

DEMOCRACY AND "POVERTY"
(A POSSIBLE APPROACH FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF HEURISTICS)

UDC 321.74 : 165

Srboljub S. Dimitrijević

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Serbia

E-mail: vidan@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Abstract. *This text would like to open the question of the relationship between democracy and poverty. Not in the sense of poverty as the lack of material wealth, but in the sense of the lack of wealth of knowledge. The intention is to question of the amount and type of knowledge which is linked to people from democratically organized societies. Is in today's world the democratic principle something that causes the progress of individuals in terms of the acquisition of knowledge or is the situation completely different? In the development of the thesis on the relationship between democracy and heuristics we first start with Aristotle's understanding of democracy and human virtue, with his study of the types of government and the position of the democratic way of organizing society.*

Key words: *democracy, poverty, knowledge, virtue, religion, theism, atheism.*

BLESSED ARE THE MEEK FOR THEIRS IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

Destruction, wars, turmoil, pollution, shortages, overpopulation, natural catastrophes, epidemics, hurricanes, tsunamis, earthquakes, the oncoming apocalyptic end, crises ranging from those of the personality to global crises, and the like. "Poverty, with one or two wealthy individuals,¹ with the hyper-production of art, tele-technology, global knowledge. All this following the rise that was brought about by enlightenment, the deifying of science and reason, the end of great ideas, postmodernism, the new modernism and the elimination of the central importance of sense. At the beginning of the 21st century, with the loss of our essence as something inside of us, everything becomes shallow and superficial. It becomes related to everything on the outside, the public, the civil, transparent since the moment of insemination, birth until death and after it. What, except for religion,

Received January 26, 2010

¹ Some of the latest statistical findings indicate that over 20% of the world's capital (the actual amount is difficult to determine) is owned by 3% of the people. They have problems either with their time or a twenty-four hour day. The number of hours is insufficient to control one's own capital, and thus they need far more than just twenty-four.

which insists on a public secret², has survived this change? Democracy (as the best type of rule), is the insistence on everything that is public. Both have spread to world-wide dimensions just like fundamentalism and globalism, invading the empty space of essence, public, transparent, rude and arrogant. Democratism (globalism) and fundamentalism, are they not the same? If nothing else, both are very old. We know when democracy began, while it is more difficult to determine the beginning of religion, as it is very good at hiding it by changing its outward appearance. Both are European creations, born in Ancient Greece and Rome.³ Both are today being used for the purpose of mondialization – democracy as a "new" religion.⁴

*

It is well known that the man responsible for the greatest systematization of antic knowledge, Aristotle, with his detailed analyses, outlined good and bad state organizations, primarily based on the lawfulness and unlawfulness of governing, but based on whether those who rule do so either based on virtue or:

...those who are virtuous but only under certain conditions. (Aristotle, 1984:1293b 10.)

The type of government that is based on the rule of law is good, and the one that breaks the law and which is based on personal gain is bad. The best thing would be if in this type of government we could find only "those citizens who are absolutely the best in terms of virtue", which is automatically required by the first condition. This would be, along with conditions of equality, equal distribution of property, economically developed states, culture, the realization of abilities, size and the like, the best form of government. But the question is how? Are they, the "citizens who are absolutely the best in terms of virtue", born or created in such a state? Still, is it at all possible, in a state as a form of community that was based on interest, to educate people of a virtuous type and to realize the remaining conditions? According to Aristotle this can be achieved through upbringing and education. *But of all the measures for the preservation of the organization of a state, the most important one is the one that everyone neglects today, and that is upbringing in the spirit of social organization.* (Aristotle, 1984:1310a, 20). Through upbringing and education, but of what kind? Not the ideal kind, since no such kind exists, but once again "under certain conditions" or "within the spirit of the organization of the state".

Aristotle said one should either follow the natural state of things or their purpose: the individual with his instincts and needs can be realized only as part of a family, the family as part of a community, in a polis-state everything gets done for him since it is a place

² A man of god, the god-man was publically, semi-clothed crucified on the cross.

