

## Faruk İncecik, Division of Pediatric Neurology, Department of Pediatrics, Adana, Turkey

Faruk İncecik

Division of Pediatric Neurology, Department of Pediatrics, Adana, Turkey.

\*Corresponding Author: Faruk İncecik, Division of Pediatric Neurology, Department of Pediatrics, Adana, Turkey.

Received Date: 04 March 2024 | Accepted Date: 11 March 2024 | Published Date: 19 March 2024

Citation: Faruk İncecik, (2024), Faruk İncecik, Division of Pediatric Neurology, Department of Pediatrics, Adana, Turkey, *J. Brain and Neurological Disorders*. 7(2): DOI: [10.31579/2642-973X/097](https://doi.org/10.31579/2642-973X/097)

Copyright: © 2024, Faruk İncecik. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of The Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

### opinion

The modern era is full of ideologies and doctrines that generally have roots in serious academic disputes, theoretical thoughts, or ethical concerns. Nevertheless, formulations, which may be full of recommendations and calculations, or doctrines, which may be packed with justifications or condemnations, or prophecies, which may be filled with wishes or fears, may not be calibrated without pragmatic measures, experiences, or outlooks. Methodically, even practice may not always be sufficient for standardizing a construction because restricted experience in a limited setting may not be enough for normalizing big ideas, plans, or extrapolations, though it may not be worthless either. For example, while historical events may be processed ideologically, like historical materialism from a Marxian perspective, or commonsensically, like customary historians, analyzing history without considering its context, namely associated sociocultural dynamics in a specific period of time, may not be constructive enough for the discovery of its concealed implications or its genuine roots. Accordingly, it demands a multidimensional exploration, which may include a specific ideology or perspective as well. Otherwise, it would result in only one-sided conclusions. Likewise, followers of a specific ideology may believe why other people are not thinking similarly to them, why they have so many antagonists, why their favorite philosophy has not captured, so far, enough national and international advocates, or why their attractive beliefs have been invented so gradually or revealed so lately. Thus, is their brainpower or judgment superior to that of other people? Similarly, such attitudes may be the cult's devotees' outlooks as well (1). Possibly, they do not consider that their conviction is the outcome of a specific series of events, relationships, educations, and experiences that may have innumerable variances amongst people in every community and even household. Therefore, people behave and think differently, which designates their own character. Consequently, any discrepancy in the said parameters may cause dissimilar mindsets, and different frames of mind may generate different judgments. This is the basis of cultural differences between societies, which have roots in historical, geopolitical, and international affairs, too. On the other hand, culture is not independent of social structure, economic situation, or political affairs. While there are a lot of similar social problems around the world, there is no lack of dissimilar public complications as well, which are particular to definite civilizations. Expressing comments or doctrines regarding people who have not been visited or comprehended perceptibly by the associated

doctrine may fail to provide the anticipated result (2). Allegorically, logic is not independent of locality. Similarly, a politician who has never understood his own society may act like a teacher who has never recognized his own pupils or a musician who has never acknowledged the preferences of his own audiences. Anyhow, there have been a lot of ideas, advice, rules, or predictions that either have never been applicable, administratively, or favorable, publicly; maybe because there has been discrepancy, obscurity, or untimeliness between associated dynamic forces, which should prepare the public minds for acceptance of pioneering ideas. But attainment of such an optimal match is not always easy. For example, while many Marxist scholars, in recent decades, like neo-Marxists, have tried to understand why the typical Marxist revolution, which had been introduced, theoretically, as an ultimate and deterministic phenomenon, has never occurred classically and repeatedly in the world, so far, and communist groups have not attained their desired or supposed political position in many parts of the world, even in democratic systems, have tried to solve their dilemma scholastically, and to find their replies in other scientific fields, like psychoanalysis, critical psychology and cultural studies, and, at the same time, to rely more on workers' group and unions, social movements, academic debates, or existent and never-ending formulaic class struggle (3, 4). They may think that if they could invent newer tactics, incentives, or beautifications, they might gain a higher, better, or more stable social position and political power, especially in democratic regimes, which are based on balloting and straight social feedback. The said question is a regular concern of Marxist activists in many liberal-democratic or social-democratic systems, in competition with their non-Marxist or capitalist party-political challengers. The same quandary, as well, may have caused cognitive dissociation and hopelessness in many leftist individuals who have lost their faith in promised inevitability, determinism, or revolt. Disregard for the accuracy or unreliability of Marxism as a basis for sociological, financial, and political analysis of events and its frequent revisions or divisions or historical rise and fall; leftists' expectations for critical restructuring of society and re-distribution of power and resources; and the ultimate turning of a class-conscious society into a classless commune have not been accomplished due to many reasons, including political and non-political causes. But one of the most important prohibitive reasons that seems to have been missed many times in academic debates is the role of deep states in different systems, which may act overtly and aggressively in despotic regimes and covertly and keenly in democratic administrations (5). No established system, whether conservative or liberal, may be expected to tolerate the threat of an upcoming riot for the

