

The Slave Syndrome

by cleaves *Tuesday, Jan 25 2005, 7:29pm*

international / social/political / feature

Throughout human history people have sought (or accepted) leadership in one form or another. Whether the subservient mentality manifests as identification to a pre-existing belief system or the need to follow another human being – the result is subjection. Forfeiting one's sovereignty in either or both cases relegates the subscriber to subservience. Anthropologists and sociologists accept this behaviour as a fundamental aspect of human society and an essential element in the formation of 'civilised' societies. This particular worldview is now taken as a given social reality.

Few, if any human beings would feel comfortable in the knowledge that they are slaves, yet the majority assume that role and rarely attempt to alter their position. What are some of the principal formative factors involved in the production of modern slavery?

During the socialisation process affective external formative stimuli become internalised and any pre-existing sense of being is lost, displaced or suppressed by the internalisation of cultural values. Reactions to socialisation are varied, the entire range of conformist and 'deviant' behaviour occurs. Nevertheless, the affective role of culture is maintained by its ability to relegate all behaviours to mapped social 'spaces.' Culture captures all social activity in regulated social spaces in order to ensure its continuity. Conformity and deviation (as manifest behaviours of socialisation) are accommodated both as productions and characteristics of culture.

All social behaviours are the direct result of the socialisation process. These behaviours fall into two categories, that of compatibility with the prevailing system or incompatibility. Deviance (including criminality) is a failure to follow a particular prescribed course, yet even the 'criminal' is produced by culture in the same way as the 'saint'. Both are defined (in every sense of the word) by the culture that produced them and as such exist in predefined social spaces. The only location for the non-slave would be as the 'other' as this is the only designation that exists outside defined social spaces.

The preceding brief introductory analysis opens numerous avenues for further investigation. However, we shall choose one aspect of social behaviour as the focus of our analysis – that of seeking leadership.

The act of seeking and accepting leadership is the foundation stone of self-subjugation. Seeking implies loss and/or need. In the social context of seeking leadership the implication is clear, the seeker is devoid of the ability to determine his/her own course. This raises the question of how that loss or need occurred/arose and whether this occurrence is a 'natural' social phenomena or the result of socialisation? The term leadership here used can be a pre-existing ideology, Capitalism, Marxism, institutional religious doctrine or persons representing ideological positions, 'new age,' alternative etc., there are many variations and permutations but all offer a form of leadership or a system to which people subscribe.

The most common social agent that creates the sense of loss (and a consequent "need") is religious ideological doctrine. Almost everyone is exposed and affected (at an early age) by this pervasive

agent of socialisation. The method of inculcation is crude but effective – coercion! The subject is intimidated, psychologically terrorised and if necessary physically maltreated to ensure the ‘successful’ introduction of doctrinal values. This process is tantamount to child abuse as nature (or infinite creation) has endowed all of its creation with the essential requirements for a harmonious existence. There is no need for the perverse doctrines of men. However, the imperative of cultural continuity demands indoctrination.

A brief analysis of a particularly pervasive theological model follows. The Mosaic model is the progenitor of Capitalism, Marxism, Socialism, Fascism, Totalitarianism and all their variations.

An historical investigation of the genesis of the prevailing Western hierarchical social model reveals the source as emanating from ancient Egypt – the land of autocratic God-King-Pharaohs.

A renegade Pharaoh (Akhenaten) formed an elitist monotheistic cult which was later suppressed by other ruling factions. The evidence of its survival as an underground movement is borne out by its later emergence in the Canaanite lands as the monotheistic cult of Jehovah (the hymn to Aten and Psalm 104 bear remarkable similarity). The story of Moses, the first tyrannical, dictator, statesman of the Old Testament is well known and needs no further description here. The patriarchal model of rule that he (Moses) adapted from the Egyptian Ra cult has had and continues to have a profound effect on various societies, especially in the area of population management.

It should be stated that ancient Egypt was not a barbaric society, it was the most sophisticated and advanced society of its day. The later adaptation of the Aten-Ra ideology by Moses does not bear the ideals of the original. Jehovah presents as a bloodthirsty, cruel, avaricious and terrible God who demands total obedience (subservience). This barbaric God also favoured capital punishment, torture, murder of enemies, conquest of lands, plunder of wealth, taxing of subjects, property rights, racism, genocide, infanticide and numerous other deplorable behaviours ‘He’ also displayed numerous familiar emotions and characteristics, such as jealousy, anger, vengeance, retribution, regret and sorrow. It is easily appreciated that this ‘God’ has very human characteristics – how could it be otherwise? All Gods are human fabrications elevated to all-powerful, peerless positions for the purpose (among others) of organising and regulating societies.

It can be surmised that Moses would have learnt from observing Egyptian culture and from his elitist education, that it was more expedient to internalise regulatory codes in individual subjects rather than maintain an expensive military or other physical policing methods. I would mention that this lesson was learnt very late by the Romans [the economic pressures of maintaining an empire by military means was a major problem for Roman ruling elites.] It was the emperor Constantine who finally adopted the economically expedient method of theocratic social control. As a result, the militaristic Roman Empire was transformed into the ‘Holy’ Roman Empire, which continued to rule Europe for another fifteen hundred years.

Any doubts relating to the efficacy of this method are removed by an examination of the historical record, which details numerous instances of atrocities and plunder committed by societies that follow the Mosaic model. Christian, Judaic and Islamic societies are an expression of this model. Compare the wanton killing, plunder, oppression and exploitation that characterise these societies with that of Buddhist societies. The values associated with socialisation (in the comparative case) are in strong contrast. Furthermore, it is a simple matter to identify societies today that follow the Mosaic model.

Modern Western secular society owes the existence of its regulatory state institutions to the theocrats of the past. To ensure continuity these theocrats commissioned scribes to encode their

'religious' regulatory doctrines in texts. Today the world's largest religions are those that possess 'holy' texts or Scriptures.

Modern secular institutions of education and law all evolved from theocratic models. In Western societies secular institutions are the principle means of inculcating values, notwithstanding religious institutions that continue to have direct influence.

With no exceptions, the masses of all cultures retain their 'subject' status and remain slaves to various ideological doctrines. Whether a particular social model is preferable to another is irrelevant. All social models of 'civilised' societies are characterised by subjection of the masses - benevolent or tyrannical systems are not at issue.

I conclude with an impossible proposition for the socialised self-defeatists and that is to allow our youth the opportunity to grow without contorting the innate sense of being which has been bestowed by universal creation. Notions that infinite creation can be improved upon are absurd. As for socialised adults, the road to freedom lies in the re-collection of the innate Self.

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-56.html>