³ Cicero's *relegere* "to collect in order to repeat and renew" *religio* as "special attention, respect, care, literally shame or piety". And *religare* which the Christians coined based on them *...(Laktacije & Tertulijan)...tying religion with a relation, or more precisely an obligation, bond, thus a task and with a debt, and so on, between men or between men and God.* Jacques Derrida, 2001:74.

⁴ *...Anglo-American remains Latin. Religion moves throughout the world, so to speak, as a single English word which has stopped for a moment in Rome and having turned around in a semi-circle, returned to the USA. Far above its strictly capitalist and politically-military figures, for centuries we have been witness to hyper-imperialistic acquisition, and we will continue to do so. It is manifested in a particularly sensitive manner and in the conceptual apparatus of international law and the world's political rhetoric.* Ibid, pg. 61.

where everyone should be able to realize oneself. The point lies in the wholeness and reciprocity. The point of an individual's life is the state which as such also determines his life. Good citizens make and a good state and vice versa. The more of them we have, the closer we are to a perfect state. "The citizens who are absolutely the best in terms of virtue", as the precondition for the best type of governing, are those who are "absolutely the best" thanks to their knowledge, and not only "their free will". Since, ...*virtue (is)...the regulation of passions and behavior...*(Aristotle, 1980:1109b I-1.) It can be achieved through "free will" and knowledge. Free will is realized through free acts or "voluntary activities". If *involuntary behavior has occurred due to coercion or through ignorance, then what we might consider voluntary behavior could be the kind of behavior whose moving force (the principle – $\psi\kappa\epsilon$) is found within the actor himself, who knows the individual conditions as part of which the action takes place.* (Ibid, 1111a, 20.) Ethical virtues reside on good will, but they have, in addition to this vital one, also heuristic components. So, dianoethical virtues reside on knowledge and logic and are acquired through study, learning and strenuous exercise.

In order to achieve virtue, and thus a better state, we need an inborn proclivity – free will, habit, exercise, knowledge and the like, so not only unstimulating knowledge; nevertheless it is also necessary, and as such, along with the choices of will represents the true path to virtue and good. Man strives with his natural will for good for himself, and through knowledge, and upbringing he should determine his actions in such a way so as to realize his own but is also mindful of those of others. This would be agnoseological prism of democracy/politics and those concrete individuals who are a part of it. After all, it is obvious that knowledge plays the most important part here. Nevertheless, knowledge is shifting, partly true and should be determined by someone. How do we realize all that then? In two ways, through the ideal of goodness, truth, courage, rectitude, by means of which the community and the individual through knowledge, upbringing and behavior would rise to the ideal better – the Hellenic model; or the proclamation of all knowledge as sacred, as it is, what it refers to and who produces it, and where our intention to rule according to it would be sacred – the Christian model.

Why is this even relevant now? For the very simple reason that, according to our initial comments, it has to do with the actual state of things. The state of my country is one thing, and of my world yet another, a world in which democracy presents itself as the highest principle, while we are actually merely dealing with the manipulation of knowledge. In Serbia, and almost all the countries in transition, people live in a disorder which has to do with democracy and interests or similar to Aristotle's ideas. Namely, in these countries democracy is understood as they system of state government which should, as it was in the time of Athens, satisfy the interests of the majority, but it is more and more often presented as the organization which allows chaotic behavior in which the strongest and the most able in terms of survival use it primarily for purposes of advancement and the acquisition of wealth. So we have a dictatorship of parties, the will to use whatever means necessary, nepotism, corruption, crime, national and religious intolerance, disorder, laziness, lack of satisfaction, an unawareness of the general good, the lack of awareness of oneself, "a lie as the truth" and much more in all the spheres of society, including the religious organizations themselves. It is related to the understanding that poverty is merely the lack of money, and that we will become richer if we achieve democracy or for instance become a member of the EU.

...and what has democracy to do with the interests of the poor...