sake of others' ideological or humanistic benefits or standpoints. They see themselves, sincerely or insincerely, in service of the majority of people, whether sophisticated or gauche, elite or hoi polloi, industrious or user, devotee or traitorous, minority or majority, etc. They have information, power, resources, and their specific cliques, and they try to bypass approaching threats or unrest by suppressing and forbidding radical groups or activists in despotic systems or marginalizing and neutralizing them in democratic systems. Hence, since this is not a well-adjusted battle, the activists from the working class, who usually lack comparable power, money, assets, or support, may eventually become exhausted and inactive or may be hired by organizations that were supposed to be nemeses. Also, since many theoretical supporters of radical groups belong to the middle class of society, who, though they may have enough knowledge, may not acquire enough motivation or insight, and so may not tolerate the lingering of class struggle easily, they may change their political orientation sooner than activists from the working class, who are expected to have experienced virtual deprivation, which may energize more resistance, higher enthusiasm, and longer protests. On the other hand, experienced deep states usually know how to stretch, complicate, or transform the game of power so gradually, disguisedly or astonishingly, that it may eventually persuade people to believe that this is the society that takes distance from radical groups, not the system, which is, apparently, running fairly and robotically, without any attention to radical campaigners. Therefore, class struggle could lead to basic alterations if deep states permitted changes to happen smoothly. Though radical views usually have populist magnetism, especially for people who are bigotedly or fervently in search of fast justice, equality, freedom, and wealth, the passage of time and the circulation of resources, which are, in general, managed by deep states, may change the game so delicately or fantastically that neither opponents nor allies may actually differentiate their companions or antagonists. So, it is not surprising that some social democratic systems are among the allies of capitalist regimes, and some socialistic administrations are among the partners of fundamentalist organizations. This, once more, shows that, contrary to ardent ideologists, who believe that human beings should be in service of philosophical objectives, ideology may be in service of power and hegemony, especially when deep states of different regimes may collaborate covertly and globally for trapping, defacement, marginalization, deletion, neutralization, or deactivation of troublesome critics or meddling radicals, and attainment of their shared political objectives. Therefore, Marxist thinkers who ask why their favorite revolution has not occurred so far in their own society may find some important answers, too, in the delicate and systematic maneuvers of correlated deep states, in addition to current academic debates or shortages of assets, fans, or propaganda. Similarly, there are many social or political activists who, while they may announce logical or understandable protests or intentions, may fail repeatedly because they may ignore over and over again the sociocultural physiognomies of their target communities. For example, a historian may ignore the demographic characteristics of a nation in a specific epoch, which, for example, may have experienced fatal calamities, and, consequently, may try to analyze preceding happenings with present-day evidence or judge others' predilections and attempts through their own yearnings. Such types of analysts may easily accuse the victims per se as the cause of past mishaps and present misfortunes and project their subjective inner conflicts as objective reasons for occurrences. Though history is, emblematically, a one-sided pathway between the past, present, and future, it is not like a monochrome identity and involves a mixture of people and ideas, which may end in different events. Nobody can condemn past failures without considering the dialectic of dynamics that have caused a social deterioration, regression, or incident. Similarly, no success is analyzable without a multidimensional approach. Another example of inaccuracy, overstatement, or meddling, which may have deterred the desired revolt by leftists and turned a radical view into a social effort or protest, may include some Marxists' advocacy respecting free love and homosexuality in the last epochs, which may have centrifuged or dwindled some

