

Romuald Starosielec

Is it allowed to convert to democracy with a sword?

In the years 1414 – 1418 on the Church council in Constance (Ger. Konstanz), came a delegation from Poland, who caused a huge debate on the methods of conversion of the pagans. **The priest Paweł Włodkowic from Poland, asked an important question to the gathered European elite: is it allowed to convert to the Christian faith with a sword?** A long-lasting and fierce quarrel, which took place at that time, brought a praiseworthy solution, both for Poland and Europe. Most notable individuals of that age acknowledged that it is not allowed to convert to the Christian faith with violence, and that decision put an end to acceptance of barbarian practice of Teutonic Order (German Order [Deutscher Orden]; full name in English: The Order of Brothers of the German House of Saint Mary in Jerusalem, Ger.: Orden der Brüder vom Deutschen Haus Sankt Mariens in Jerusalem; latin: Ordo fratrum domus hospitalis Sanctae Mariae Theutonicorum in Jerusalem).

Today, the Western World has reached a point of very similar challenge: most powerful countries, who are allegedly Polish allies, gave themselves the right to impose the system of liberal democracy on other nations and states with violence. In the name of expanding the democracy rights they undertake the actions, which are in reality a hidden aggression or an open war against the states, which, belonging to a different civilization circle, oppose to accept alien rules. Let us think for a while: should the Polish president Andrzej Duda, when speaking at the United Nations forum – instead of just saying about 'rights and democracy' – bravely ask our Western allies: **IS IT ALLOWED TO CONVERT TO DEMOCRACY WITH A SWORD?**

PERMANENT WAR ON DEMOCRACY

This is a fundamental question for our future. There is no bigger thing on international arena, which denudes the today's ideological and moral fall of the West, than long-lasting for decades attempts of imposing the "liberal democracy" doctrine on the "remaining part of the world". "Fight for democracy" banner has become a shield, behind which the ideological and economical aggression on other states and nations is performed. This banner has nothing to do with officially proclaimed slogans. The former imperialism was less cynical, and enforced its power on others using mottos like "mission of civilization", or the "zone of influence" principle.

Today's imperialism makes use of ideology, which has not grown on natural fight between mind powers, or rivalry of numerous visions of the international order, but it has grown in the laboratories of societal manipulation. Ideologists of this stream have recognized that maintaining the Western supremacy over the whole world requires social mobilization and emotional engagement of the masses around the idea, which will excuse ideological, economical and military aggression. In that way the "fight for democracy" slogan has been created, and this needs to be executed day by day, regardless of price.

The modern „fight for democracy“ ideologists stem from youth generation of contra-culture of the sixties in the 20th century. They changed their youth ideals of overall-human brotherhood, world without violence and wars, into actions, which, by means of "exporting democracy", should make the mankind happy, even against their will. Amidst these ideologists, however, the biggest influence was gained by the former left-winged radicals, who immediately dropped the trockists' "permanent revolution" slogan and introduced the one of "permanent fight for democracy". This group, defined as "neoconservatives", have gained huge influence in American politics world. However, they have transferred their sect-like mentality from the marginalized social movement into the politics of the world power. Last three decades of the United States policy are affected by this style of political thinking, and, what is even worse, political actions. Another thing is a very dangerous evolution of the democratic system in America itself. The very basic principles of the classical, American conservatism, which is based on grassroots self-organization of the society, have been undermined. Today's state political system has been dominated by growing bureaucracy, which imposes top-down new values and social principles in the internal relationships, whose big objective is to "create the new society". This bureaucracy is currently also a tool of ideology-driven military aggression on other states, which were chosen arbitrarily as non-democratic.

