became possible. It is an accepted view that the appearance of large-scale public production in a slave-owning society united slaves with the property of slave-holders—they became a means of production, which has been an objective economic basis of class struggle. For all who think in this way, the centuries-old struggle of social classes was and remains a natural phenomenon. They praise the German thinker, Karl Marx, for discovering what is accepted as a great law of historical movement of class societies—the law of class struggle. Is it necessary to believe all this? It is very difficult to persuade these people to change their minds, as these views have a powerful explanatory basis, in which there is some level of logic. To understand in one way or another is a voluntary matter; that is why one should not try to change their minds or, moreover, blame ignorance. I find it necessary to suggest that everybody thinking about another system of views explains historical events in a different way. Let people themselves compare different logical structures and make their conclusions consciously, that is to say, take some beliefs into their minds and hearts.

In the first stage of social development, which was called “primitive,” people lived in small, self-governing groups. A communal form of life for a human society was the most rational, justified by difficult and dangerous living conditions. With the help of primitive tools made of stone, bone, and wood, people communally earned their means of living. The main methods of gain were hunting and gathering, to which fishing was added later. A community created (or converted) a product



no more, or not much more, than was necessary to provide for the physical existence of all its members. In these conditions, the existence of communal (common or, in other words, collective) ownership of the means of production and items of consumption, and especially food, was a necessity. Food was distributed among all members of a community, not depending on whether or not they had participated in its gaining. Such distribution is usually called “egalitarian.” It does not mean the distribution of a product equally among everybody, although this could have taken place.

The essence of the distribution system existing in those times was that every member of a primitive society had a right to part of product created in it, exclusively by virtue of belonging to a community. *The size of a received share depended, first of all, on the volume of manufactured product*, and also on the requirements of a separate individual. Initially, communities were small—usually they did not exceed several tens of people. Each of them presented itself (first of all, in economic regard) as an independent social body. There were no special authority organs inside communities, and there were no officials. Some people could use significant influence, but this was based exclusively on their personal traits. The only regulator of people’s behavior was the will of the community (primitive morality), expressed in public opinion and entrenched in customs and traditions.

The natural improvement of productive forces and, consequently, the increase of mass of surplus product brought to awareness the fact that an egalitarian distribution prevents further development of production. The necessity for distribution of labor was acknowledged. The generation of a new way of distribution contributed to the appearance of individual ownership, an increased role of the family as an economic unit, and the appearance of property inequality between families and individuals. The processes of appearance of personal property