potential followers, who could see Marxism as an avant-garde political ideology rather than a psychosexual campaigner or theoretician. Though Marxism was indeed a radical outlook regarding politics, sociology, and economics, and maybe its doctrine regarding influential links between infrastructure and sociocultural phenomena is unique, its obsessive overlaps with unlike items, like sex and homosexuality, may act reversely on potential supporters who belong to different social classes. Since the working class constitutes, quantitatively, the majority of dynamic people in every society, and homosexuals, in contrast, are among the minor (sexual) groups of every community, with their own preoccupations, stigmas, or social challenges, in addition to widespread gossip regarding the hostility of Marxism to the traditional structure of the nuclear family, which may not have been addressed correctly by Marxist theorists, may produce a milieu that is full of mistrust, misapprehension, and mistaken belief against leftism or leftists. Though Marxist philosophers may have faith in broad-spectrum open-mindedness with respect to thinking, behavior, and decision-making, even up to a stateless anarchistic level, the masses, as the constituents of every society, may not handle that so straightforwardly or intellectually. On the other hand, while normalization of abnormal patterns, if not impossible, is not stress-free, the side effects of deviation, too, are not continuously unobjectionable. The same inference may be applicable to similar normalizations like unisexism, which tries to bypass gender-specific traits or peculiarities, and transgenderism, which may fill the theoretical gaps of unisexism, though gender dysphoria is still a psychiatric disorder. Though the Marxian approach may consider itself a critical tool for the re-assessment of prevalent totems and taboos and the sociological intervention of current cultural stereotypes, it should also be aware of the great political costs of such interferences. On the other hand, though some scholars or elites may have faith in the eventual convincing of the world by similar propaganda and schemes, they should not forget that groups, which could not yet convince the majority of their own people, seem unlikely to convince the majority of people in the world. Cultural globalization, which might have been supposed initially, by some intellectuals, for the universalization of innovative outlooks, does not seem to be successful without vigilant consideration of sociocultural predispositions or insights, which may not automatically be parallel to current rubrics (6); a necessity for the prevention of social cleavage, disgust, or tension. Frequent rise and fall of sociopolitical processes may show that neither cultural values nor sociopolitical activities have enough stability for over-all formulations or one-sided anticipations. Modernism, humanism, and liberalism may not be matched with each other without consideration of the mindset of the silent majority, in addition to sociopolitical campaigners and their aficionados. Though homosexual or transgender people may declare that since science, medicine, or behavioral sciences have been incapable, so far, of finding curative or corrective treatments or procedures for turning homosexual individuals into heterosexual persons and transgender people into standard folks, the general public should leave them alone to deal with their own social humiliation and encounters. Psychiatry could not find unconditional healing methods for other psychiatric disorders or aberrancies, either. Addiction, psychoses, mood disorders, anxiety disorders, paraphilia, somatoform disorders, dissociative disorders, personality disorders, factitious disorders, and so on have fractional medicinal and psychotherapeutic management because modern psychiatry is based on phenomenology and descriptive psychopathology, not etiology, an approach that was majorly mandatory, not willingly (7). Also, while antipsychotic medications may break the toughest delusions, they may not impact thoughts, overvalued ideas, or drive. Thus, while cure, usually, does not have a distinct position in psychiatry, management of psychiatric disorders, too, is commonly half-done. Anyhow, the wellbeing of the general public does not permit scientific psychiatry to surrender to the populist and exciting propaganda of the antipsychiatry movement (7). Modern psychiatry, which is also based on evidence-based medicine, is obliged to approach objectively, not subjectively, and tries to differentiate between normal and abnormal based on the degree of deviation from

observable facts, accessible data, and historical or evolutionary processes. Accordingly, any judgment that is not based, for example, on karyotype, endocrinology, or neuroscientific proofs may be unsound and unscientific, even if it is populistically pleasing. Nevertheless, why do ordinary people avoid normalizing the behavior of people with aberrant sexual orientations, preferences, or exhibitions? Perhaps, because: a) it may endanger the traditional borders of the nuclear family (father, mother and children), while it concurrently thwarts quantitative growth of community due to its uncultivable consequences ( 8, 9 ), b) it may interfere with normal identification of their children with their own parents, c) they may affect normal orientation of adolescents with identity problem, who are prone to mental turbulence, d) they may induce false impressions in some simple-minded people, who may, fallaciously suppose that exhibition of sexual aberrancy is a hallmark of innovativeness or open-mindedness, and e) they may increase, misleadingly, the number of confused bisexual persons or regretful homosexual individuals, who may, eventually, comprehend that they, innately, are not, the persons that others are, now, acquainted with. On the other hand, it is not deniable that negation of a preference is not equal to its extinction, and denial of a preoccupation may not automatically lead to its modification. In such a situation, and if no clear-cut solution or treatment, at least according to present data and means, is imaginable, the “rule of law” will, inevitably, determine, as a problem-solving strategy, the borders of freedom and conduct (8, 9). But some influential Marxist thinkers, too, were not devoid of such contrasting attitudes. For example, while, in line with utopian socialism, some Marxist theorists supposed that a person's sexual flavors had nothing to do with a man's political character and all sexual expressions should be enjoyed as long as people are not abused, and affirming one's difference may actually enhance social integration, other similar thinkers were accusing homosexual people as persons who are extremely against nature, warning against such types of theorization and social advocacies, and also prohibiting too much emphasis on issues unrelated to class struggle. Likewise, some socialist intellectuals warned communists of the dangers of same-sex love and labeled it as upper-class, metropolitan, and imported corruption. In the same way, while some anarchists demand freedom in everything, including sexuality, and believe that homosexuality could lead to a healthy sense of egoism (10–13), there were also anarchists who believed that nature had provided a perfect answer to human relationships and that an anarchist must avoid any relationship with homosexuals (14); standpoints, which seemed to fade again after World War II and the repealing of Nazi-era anti-sodomy laws; denial of fascism or totalitarianism (15); appearance of neo-Marxism; and blossoming of liberalism and neo-liberalism; Anyway, at least psychiatrically, people who are suffering from gender dysphoria or any other type of sexual aberrancy may be known as help-seekers, who deserve systematic care and demand scientific answers to their ceaseless social challenges and personal problems. The assumption of parallelism between atheism and materialism, while the materialism dialectic was proposed essentially for taking into account the tangible facts for analysis of history (historical materialism), surroundings, and events, could be accounted for as another example of slipup by some Marxist thinkers. The said immoderation has possibly dropped, over the years, many potential followers who might suppose leftism as equal to profanity and leftists as instinctively corrupted people. To sum up, even if a sociologist does not gather enough pragmatic experience by living among different groups of people and civilizations and cannot assess the existing theories through his personal observations or firm proof, he may never successfully integrate his theoretical knowledge with the circumstances of his own society or be able to

