

POLITICS VERSUS ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL THINKING

Ciprian-Beniamin Benea

Department of International Business, Faculty of Economics, University of Oradea, Oradea, Romania
c_benea@yahoo.com

Abstract: *In a world where man has been regarded since ancient times by philosophers as a zoon politikon (Aristotel, 2001), and whose traits reverberates through centuries, focusing upon some of its peculiarities could only be refreshing. As the military, social, economic, and cultural traits of globalization have been accelerating, the leaders of different nations felt there is a slippery ground upon which they could take decisions. Lot of them have been bad prepared to fully understand these processes, or haven't been capable to harness the national potential of their countries towards extracting benefits from these processes. There are small countries which have well understood the path the world was heading to, and they have acted accordingly; Singapore, South Korea, Finland or Switzerland could be such positive examples. All these have gained a lot as globalization has been widening. While others, with far greater potential in comparison with all these countries, are fighting for their survival. For these others, globalization has brought more pain than relief. The domestic society in all these examples and its traits has played important roles for these different paths, but there couldn't be neglected the crucial role of political leadership in both, the successful countries, and the less successful ones. Without naming a peculiar state, the paper focuses in fact upon the character a man of state should have in a globalized world, and which should be the main focuses for him. There are presented in a contrasting manner the characteristics of political man, face-to-face with the characteristics of the man who thinks politically. In a globalized world the economic diplomacy can help a state in its geopolitical interests' promoting, and a successful economic diplomacy is of crucial importance for having a healthy statehood. The paper mention that a healthy state is formed and is based on its citizens, while a weak or even a failed stated has the illusion of being based on individuals. There are presented the differences between individuals and citizens, and which are the benefits for having a society formed by citizens leaded by a man who thinks and acts politically, in a globalized economy and society.*

Keywords: *citizens; individuals; man who tinks politically; political man*

JEL classification: *F49; P41; P50; Z1*

Background

Common people and men of state are searing for freedom, security and prosperity, and in most cases, of power *per se*, defining their aims in the name of a religious, philosophical, economic, or social ideal.

Nowadays, there are very few cases of states where their elites are entitled by custom and force to lead the societies. With the exception of North Korea, Sri Lanka, and Cuba, there are a plethora of democracies in the world; at least on papers...

In this context, if there is a difference between common man and the man involved in politics, this difference would be much larger between a political man and a man who is used to think politically. We can see and understand this difference if we throw even short a bird-eye view upon Mommsen's political testament (Mommsen, 1987), opened fifty years after his death, in 1903. Even there could seem a commonality between these two categories there is a huge gap between them. Political man is looking at a constantly changing picture, being more attuned to domestic politics, and election cycles, these being of outmost importance to him; his calculations are focused upon votes in election years. His key-interest is success in elections – and because of this reason, all his actions are determined by *public opinion*, and its evolution. Sometimes he searches to influence this opinion and its evolution, to canalize it, and to exploit it in his (or his party) interests, when the elections take place.

Propaganda and politics are inseparable in this case, sometimes with dramatic consequences for state as a whole, and for each tax payer in particular. The situation is more dramatic, when political man who created a public opinion and a trend connected to it, has to follow it. He sees himself engulfed by this public current and it must follow it. He is facing the situation of being swallowed by the trend it had created. Put shortly he committed a fraud upon electorate; an ideological fraud. He could create a trend which has nothing to do with reality and real life events and he could find himself trapped in the position following this trend, finding in the end that he committed a fraud, first upon himself, and then upon his voters. First he lied himself regarding the finality and benefits of his actions, and then – of course – his voters... Myths, imagined fears, fraudulent economic and social doctrines could be created in this way, but then their negative effects impact their promoters, and society at large.

Past events (old and recent), individual character, informal networks, all push political man to act in the manner mentioned. He wishes political power for himself and for political faction to which he is belonging to. Of course, there could be a situation where his interests and his party's interests overlap national interests, but this situation has a character of probability, being filled with unknown facts.

There is a peculiar discipline – political marketing – which is focused upon identifying ways to promote peculiar interests (narrow party, or even personal interests) on voters' market, his conspicuous aim being this market's conquering, and competition's marginalization. It is one of the purest types of political struggle, but its vision is shortsighted, and its effects, in most cases, negative.

Face-to-face with him, and in a very contrasting position is situated man who thinks politically; he is focused upon the national interest. Contrasting the political man, a man who thinks politically is always focused upon strategic and long term interests of his nation, looking through all means to provide it a prosperous future among other nations of the world. If he gets to this point using all means, but force, his policy would be an extremely wise one and full of finesse, attaining in this way both, peace and prosperity. He would be regarded as a promoter of human civilization; anyway, peace and civilization are two facets of the same coin. A man who thinks politically must possess traits which promote him into this venerable position: vision and character. He who thinks politically must possess both these traits; one without the other makes him vulnerable, and, in fact, pushes him quickly out from the national and humankind history.

Having vision, but missing character could help him in understanding the evolution of international political context, and of the path world is heading to, but he could exploit this personal talent to attain only narrow interests (personal or small group interests). Having character, but missing vision could endow him with a rigidity which could cost him its political “death”, and, as a consequence, of the ideas and ideals it has intended to promote.