For Aristotle this is the real situation. All of the concrete forms of state government are ruled by people who "are good under certain conditions". Those in which, in addition to these men, the law also rules, are good but only partially so, that is, there is a flaw or a lack of some sort – poverty. Yet, these are the real or existing means of organizing government in a state, from the best to the worst ones. There are rules (and their various combinations) which are not based on the law, or in other words, the law varies, it could be ambiguous and the like, and it is within them that personal interests are usually realized. Stagiranin in the daily journal *Politika* said: *...tyranny is a monarchy which only sees the interests of the monarch, oligarchy only the interests of the rich, and democracy only those of the poor. None of them keep in mind the general interests of the people.* (Aristotle, 1984:1279b 4.) In all the cases of bad governing, and here we are primarily referring to the interesting combinations of democracy⁵ (and oligarchy) as the rule of the masses (the antipode of a republic) and the rich (the antipode of aristocracy) and with the absence or lack of any laws, a double anomaly can be seen. On the one hand, the collision of two types of interest: the interests of the poor man realized through democracy, the interests of the rich man through oligarchy and the general interest through democracy. On the other hand, democracy and oligarchy then are not able to found a state, but are focused against the interests of the state as a whole. Since, democracy based on the interests of the poor, without bearing in mind the interest of the state, actually destroys it, and the situation is not much different in the case of oligarchy. They go against the natural state of things, that man is only a man when he is a "political being" and that "the more perfect act is the founding a state and the maintaining the welfare of a state ". In a way they are opposed to their own field of interest. So, seen in real time, the state is in its nature also a form of organization of the life of people which is highly controversial, with a lot of tension, so that it is difficult and almost impossible to realize the ideal of a state as a place for the betterment of men. That is why they are born and they die.

*

We have mixed together democracy and oligarchy or a compromise organization, the average, "the common denominator of all types of government, that is politics ". It should be a compromise in relation to the creation of freedom, acquisition of property, the role of ability in relation to the state we find ourselves in. Still, it is a mixture of those who seek their own interests, the poor trying to become wealthy and the wealthy trying to acquire even more wealth, and for these reasons they cannot see the general interests from the realization of freedom, equality in property and ability. Actually, they should be made equal, since in both cases we are dealing with the lack of something, that is, with poverty. Those who do not have something want it, and those who have something want even more.

⁵ Aristotle believed there were four types of democracy which were not that bad since they resided on the law, but were not satisfactory since they were based on the rule of those who are only good under certain conditions. The first one is where the rich and the poor claim equal rights in the eyes of the law (the principle of freedom and equality); the second, those who possessed certain property; the third, where the "citizens who do not have to account for their background" can rule; the fourth, if they are only citizens; and the fifth one is the worst one that Aristotle refers to when he said it was just as bad as tyranny and oligarchy: *"in which everything is the same, but the power lies in the hands of the people, and not the law"*. (Aristotle, *Politika*, 1292a, 3.)

Are we talking about people who are poor in a material sense or in a spiritual sense, to be more precise, people with very little knowledge or poor people in some other sense of the word? What could a person knowledgeable in political organization and the actual state of things, a realist and someone primarily close to what is today considered a scientist⁶, want to state by equating tyranny, oligarchy and democracy? That is, what could be so bad about the greatest ideal and principle in today's world, and that is democracy as a principle?⁷ That is, as we shall see, disrespect of the law and a gratification of one's own interests, and not those of the general population. It is a case of general one-sidedness or "Poverty", in a material sense – the lack of wealth (money) and in a spiritual sense or in terms of knowledge, since they know nothing except how to realize their own interests. All this is opposed to the rule of those "citizens who are the best in terms of virtue" or in actuality those who use their will, knowledge and education to strive to it, but who are very few in number, and found only in degrees. But how will all of them remain? They have to take their place and put on the robe of a citizen with the best virtue, that is, they have to promote themselves with the knowledge that will also be absolute and sacred. Since these kinds of people and these kinds of states are the most frequent, absolute and since they rule them, then what we have is a case of "Democracy" and "Poverty" at work. The only thing missing is "Holy Knowledge" and "Education". Aristotle and the Ancient Greeks determined that it was important, but they still have not actually put it forward, for which special institutions of knowledge are necessary.