accurately analyze foreign societies' circumstances. The end result of such a failure may include half-done formulations, mistaken theorizations, and, maybe, losing allies and turning fortune into famine. Though knowledge may provide necessary context for cerebral elites to ponder better and analyze in depth, the library and literature may not replace streets and lanes if theorization is supposed to be in support of the masses, not power, and tries to solve the existing problems, not dumping the general common sense, for gaining oligarchic profits. The dichotomy between elites and the masses may provide a gap that may not be filled easily by law or lectures.

## References:

1. Shoja Shafti S.(2020). Narcissism: Groundwork for Sectarian Misdemeanors. *International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health* ; 2: 08 -16.
2. Saeed Shoja S. (2023).Modernization, Anarchy and Evolving Societies: Reconsideration of a Challenging Stance. *International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health* ; 5: 17-22.
3. Shoja Shafti S. Class Struggle: (2022).A Critical Review in the Field of Political Psychology. *Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research* ; 45: 36199-36207.
4. Shoja Shafti S. (2022).Political Economy and Mental Health: A Reconsideration in Modern Era. *J. Clinical Research Notes*; 3: 1-5.
5. Shoja Shafti S. (2022).Deep State and Attuned Democracy: Political Affairs vs Political Psychology. *Journal of Clinical & Community Medicine*; 4: 441- 443.
6. Shoja Shafti S. (2021).Sociobiology Against Globalization: Hypothetical Battle in the Field of Evolutionary Psychology. *Journal of Psychiatry Research Reviews & Reports*; 3 (1): 1 – 6.
7. Shoja Shafti S. (2021).Antipsychiatry Against Psychiatry: Remonstrations vs. Responsibilities. . *Journal of Psychiatry Research Reviews & Reports*; 3 (3): 1 – 7.
8. Shoja Shafti S. (2023).Sex and Radicalism: A Sociobiological Approach. *International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health* 2023; 5:29-34.Shoja Shafti S. Secessionism vs. National Solidarity: Political Psychology of Societal Cleavage. *International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health*; 5: 23-28.
9. Kinsman G, Patrizia Gentile P. (1994)).The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), p. 65. Weikart R. History of European Ideas . *Journal of History Britain.*; 18:657-672.
10. D'Emilio J, Estelle B. Freedman, (2012),Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America, 3rd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, ), p. 316.
11. Evans JV. (2005),The Moral State: Men, Mining, and Masculinity in the Early GDR. *German History*, 23:3, , pp.355-370.
12. Shoja Shafti S. (2023).Human Beings and Anarchistic Inclinations: A Reexamination. *Online Journal of Neurology and Brain Disorders*; 6 (5): 616-619.
13. Shoja Shafti S. (2021).Jung as a Fascist Theorist or Philanthropic Victim: A Second Look. *Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research*; 38: 30160- 30167.



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

To Submit Your Article Click Here:

**Submit Manuscript**

**DOI:10.31579/2642-973X/097**

**Ready to submit your research? Choose Auctores and benefit from:**

- fast, convenient online submission
- rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- authors retain copyrights
- unique DOI for all articles
- immediate, unrestricted online access

At Auctores, research is always in progress.

Learn more <https://auctoresonline.org/journals/brain-and-neurological-disorders>