Destruction, which is caused by the „permanent fight for democracy“ can easily be observed on the examples of wars unleashed in Serbia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria, and recently also in Ukraine. A public and social system in each of these countries was based on completely different foundations, referring to other civilization values, different mental, social and cultural traditions. With such diverse conditions, the very presupposed assumption that a violently and externally imposed system of liberal democracy, which was created in totally different conditions, seems to be a very dangerous utopia. We have the right to evaluate the effects of the

actions, which were undertaken to execute this utopia, as political and war felony. It would seem reasonable that "democracy creators", **after the fiasco of wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, revise their strategy, admit their mistakes and withdraw from further wars "in the name of democracy". If they had not done it yet, it is clear, that it is not caring for democracy or human rights that was the imperative for their actions.**

Bureaucratic party of war divides the world into "good" and "bad" according to their arbitrarily defined non-objective criteria. They recognized Syria as such a "bad" country – the country that was a leader in religious tolerance in the Middle East and its society was mentally and culturally closest to the European one, whereas Saudi Arabia, with its radical, Wahhabi type of islam, ruled by absolute masters, has been recognized as a "good" country. The result of the "fight for democracy" in Syria is known: 400.000 people killed, 9 million people, whose houses were devastated, are wandering around the country and around the world. What results brought the "war for democracy" in Ukraine ? Several thousand people were killed, change of one oligarchic system into another oligarchic system was done, economy ruined, massive poverty and workers exodus for food started, and common social and national hatred created.

DEMOCRACY AS SHIELD

Despite such terrifying results, „fight for democracy" doctrine is still valid in the Western world. There are no significant voices of resistance against this doctrine, neither from media, nor think-tanks, churches or political class. However, one can note a weak and inexplicit voice of resistance coming from the left-winged sources, who quickly loses its power under pseudo-patriotic rhetoric of "war party" representatives, who describe its adversaries as "non-patriotic left wing". The false principle of "only democracies can be peaceful" is still in force in the western world. This characteristic sacralization of democracy is a scaremonger for intellectual devastation in environments, who take the cultural and civil responsibility for the West. Democracy is, regardless of how we define it, not just the one of many possible forms of a social system, but becomes a "moral core", the ultimate goal of actions and efforts of the mankind. From this place, it is only a small step towards acknowledging as moral and just every parliament regulation, which gains arithmetic majority. The term of "majority dictatorship" was unfortunately taken out of the public debate.

The objective truth, natural laws and the rights stemming from them for an individual person, family and communities can only exist, if they achieve the majority support.

It is no doubt that such a defined democracy is not understood by non-European societies and nations, and is mainly perceived as a sign of civil and spiritual fall of the West. It is acknowledged as a deadly threat, against which one needs to oppose. Non-efficiency and tragic consequences of a "war for democracy" are clear today, whereas motives, which lead the political elite of the West to further stubbornly execute this doctrine, are incomprehensible. Being aware of all the barriers limiting the possibility of implanting the liberal democracy in other countries, they still enforce it with two objectives. The first is to gain power and economic, political and media domination. The second is to create chaos, weaken the state or cause the significant reduction of its current potential or to unleash a destructive, long-lasting civil war. Crisis management in international relations has become a new form of realization of imperialistic interests without looking at any interests of the conquered states.

In order to realize this aberrant concept, an idea was needed that justifies the planned and taken actions. "War for democracy" has become this justification. Democracy, long before, ceased to be a standard for the globalists, it has rather become a convenient shield, behind which the real goals of global aggression are hidden. There were tries to introduce another term into a public debate – "enlightened interventionism". This term was not acknowledged, but it perfectly depicts the strategy of the global political class. On the one side, this group, in international relations, authorizes interventions which means open violence against sovereign states, on the other side, however, it settles that the right for such interventions is only granted to the chosen ones. Only "the enlightened" can make interventions, and criteria, according to which they are chosen, stay unclear and totally arbitral. This yields malicious consequences in international relations and divides countries into categories: the privileged that deserve to realize the mission of "enlightened interventionism" and the others – that cannot attain this honor. Moreover, these others are more and more often put on a list of those, who due to "breaking of the human rights" and authoritarian governments can become the object of intervention as part of the "war for democracy".