All ... *soldiers take the pledge and give suggestions for the rectifying of ill doings and unfavorable political circumstances...* the thirst and the search for the deciding knowledge is general.

Miloš Đurić, in his preface to Aristotle's *Politics*, represented the state in which it was born or the time in which Aristotle lived and which, we might tentatively claim, was similar to our time or was a time of crisis, but also a time of discussing the crisis. *Plato and Aristotle lived at a time of the fastest developing political literature, since this was a time when the Hellenic city state was in crisis, and various philosophers, orators, statesmen, among them even a Spartan, Tíbrón, ..., as well as soldiers decided to speak and gave their suggestions for the correction of unhealthy and unfavorable political circumstances, caused by the awoken appetite for property, the difficult economical inequality and inner problems, which could have taken a turn for the worst, such as the event in Argus, dating from 370, when an enraged mob killed more than one thousand and two hundred citizens...* (Miloš Đurić, *Predgovor*, Aristotel, 1984:VI). The guards were connected to the polis, which may not have been the appropriate setting for the arrival of "citizens who were absolutely the best in terms of virtue", maybe even more so than the other people deprived of knowledge. But even with cosmopolitanism (hellenization – latinization – Europeanization – Americanization) which the polis was accepting more and more. It was obvious that the state, as a polis, as well as a greater state in the world, is very unstable. There is that necessarily obligatory fact that it is there for people in power with spe-

⁶ Aristotle had no desire to be a reformer, ...*he did not wish to change the world but he did wish to find out everything that could be the subject matter of knowledge, from the most abstract of logic to the liveliest turmoil and most colorful bustle of animal and plant life.* Miloš Đurić, *Predgovor*, Aristotel, 1984:V.

⁷ *Moderno i opšte načelo...Parola demokratije zavladała je skoro svim umovima XIX i XX veka.* Filip Lovo, *Velike savremene demokratije*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci–Novi Sad, 1999:13.

cial interests, going from bad to worse, that is, constantly in disintegration. This does not suit anyone, least of all the absolute majority – "The poor". That is why it was a time which produced the most political literature, demagogy and attempts to find salvation in knowledge. Knowledge is necessary as a strong and sacred "ism".

*

Our ways of thinking, since this is what bothers us as the actual state of things in every respect: the individual, local, state and world wide, inspired by Aristotle's analyses, would be the following. Those who follow their own interests, they do not even know about anything else, but see this other in their own history or the sphere of their own interests and measure accordingly. The rich measure themselves against the richer, and they in turn with the even richer, and there is no community there, only unity in relation to money or based on something similar. This type of unity breaks up both the family and the state. Everything else serves as a mask for meeting one's own interests. "Equality" exists in the fact that people are located in the space of money and lack of money, and so can, or think they can, do anything from this equality.

"The space of having and not having money "is the space of "The poor man", the space of democracy, oligarchy, and the like, of all the actual types of government It craves sacred knowledge.

What is the knowledge of people who speak up for democracy but realize their own interests? That is, what kind of knowledge lies behind the personal interest of "The poor" so that they negate their basic status according to Aristotle⁸ that the greater good is above the personal one, and that it is actually the good of the state. This knowledge of the democratic poor and "The poor" is actually the lack of knowledge of the proper measure, or excess in something which is not good. They have no sense of measure in satisfying their own values and thus cannot be the basis for a good state which has to reside on the knowledge of measure or virtue. They do not actually have the free will to select a milieu for enrichment, not even the knowledge to do so, not even the rational features of an individual – "to judge every single thing correctly ". And what would happen if we were to shed light on this space of the personal interests for the acquisition of wealth; if we were to make the space equal for everyone; to present the fight for progress as legitimate, and so on?

What has no measure is excessive to the point of transcending the existing space into infinity.