In this context, for example, could one dare to accuse Talleyrand of treason? And the answer is fully: No! Nowhere could one ever find an indication reflecting had he ever betrayed the interests of France, which mean all to him. This is one of the best examples of a man who thinks and acts politically. We now turn our attention towards Machiavelli, who had dedicated all his life and efforts to study and develop the means and methods to create a unified and powerful Italy. His endeavors were rewarded over three centuries, when, in his honor, the first capital city of Italian Republic was chosen Florence, the city which he had served as Secretary of the Florence’s Second Office (nowadays the equivalent of foreign minister position).

Even they were regarded with suspicion in some circles – especially religious circles – their life’s cornerstone was their nation’s prosperity. Centuries after their death, the humankind rehabilitated them, and their home country rewarded both, granting them their deserved places among peoples who marked humankind history. As one walks from Palazzo Vecchio towards Ponte Vecchio, he could observe the Machiavelli’s statue, on the left side of the road. With his specific smiling, he seems to be pleased with the noise he had created through “*Il principe*”, book which is the base of modern political theory, being the philosopher who methodically pointed first the separation between State and the Church. And this is an extraordinary example of a man who thinks politically...

Or, closer to our times and souls, stays the example of a man of state: Alexander Ioan Cuza. He had to defy not only the national opposition coming from an agrarian society, crystallized over one millennium, along the interests of an old and powerful institution – the Orthodox Church – but he had to counter the interests of three political powerful neighbors, the Russian Empire, Austrian Empire, and Ottoman Empire with its Phanariot influences. His vision and character – coupled with the French support which cannot be overlooked – had pushed Romania out of the Middle Age onto modernization, during his short tenure (1859-1866). Carol the 1-st continued Cuza’s vision and gave life to the reforms initiated by his predecessor, placing Romania on the orbit of civilization and independence.

And these are all examples of men who think and act politically...

Contrasting political man – who concentrates his attention on political sociology, with its subdivisions given by religious orientation, sex, age, social class, and ethnic groups of the *individuals* who generate his electoral basin – the man who thinks and acts politically *must* comprehend the deep traits of the *citizens* of his nation, or their peculiar *style*, as Lucian Blaga (2011) synthetically pointed to them. Taking account of this peculiar national style, and of geographical, historical, and prospective contexts, the man who thinks politically struggles to provide to his nation a better place among other nations of the world. He is in the position of man in searching for solutions – not votes – to present and especially future problems the nation he is belonging to would encounter.

Behold these traits supporting the thesis that a man of state must possess the attributes of a man who thinks politically, and not those of a narrow political man...

But the power of a nation could achieve the highest summit when a man who thinks politically is supported and followed in his actions by *citizens*.

There is a huge gap between citizens and individuals; the last legitimate themselves with a credit card when they are buying goods and services provided by different private companies, which promote first and foremost their narrow financial interests, which are sometimes coupled with the interests of countries where they are coming from.

The citizens legitimate themselves with an identity card (Malița, 2012: 170), both when they manifest their voting preferences, and when they interact with forces coming upon their state from outside sources. They know they belong to a powerful state; while the individuals belong to a weak state, or even to a failed state. A nation formed by individuals generates a weak state while the nation created by citizens gives a strong state. In the same time, a strong state's institutions know they can rely on citizens, while a weak state's institutions have the illusion they could rely on individuals.

The country where citizens are politically active and, being involved through legal means in administration (locally, regionally, and nationally), witness a vote which is expensive and hard given; while the responsibility of the elected ones is great relating to nation.

The country where the individuals are becoming apathetic towards political phenomena, this apathy being due to a material or cultural impotence, the vote is cheap. As man of state, it is impossible to base the actions and projects upon a population which is dissatisfied and ignorant about its own history and geography, living modestly, where national creed and culture has lost its meanings...

He faces a complex situation where it is impossible to jump from unsophisticated music to Bach; it is hard to identify a future for a nation where individuals are focused only on short term interests, where citizens which would support large and long term projects are few.

In such a case, even a man who thinks politically finds his hands tied, and his aspirations and reflections are impossible to meet real world affairs.

He recognizes himself as being isolated, facing the difficulty of reforming a nation composed from very few people, and a lot of population...

In conclusion

As the reader could observe through paper's reading, there is a huge difference between the political man and the man who thinks politically. In the same time, there is a large gap between individual and citizen.

In a globalized world, the happiest situation is to be found where the man who thinks politically is leading a nation formed by citizens, while the worst situation could be found in cases where a political man pretends to lead a nation formed by individuals, ignorant of their history, geography, and their real potential. It is a striking presentation which signals that in a globalized world the character and the *grey gold* – the brain – is more important than national endowments, pointing to the importance of the men who could think and act politically, in order to promote a resuscitation of a national rebirth.

References

1. Aristotel (2001) *Politica*, București: Paideia.
2. Blaga, L. (2011) *Trilogia culturii*, București: Humanitas.
3. Georgescu, C. (2012) *Pentru un ideal comun*, București: Compania.
4. Machiavelli, N. (2001) *Principele*, București: Mondero.
5. Malița, M. (1977) *Zidul și iedera*, București: Cartea Românească.
6. Malița, M. (2007) *Între război și pace*, București: CH Beck.
7. Malița, M. (2012) *Homo fraudens*, București: RAO.
8. Malița, M. (2016) *Mare și mic*, București: Institutul de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale „Ion I. C. Brătianu”.
9. Mommsen, T. (1987) *Istoria romană*, vol. I, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
10. Potemkin, V. P. (1962) *Istoria diplomației*, București: Editura Științifică.
11. Voltaire (2000) *Political Writings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.