THE RIGHT OF NATIONS FOR SELF-DETERMINATION?

Amid many pathologies that have grown in international relations in the last decades, the leading place takes the marginalization of nations' rights for self-determination. This was a foundation, which shaped Europe after World War I. This right covered not only the right of a nation for its own state, but was extended to the right of a nation for shaping its own state system, that its citizens perceive best for themselves. Well, this right has been totally undermined. This yielded another field for the ideological and political aggression of the "enlightened" part of the political elite of the western world. This problem surpasses by far the sphere of power game, used techniques of social manipulation or information wars that deafen rational thinking. Today's political elite, who are open to multiculturalism in their own societies, who are even its direct promoters there, this elite becomes, on international arena, where cultural diversity is a natural outcome of centuries-old work of generations, a dogmatic believer of the arbitrarily defined doctrine of "fight for democracy". Here the whole hypocrisy of this elite is externalized. They are not able to understand and accept the diversity of the world, its unrepeatable beauty emerging from the number of cultures, languages, customs, systems of values and forms of collective life. Their pursuit of ideological unification, of putting the so diversified world under the power of global interest groups, today constitutes the most severe challenge for social peace and peaceful coexistence of states and nations.

The foundation of sound international relations is the acknowledgement of the right for nations to self-determination, including the right for shaping their own political system in line with their own traditions and with the outcomes of internal elections. Not all the non-European state systems, past and existing, are according to our expectations. Many of them are the opposite of what we acknowledge as sound and right. Nevertheless, imposing violently western solutions within the "fight for democracy" doctrine, nearly always triggers consequences opposite to what was intended. This yields a natural resistance against externally imposed, incomprehensible political systems, the fight against the aggressor is starting, which very often ends with blasting colonial or civil war.

The final outcome of the conflicts initiated by western powers is an occurrence of terrorism. Terrorism is not a cause of the aggressions and wars, but their outcome. Startling is the levity, which touches the western governments, political think-tanks and media, which do not combat the cause of terrorism, but its results, escalating the conflict to such an extent that it endangers, due to the number of living Muslims in Europe, the

social peace itself. In such a way, next to "permanent fight for democracy" we allowed to create a system of "permanent fight against terrorism", which fruit is escalation of terrorism on a world's scale.

KEY QUESTION

The question whether it is allowed to convert to democracy with a sword, is today a key question for the western world. It focuses in itself, what adds up to its weakness. Only a man, who is spiritually weak and morally primitive, converts another with a sword. A man, who is strong in his beliefs, that are based on the lasting foundation of the Latin civilization, a man who has an ambition to convince others to his own values, does not reach the sword. He converts with a word, act and example, he convinces with a solidity of the created institutions, which are created to serve the common good, with the attractiveness of his own culture and depth of his spiritual life. He convinces with a clear and solid system of moral norms, a harmony of social and economical relations, based on respect of human dignity and individualism of each member of the society. He convinces with a real equality towards the law, with a creation of equivalent conditions for intellectual, spiritual and economic development. He convinces finally with a rightly functioning state, which possesses only so many prerogatives, that are granted by its free citizens, the state which is solely organized for guarding the citizens rights and defending them against the potential external aggression.

A man from outside the community understood in such a way, can accept these values voluntarily, without reaching the sword by us. Only voluntary and conscious joining of such a community can be permanent, fruitful and creative. Naturally, this man has also a right of not receiving these values and leading his life according to his own beliefs. If he does so in his homeland, we cannot take these rights from him, because they stem directly from his existing natural laws. All the more we must not convert him with a sword.

As Poles, we are depositaries of the Latin civilization, we are successors of freedom traditions of the Rzeczpospolita (the Commonwealth), therefore **we have the right to demand from our president, according to the prime example of the priest Paweł Włodkowic, that he asks our western allies a simple question: IS IT ALLOWED TO CONVERT TO DEMOCRACY WITH A SWORD ?**

Warsaw, April 2016