Therefore we find dedication, the sacred nature of knowledge, faith in success, the right to it, equality in religion and desires, democracy is brought closer to religion, knowledge to faith. The seclusion of excessiveness. Excessiveness is not knowing the measure or knowledge of the basic "hunger" which is constantly requires satisfaction or "repetition so that it would come true." *It is often thought that wealth is made up of great amounts of money... Often times a man who has a lot of it will lack the food that is most necessary.* (Aristotle, 984:1257b, 16.) And the skills to run a household and the state

⁸ We should bear in mind that in Aristotle's time, we are talking about different types of rich and poor people, and a different state. We are not talking about slaves, women and foreigners, and the state is the polis or city made up of families and municipalities. .

should not be related to the acquisition of wealth, since ...*the accumulation of wealth, the skills of running a household has them,*... (Ibid, 1257b, 17.) This measure is appropriate. But how are we now supposed to present our own poverty, and excessiveness as something with measure, only by means of the democratic principle and religious exclusivity: that the measure lies in excessive dedication and knowledge of it. You have to be very rich and very poor. Which type of system of knowledge promotes the wellbeing of these extremes and equality before it? The basic component of the leveling of everything is money. Money, which since the time of Aristotle from a means of facilitation during an exchange becomes a purpose all of its own, and equalizes everything that is available on the basis of experience. We are all equal in terms of money. There we find the material and spatial (transcending) guidelines of "Democrat" and "The poor man".

One should now be educated and brought up in that spirit. In the natural order of things, from the individual, the family and move to the state, the lack of measure is manifested and so it is necessary to shed light on the matter "from the top" and color it with knowledge as well as the possibility of having it, since there is nowhere else from where to do so or is it possible in any other form. Whatever comes from "the top" has always been divine and holy. An individual is a "a poor man" just like the one who follows his own hunger, and thus is not for the family (does not have a rational relationship to it) or for society or the state, thus he is not human (since man is a political being) but an "animal or divinity". The religious democrats, "The poor" in money and knowledge, "one-dimensional people", dedicated individuals as such have this will, albeit not free, but guided by personal interest. The borders for becoming wealthier in a state and a household are to be found in the existence of other needs as well, and they are the needs of others, again at the expense of others. That is, ...*more care should be given to people than the acquisition of assets, and more to the care of the wellbeing of people than the wellbeing of property which makes up wealth,*... (Ibid, 1259b, 3.) So, those who are supposed to run a household and run a state should have more than the skills and knowledge of acquiring wealth, and that includes the needs and virtues of other members, that is, their happiness and satisfaction. Aristotle was right here, but this moment keeps becoming distorted, since "The poor", who are dedicated, by uplifting their pursuit, fanaticize it, claiming it is for others. Even Christ himself at Calvary did nothing for himself, but for other people. The Americans also wage war all over the world, not for themselves but for peace, democracy, freedom and the welfare of others. We have social workers, psychologists, courts and educational institutions which take over the care.

*We needed knowledge but we also needed its institutions*⁹

The family, and then the state are "complex creations", since they are made up of different individuals with many needs. This is why knowledge of these needs is necessary, and primarily in the case of those who would like to lead or who by their nature are already in that role, as for instance, the father of a family is. Knowledge comes in various

⁹ The Greeks did not have institutions of knowledge, they are the product of Christianity and the late ancient world. A school is a good example of an institution of knowledge. Something is a school if it has a building, teachers, a library, diplomas. Christianity is institutionalized around the church and commune. Flavius Cassidorus began the institutionalization of the education of monks. In the monastery "Vivarijium" to the south of Italy, he founded a library and wrote a handbook, meant to be used in education, the scientific work of Christian priests, *Institutions of divine and secular learning*.

shapes and sizes and is practical: knowledge of good, knowledge of how to run a household and knowledge of how to run a country. These free individuals with certain knowledge of their interests and the interests of others, such as the head of the family, are part of a state is meant to run it or who "take part in the justice system and government ". And so...*the state is made up of a great many citizens... and government is a certain order among the people in the state they live in.* (Ibid, 1275b, 2,1.) This is taken care of by the institutions of a new religion. They issue diplomas from "the top" for those who will take care of the wellbeing of others, but only to a certain extent.

The ancient Greeks did not have institutions of knowledge or as Jacob Burkhart puts it: *Taken as a whole, the polis relied on the education of citizens which they gained during their lifetime* (Jacob Burkhart, 1992: 329.) Aristotle looked at practical knowledge, practical science ethics and politics as parts of what he called "Politics", or in other words, unity. A man as an individual can be realized only as part of a community, and so ethics and politics are something that can be manifested as unique. There are no ethics or politics outside the community. Everything is focused on the state, it is the aim of man, since only in it can the welfare of everyone be satisfied and the individual develop as such. If man is an individual in a state or a political being, he is realized only by means of the knowledge of the determined laws and interests, and that is the welfare of everyone. Every other organization, which is not based on knowledge of the greater good actually does not enable the realization of all the individuals and thus is not a state. Nevertheless, Aristotle did not reach the conclusion of the necessity of institutions of knowledge for the purpose of the state as an institution.¹⁰

Having obtained his diploma, a man dedicated to knowledge takes his place next to a man dedicated to money. His knowledge is in use, but not in a free way, but is focused and guided. There is nothing outside the new religion. Just like every mythology, it too has an all-encompassing story. The official story of the "Democratic" "Poor".

*

The state is the highest form of human community in which the greatest good is realized, but also the greatest evil. Aristotle was, as were all ancient Greeks, limited by the time in which the city state was the milieu in which a state could be realized ...*the very notion of a city for Aristotle as an Ancient Greek matches the concept of a state.* (Miloš Đurić, 1984: IX). It existed in the world – a cosmos in which the same principles apply. This is why the Ancient Greeks and Aristotle could not consider this but not in the sense that they did not take into account that the planetary community in a political sense is either cosmopolitanism – globalism – planetary democracy, which is the tendency today.¹¹

¹⁰ What we will not develop here is the question of the laws which is also important for the formation of a state. The deciding role in that was played by Rome, which considered all citizens equal before the law. The second is its institutionalization which has a heuristic, judicial and educational aspect. The Greeks did not have any of that, except the legislature, the judges and the knowledge of the world and social order and the metaphysical order or principle.

¹¹ Aristotle in part thought about this but not consciously and ideologically with any pretensions, in the direction that some cosmopolitan state could be realized, and based on the knowledge and ideology of the Ancient Greeks. Of all the people they are the most capable since they have sense, courage, until now they have

For something like this we needed a cosmopolitan religion such as Christianity or what the Greeks lacked.

We are talking about a world state. Is it then possible to achieve good in such a state? Based on what we have said, it is a case of world "Poverty" and "Democracy"– the "new" religion. What this means is a regression rather than progress, since poverty is against the state. What we are dealing with is repetition, *respondeo*, as the logic of every mythology. The two-millennium endurance on the repetition of a single text. Are then "oasis of paradise" possible in a world of "Poverty"? It is impossible, since paradise has long ago been declared the enemy of knowledge.

But:

I promise that it has arrived. (Jacques Derrida, 2001:65.)

We in our earthly world are faced with the ever increasing centralization of money and power, which is linked with democracy which is taken as a modern principle or the best form of government, along with the new-age principle of reason, science and economic knowledge as something epochal. That is, the planetary principle of democracy obviously is not based on a law, let alone the rule of men "who are absolutely the best in terms of virtue".¹² What we are dealing with is planetary "poverty" and there are no measures in the development of the sphere of man and the world, to extents resembling that of a cancer, thanks to the concept of liberal democracy. Even those who get the Nobel Prize for peace, are not the absolute best in terms of virtue. No such people actually exist. The question is why they do not exist and what the preconditions for their occurrence are? There are none due to the power of ignorance.

We all make mistakes on the road to a greater cause.

Let us cite the following conclusion: *...man is free, which means responsible, which means he can make mistakes. Because he has been given the gift of freedom, an individual can choose, pick and give advantage to this or that in the field of possibility. Every act originates from free choice, free will, informed and obvious.* (Michel Onfray, 2005:79.) Could this not be the perfect guideline for a democratic individual? Freedom, choice, and the like, that is what represents the initial guidelines of Athenian democracy. No, that is not the knowledge of the Ancient Greeks, but it *...tells the story of the original Paradise...from the Five Books of Moses* (Ibid, pg. 79.)

The pragmatic democratic freedom, such as "Christianity with no God" is actually superfluous since democracy already means freedom, and Christianity requires the existence of a god. Bound to "Poverty", they unconsciously and unnoticeably remain filled with Christian belief/faith, encouraged even – they have called themselves civilized for a very long time. The western democrat knows, believes, punishes and forgives. He gives gifts to other poor people all over the world in terms of donations, humanitarian aid, in terms of expertise; he tries to abolish the effects of tyranny, introduces democracy and is ever richer. "How won-

realized the best social organization, kept their freedom, they have a sense for the arts, and the like. But there is something lacking. *...if they were to be united, they would be able to rule everyone.* Aristotle, 1984:1327b, 1.

¹² The second governing principle of planetary proportions is the one that originates from religious fundamentalism, as a response to Latinized democracy, and the "new religion". About the poverty of this type of government we need not say much, since it is clear that it resides on the mythology and theologies which do not allow the diversity of knowledge and thus the democratization of pluralism which is the precondition for the rule of those who are the best in terms of virtue.

derous", and why can we not say that a god is not needed for all that, but the "evangelical morality" says one is. "Christian atheism" speaks of knowledge. *God does not exist, virtues do not originate from revelation, they are not sent down from the sky, they originate from utilitarian and pragmatic reasons.* (ibid, pg. 87.) A simple change of place in the modern variant of Christian-democratic demagoguery. Through the story of "man becoming a god", the modern way of thought pushes Christian knowledge out. Is not Hegel's system a theoretical ode to a Christian god? What a triumph for "The poor man".

The final variant of the mimicry of the knowledge of "The poor" is "postmodern atheism". The deconstruction of everything that aspires to be the point – the essence. What was essence again? This is what the postmodernists of Anglo-American folklore ask themselves. It is all there, transparent, immanent, hedonistic, and merciful.....*taking care of people, with their help, for them, and not through the grace of God, for God.* The change of place, since the old ones have served their purpose. It is no longer "necessary to threaten one with Hell" or point out Heaven...*it is futile to resort to the ontology of the reward and punishment post mortem in order to call upon people to do the good, honest and fair thing* ("Desert Storm", "Angel of Mercy", the world financial crisis, SD) *A single ethics without transcendental commitments and sanctions* (Ibid, pg. 90.) So much has been done in the name of God and for God, it is democratic to replace him for a while in ruling the world.

It is not a question of the end of Aristotle's metaphysics (philosophy), it is merely tired of trying to outwit the incredibly resistant democracy of "The poor".

REFERENCES

1. Aristotel, 1980, *Nikomahova etika*, BIGZ, Beograd.
2. Aristotel, 1984, *Politika*, BIGZ, Beograd.
3. Burkhart Jakob, 1992, *Povest grčke kulture*, tom III, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci–Novi Sad.
4. Derida Žak, 2001, *Vera i znanje*, Svetovi, Novi Sad.
5. Lovo Filip, 1999, *Velike savremene demokratije*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci–Novi Sad.
6. Onfray Michel, 2005, *Ateološka rasprava*, Rad, Beograd.

DEMOKRATIJA I "SIROMAŠTVO" (JEDAN MOGUĆI PRISTUP IZ PRAVCA SAZNANJA)

Srboljub S. Dimitrijević

Ovim tekstom se želi da se otvori pitanje o odnosu demokratije i siromaštva. I to ne u smislu siromaštva kao oskudice u materijalnom bogatstvu, već u smislu bogatstva znanja. Namera je preispitivanje količine i vrste znanja koje se vezuje uz ljude demokratskog uređenja države. Da li je danšnji svetski demokratski princip nešto što uzrokuje napredovanje ljudi u znanju ili je to jedna drugačija situacija? U razvijanju teze o odnosu demokratije i saznanja započinje se Aristotelovim razumevanjem demokratije i ljudskih vrlina. Njegovim razmatranjem vrsta državne vladavine i pozicija samog demokratskog načina organizacije.

Ključne reči: *demokratija, siromaštvo, znanje, vrlina, religija, teizam, ateizam.*